C/L

THIS DOCUMENT IS THE PROPERTY OF HER BRITANNIC MAJESTY'S GOVERNMENT

E(81)60

20 May 1981

COPY NO 57

CABINET

MINISTERIAL COMMITTEE ON ECONOMIC STRAGEGY

LOCAL GOVERNMENT FINANCE

Memorandum by the Secretary of State for the Environment

1. Following our discussion on local authority expenditure and the future of the rating system on 13 and 19 May I am circulating this further note to draw together briefly the package that seems to be emerging. There are three main strands:

i. Action on local authority expenditure in 1981/82 and 1982/83 by means of the grant system.

ii. Medium term action on the rating system by means of legislation in the 1981/82 Parliamentary Session to come into effect on 1 April 1983.

iii. Longer term action to reform local taxation and local government organisation by means of legislation in the 1982/83 Parliamentary Session to come into effect in a new Parliament.

2. Action for 1981/82

We have agreed that it will be necessary to respond to the prospective overspend on local authority expenditure in the current year by proposing a substantial withholding of grant. We would at the same time call for revised budgets from authorities and hold out the prospect that if the revised budgets are lower the amount of holdback of grant may be reduced. We have still however to take final decisions on the level and distribution of the proposed holdback, and the form of any exemptions.

3. In deciding on the level of holdback the critical factor is the level of prospective overspend. The public will judge the adequacy of our response by reference to this. In cash terms authorities have collectively budgetted to overspend by £1350m on current account, which allowing for over-budgetting could prove to be some £950m in the outturn. Of this the Metropolitan Police are responsible for around £110m, by comparison with a 5.6% volume target, so that if they are excluded on the basis that we cannot look for an expenditure reduction from them, the planned cash excess under the control of local authorities is reduced to £1240m, or about £840m in the outturn.

4. In terms of volume of expenditure at November 1980 prices the budgetted overspend is £880 (or £780m excluding the Metropolitan Police) which might come down to about £500m in the outturn (or about £400m excluding the Metropolitan Police).

5. ILEA is responsible for just under £40m of the cash overspend or £36m of the volume overspend compared with their 5.6% volume target. Since they have already lost virtually all their grant because of their overspending, it might be argued that their overspending should also be excluded from the assessment of the amount of holdback. Butthe sums involved do not seem sufficient to affect the overall judgement on holdback significantly.

6. Annex A shows the effects of 3 levels of holdback set to withhold about £300m, £600m and £900m respectively. (The effects on individual authorities of the £300m and £900m holdbacks were exemplified in Annex E to E(81)52. I am circulating separately corresponding exemplifications for the two £600m options).

7. There is no way of establishing a precise relationship between the amount of overspend and the appropriate amount of holdback. It must be a question of judgement, bearing in mind the figures on overspend set out above. I believe that the low figure of £300m would be ineffective in reducing expenditure and should be rejected. A higher figure of £600m or £900m will be more effective in reducing expenditure but will also lead to a significant number of supplementary rates, which Labour-controlled authorities will be quick to blame on the Government. Indeed such authorities will undoubtedly hide their own increased expenditure plans and consequent need for supplementary rates behind the effects of our reduced grant. There is no escape from this dilemma. Hopefully we will be able to point to large numbers of Conservative-controlled authorities whose prudent expenditure plans avoid the need for any supplementary rates at all. But I must again point out that there could well be some embarrassing supplementary rates in Conservative-controlled authorities which have not met the targets.

8. As to the distribution of the holdback I now recommend what is referred to in the Annex as the lower GRE differential option. On closer examination of the figures I believe that the steeper GRE differential is too severe on the urban areas including London which have already lost heavily under this year's settlement. I recognise that this means that initially more of the burden will appear to fall on the shire counties. But most of them are much closer to achieving exemption through comparatively modest reductions in their budgets which mean that the outturn distribution will be more favourable to them.

9. As to exemptions I would initially announce exemption for those who have achieved the volume target and partial exemption for those within 2% or 2-4% of the target. I would not propose to concede any exemption initially to those below GRE because we still want all authorities to continue to make efforts to get down to the volume target set in January even if they are below GRE, and because there are legal difficulties about setting a GRE-related exemption when the GREs are themselves subject to amendment in the Supplementary Report in the autumn. We could however review the position in the summer in the light of the revised budgets, and reconsider then whether some GRE-related exemption could be conceded at that stage before the holdback is actually implemented through a Supplementary Report approved by Parliament.

10. I also propose to indicate in my statement on June 2 that the grant percentage for 1982/83 will be substantially influenced by the extent to which authorities attempt to achieve our targets in 1981/82.

Action on the Rating System

11. Reduction of grant on the scale I have proposed for this year coupled with the prospect of a further reduction next year, should have a significant effect in reducing levels of expenditure. Inevitably, however, this will lead to further rate increases as well which will put further pressure on the rating system. Bearing in mind the electoral mileage which the Labout Party and the Social Democrats may make out of a firm commitment to abolish domestic rates, it is essential that we should ourselves be able to announce in June a firm programme for amelioration of rates in the medium term, and for abolition of domestic rates as soon as that can be achieved.

Amelioration of Rates in the Medium Term

12. In the light of our discussion of para 6 of E(81)53, I now propose that we should announce in June our intention of proceeding - subject to consultations - on the following items:

(i) Keeping non-domestic rates but imposing a limitation (in high spending authorities) on the level of non-domestic rates (para 6(a) of E(81)(53).

(ii) Revaluation of the non-domestic sector (para 6(b)).

(iii) Requiring expenditure above a certain level to be financed under a new regime in which:

(a) a first tranche of additional expenditure would be financed only by a supplementary rate, to be levied not before September in the year; and

(b) any further tranche of expenditure be financed by a further supplementary rate, but would only be permitted after a referendums/fresh election of the council (I incline to prefer a fresh election). Elections of referenda would have to be by the whole electorate; it would be impossible nowadays to confine voting to ratepayers, which in most cases would mean the male head of the household.

(iv) Establishment of a new body to be responsible for improving the management efficiency of local authorities, and for the appointment and supervision of the auditors (E (81)54).

13. I propose to announce these proposals to Parliament on June 1 and to CCLGF on June 2. We would consult quickly thereafter and would aim to take final decisions before Parliament rises at the end of July; and to introduce (i) and (iii)-(iv) in a Bill in November this year so as to come into effect on 1 April 1983. The non-domestic revaluation would not require legislation but would take some time to carry out; it would come into effect on 1 April 1985.

14. In view of our decision to press on towards abolition of domestic rates as fast as possible, I think colleagues felt that it would not be worth pursuing any further the other ideas in para 6 of E(81)53 that were intended to alleviate the position of the domestic ratepayer, viz:

(i) Restructuring domestic rate relief (para 6(v))

(ii) Discounts for single person households (para 6(d))

(iii) Separating bills for rents and rates for council tenants (para 6(g))

I now recommend that we should not pursue these any further.

Abolition of Domestic Rates

15. We have so far agreed in E that we must maintain the manifesto commitment to abolish domestic rates, and should work towards implementation as soon as practicable. The work that has so far been undertaken enables us to reduce the field of alternative local taxes to local income tax, local sales tax and poll tax. In addition, I think we would be wise to retain also for the time being the option - although this is thoroughly unattractive politically - of making authorities basically reliant on central grant, and removing their revenue-raising powers completely, since it is by no means certain that we shall be able to find satisfactory ways of resolving the many serious technical and administrative problems to be overcome in the alternative local taxes. We should also keep open the option of phasing domestic rates out over a period of years (perhaps even retaining them indefinitely for one tier).

16. We must recognise at the outset that any alternative system we adopt will itself have very serious drawbacks. And while no-one doubts the injustices of rating, objections to alternative taxes (eg. lack of accountability, greater buoyancy, loss of control of expenditure, unpredictability of yield) could amount to almost insurmountable objections. Nevertheless our political commitment, and the movement of other parties towards pre-empting our stand on this ground, make it imperative that we maintain our commitment and push on with development work on the alternatives.

17. I would propose that further work should now proceed on the following broad timetable.

(i) Announce in June that we have narrowed the field to Local Income Tax, Local Sales Tax, Poll Tax or 100% grant.

(ii) Issue a consultation document on the alternatives in the autumn.

(iii) Conduct consultations and further development work on the alternatives in October-December.

(iv) In January 1982 colleagues review the consultations and further work, take main decisions and begin preparation of legislation for November 1982.

(v) Implementation would probably not be until the new Parliament, though this will depend on further investigation of the practicalities.

Local Government Reorganisation

18. We have also agreed at E that it would be desirable to consider abolition of the GLC and the metropolitan counties at the same time as any new form of local finance is introduced. I would propose to include this proposition in my statement on 1 June, and then to initiate consultations, with the other items to be the subject of consultations, during the remainder of 1981 so as to be able to announce firm decisions next January (possibly in a White Paper) at the same time as final decisions on the new source of local finance.

Conclusion

19. I invite colleagues to agree the proposals set out in this paper. I would then expect to announce them in Parliament on 1 June and to the Consultative Council on Local Government Finance on 2 June. I will circulate my statement in draft.

MH

Department of the Environment
2 Marsham Street
LONDON SW1

20 May 1981

SECRET

Summary incidence of holdback

	Volume overspend* (1)	£300m Holdback Small GRE differential (2)	£300m Holdback Larger GRE differential (3)	£600m Holdback Small GRE differential (4)	£600m Holdback Larger GRE differential (5)	£900 m Holdback Small GRE differential (6)	£900 m Holdback Larger GRE differential (7)
Cash amounts							
TOTAL England	£774m	£295.024m	£299.110m	£589.050m	£597.365m	£879.341m	£888.004m
Non-met districts	£38m	£20.129m	£24.636m	£40.395m	£49.102m	£56.077m	£64.955m
Non-met counties	£353m	£142.899m	£113.069m	£286.775m	£227.406m	£460.750m	£401.550m
Metropolitan districts	£159m	£62.095m	£66.772m	£125.190m	£134.646m	£183.695m	£193.195m
Metropolitan counties	£117m	£24.492m	£32.045m	£49.563m	£64.701m	£67.109m	£82.255m
Non-met total	£391m	£163.028m	£137.705m	£327.170m	£276.508m	£516.827m	£466.455m
Metropolian total	£276m	£86.587m	£98.817m	£174.753m	£199.347m	£250.804m	£275.449m
City & Westminster	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Rest of Inner London	-	£13.966m	£24.009m	£28.450m	£48.546m	£32.898m	£52.997m
Inner London inc ILEA	£67m	£18.772m	£28.815m	£33.256m	£53.352m	£37.704m	£57.603m
Outer London	£34m	£22.785m	£29.444m	£46.099m	£59.447m	£62.782m	£76.14[illegible]
GLC & Met Police	£6m	£3.890m	£4.428m	£7.851m	£8.931m	£11.284m	£12.36[illegible]
London total	£107.0m	£45.447m	£62.687m	£87.206m	£121.730m	£111.770m	£146.30[illegible]
Shares of holdback							
TOTAL England	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Non-met districts	4.9%	6.8%	8.2%	6.9%	8.2%	6.4%	7.3%
Non-met counties	45.6%	48.4%	37.8%	48.7%	38.1%	52.4%	45.2%
Metropolitan districts	20.5%	21.0%	22.3%	21.3%	22.5%	20.9%	21.8%
Metropolitan counties	15.1%	8.3%	10.7%	8.4%	10.8%	7.6%	9.3%
Non-met total	50.5%	55.3%	46.0%	55.5%	46.3%	58.8%	52.5%
Metropolian total	35.7%	29.3%	33.0%	29.7%	33.4%	28.5%	31.0%
City & Westminster	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Rest of Inner London	-	4.7%	8.0%	4.8%	8.1%	3.7%	6.0%
Inner London inc ILEA	8.7%	6.4%	9.6%	5.6%	8.9%	4.3%	6.5%
Outer London	4.4%	7.7%	9.8%	7.8%	10.0%	7.1%	8.6%
GLC & Met Police	.6%	1.3%	1.5%	1.3%	1.5%	1.3%	1.4%
London total	13.8%	15.4%	21.0%	14.8%	20.4%	12.7%	16.5%

* Excluding Metropolitan Police

CONFIDENTIAL Table 2 Copy No.... 57

The effect of holdback on individual authorities

	Budget total expenditure (1)	Performance against Volume target (2)	Performance against GRE (3)	£600m Holdback Small GRE differential (4)	£600m Holdback Larger GRE differential (5)
	£271.597m	£8.207m	£9.0ph	£6.969m	£5.877m
	£4.797m	£-.118m	£-5.6ph	-	-
	£34.577m	£4.822m	£23.7ph	£2.123m	£3.235m
	£2.853m	£.295m	£-4.9ph	£.083m	£.025m
	£3.918m	£.308m	£-3.1ph	£.177m	£.089m
	£2.701m	£.039m	£-4.2ph	£.023m	£.009m
	£6.626m	£-.003m	£3.1ph	-	-
...SHIRE	£169.094m	£5.481m	£33.3ph	£5.771m	£5.937m
...Bedfordshire	£5.761m	£-.167m	£5.0ph	-	-
	£8.575m	£.043m	£3.3ph	£.123m	£.117m
...Bedfordshire	£2.764m	£-.073m	£2.5ph	-	-
...Bedfordshire	£4.860m	£.478m	£3.5ph	£.317m	£.305m
...SHIRE	£200.161m	£9.994m	£-.4ph	£10.957m	£8.262m
	£3.379m	£.186m	£12.4ph	£.289m	£.379m
	£4.963m	£.519m	£-1.9ph	£.226m	£.139m
	£10.500m	£1.024m	£23.1ph	£.918m	£1.391m
	£5.629m	£-.400m	£-.2ph	-	-
...or and Maidenhead	£5.182m	£.234m	£-5.0ph	£.246m	£.073m
	£4.593m	£-.008m	£-1.8ph	-	-
...GHAMSHIRE	£172.147m	£17.187m	£16.9ph	£9.952m	£9.052m
...bury Vale	£4.619m	£-.038m	£1.6ph	-	-
...Buckinghamshire	£2.014m	£-.179m	£-8.0ph	-	£-.022m
	£3.389m	£-.013m	£3.9ph	-	-
...on Keynes	£6.635m	£.247m	£21.8ph	£.585m	£.876m
	£4.354m	£-.008m	£-1.5ph	-	-
...IDGESHIRE	£168.199m	£13.905m	£.8ph	£7.749m	£5.935m
...bridge	£4.997m	£-.057m	£-.1ph	-	-
...Cambridgeshire	£1.661m	£.006m	£.3ph	£.020m	£.015m
	£2.515m	£-.053m	£-4.2ph	-	-
...borough	£4.157m	£-.014m	£-2.2ph	-	-
...Cambridgeshire	£8.880m	£.497m	£23.1ph	£.662m	£1.004m
	£2.679m	£.052m	£-8.0ph	£.072m	£-.025m
...SHIRE	£304.771m	£13.878m	£16.4ph	£14.092m	£12.763m
	£6.350m	£.825m	£12.1ph	£.431m	£.560m
...and Nantwich	£3.325m	£-.003m	£9.6ph	-	-
...mere Port and Neston	£5.863m	£-.136m	£6.8ph	-	-
	£4.746m	£.347m	£7.7ph	£.341m	£.394m
...sfield	£7.105m	£.505m	£12.9ph	£.414m	£.548m
...Royal	£6.171m	£-.084m	£1.1ph	-	-
	£5.240m	£.003m	£10.5ph	£.081m	£.101m
	£8.751m	£-.482m	£13.5ph	-	-

CONFIDENTIAL Table 2 Copy No....

The effect of holdback on individual authorities

	Budget total expenditure (1)	Performance against Volume target (2)	Performance against GRE (3)	£600m Holdback Small GRE differential (4)	£600m Holdback Larger GRE differential (5)
CLEVELAND	£205.076m	£10.100m	£25.6ph	£8.363m	£8.152m
Hartlepool	£6.355m	£.475m	£14.7ph	£.274m	£.374m
Langbaurgh	£13.216m	£1.042m	£36.8ph	£1.081m	£1.787m
Middlesbrough	£15.058m	£.873m	£32.9ph	£.760m	£1.232m
Stockton-on-Tees	£11.113m	£.918m	£17.0ph	£.784m	£1.109m
CORNWALL	£120.308m	£9.104m	£-5.8ph	£4.021m	£2.799m
Caradon	£2.808m	£.141m	£5.3ph	£.117m	£.122m
Carrick	£3.921m	£.147m	£4.1ph	£.150m	£.148m
Kerrier	£3.054m	£-.126m	£-6.6ph	-	-
North Cornwall	£2.820m	£.441m	£1.9ph	£.106m	£.093m
Penwith	£3.023m	£-.023m	£3.1ph	-	-
Restormel	£2.993m	£-.065m	£-2.3ph	-	-
CUMBRIA	£148.207m	£5.614m	£7.8ph	£4.555m	£3.796m
Allerdale	£4.795m	£-.560m	£7.5ph	-	-
Barrow in Furness	£4.047m	£.150m	£7.6ph	£.130m	£.150m
Carlisle	£5.940m	£.573m	£21.2ph	£.364m	£.542m
Copeland	£4.216m	£-.010m	£23.4ph	-	-
Eden	£1.546m	£-.286m	£-5.5ph	-	-
South Lakeland	£4.415m	£-.004m	£.6ph	-	-
DERBYSHIRE	£273.128m	£11.992m	£8.6ph	£10.079m	£8.466m
Amber Valley	£4.538m	£-.015m	£-3.6ph	-	-
Bolsover	£3.448m	£-1.913m	£7.2ph	£.117m	£.133m
Chesterfield	£6.035m	£.398m	£20.2ph	£.372m	£.547m
Derby	£13.090m	£1.199m	£19.3ph	£.923m	£1.345m
Erewash	£4.550m	£-.114m	£1.7ph	-	-
High Peak	£3.789m	£-.129m	£6.0ph	-	-
North East Derbyshire	£4.640m	£.330m	£13.5ph	£.221m	£.296m
South Derbyshire	£2.134m	£-.001m	£-4.3ph	-	-
West Derbyshire	£2.880m	£.135m	£-.8ph	£.094m	£.066m
DEVON	£271.103m	£15.662m	£-.1ph	£10.325m	£7.813m
East Devon	£4.424m	£-.461m	£-1.7ph	-	-
Exeter	£4.270m	£-.170m	£.5ph	-	-
North Devon	£3.717m	£.136m	£1.9ph	£.123m	£.108m
Plymouth	£10.804m	£.038m	£-6.4ph	£.069m	£.006m
South Hams	£2.866m	£-.015m	£-7.2ph	-	£-.003m
Teignbridge	£4.452m	£.045m	£.3ph	£.038m	£.029m
Mid Devon	£1.957m	£-.005m	£-.2ph	-	-
Torbay	£6.300m	£.915m	£5.3ph	£.300m	£.314m
Torridge	£2.328m	£.045m	£1.0ph	£.034m	£.028m
West Devon	£1.439m	£.154m	£-11.0ph	£.022m	£-.024m
DORSET	£163.079m	£-.019m	£8.2ph	-	-
Bournemouth	£9.526m	£-.553m	£4.9ph	-	-
Christchurch	£1.724m	£.045m	£3.2ph	£.061m	£.058m
North Dorset	£1.362m	£.069m	£-3.9ph	£.054m	£.023m
Poole	£5.823m	£-.497m	£2.3ph	-	-
Purbeck	£1.350m	£.057m	£-7.3ph	£.045m	£-.003m
West Dorset	£2.487m	£-.114m	£-12.1ph	-	£-.071m
Weymouth and Portland	£2.862m	£.088m	£4.1ph	£.108m	£.106m
Wimbourne	£2.292m	£.039m	£-7.8ph	£.045m	£-.012m

CONFIDENTIAL Table 2 Copy No....

The effect of holdback on individual authorities

	Budget total expenditure (1)	Performance against Volume target (2)	Performance against GRE (3)	£600m Holdback Small GRE differential (4)	£600m Holdback Larger GRE differential (5)
	£195.896m	£11.176m	£28.2ph	£6.280m	£6.233m
	£2.928m	£.143m	£17.7ph	£.128m	£.183m
	£7.990m	£-.009m	£33.5ph	-	-
	£6.330m	£.742m	£32.0ph	£.368m	£.594m
	£5.542m	£.306m	£29.7ph	£.309m	£.492m
	£5.648m	£.129m	£4.8ph	£.077m	£.079m
	£7.478m	£.157m	£24.4ph	£.197m	£.302m
	£.916m	£.038m	£2.1ph	£.033m	£.029m
	£4.917m	£.295m	£26.9ph	£.224m	£.349m
	£181.809m	£1.432m	£10.7ph	£2.348m	£2.016m
	£12.780m	£-.174m	£16.1ph	-	-
	£6.316m	£.339m	£18.5ph	£.428m	£.618m
	£4.574m	£-.107m	£4.9ph	-	-
	£4.626m	£-.012m	£-7.7ph	-	£-.018m
	£4.018m	£-.071m	£4.6ph	-	-
	£3.770m	£-.001m	£.8ph	-	-
	£4.265m	£.002m	£2.2ph	£.054m	£.048m
	£418.799m	£24.691m	£-.5ph	£21.068m	£15.865m
	£11.366m	£.960m	£22.6ph	£.811m	£1.224m
	£4.189m	£.267m	£-1.4ph	£.191m	£.126m
	£2.539m	£.141m	£-4.6ph	£.136m	£.046m
	£3.637m	£-.057m	£4.5ph	-	-
	£4.572m	£.083m	£4.2ph	£.212m	£.210m
	£4.627m	£-.035m	£.4ph	-	-
	£4.403m	£.180m	£3.6ph	£.320m	£.308m
	£6.737m	£.807m	£41.5ph	£.462m	£.462m
	£1.632m	£.010m	£-4.8ph	£.018m	£.006m
	£2.949m	£.032m	£-2.6ph	£.030m	£.016m
	£10.769m	£.662m	£8.0ph	£.574m	£.669m
	£5.560m	£-.151m	£5.3ph	-	-
	£7.111m	£-.082m	£1.6ph	-	-
	£2.142m	£.044m	£-9.5ph	£.036m	£-.033m
	£147.511m	£4.472m	£6.2ph	£3.752m	£3.070m
	£4.078m	£-.287m	-	-	-
	£2.515m	£-.007m	£-5.7ph	-	-
	£2.263m	£.075m	£-10.5ph	£.041m	£-.037m
	£3.017m	£.006m	£-8.6ph	£.023m	£-.032m
	£3.390m	£-.118m	£.6ph	-	-
	£2.404m	£.059m	£-1.0ph	£.073m	£.050m
	£424.654m	£9.984m	£-1.4ph	£11.375m	£8.458m
	£5.349m	£-.559m	£10.6ph	-	-
	£3.952m	£.307m	£-2.3ph	£.139m	£.080m
	£3.440m	£-.149m	£4.4ph	-	-
	£4.548m	£.421m	£10.0ph	£.262m	£.324m
	£3.315m	£.050m	£-4.5ph	£.061m	£.022m
	£2.958m	£.426m	£5.4ph	£.174m	£.182m
	£4.884m	£-.230m	£-4.9ph	-	-
	£6.143m	£.155m	£-.4ph	£.189m	£.138m
	£16.549m	£.648m	£6.9ph	£.852m	£.955m
	£5.111m	£-.009m	£11.2ph	-	-
	£12.983m	£-.276m	£8.6ph	-	-
	£3.495m	£.060m	£-.5ph	£.103m	£.074m
	£3.548m	£-.025m	£.5ph	-	-

CONFIDENTIAL Table 2 Copy No....

The effect of holdback on individual authorities

	Budget total expenditure (1)	Performance against Volume target (2)	GRE (3)	£600m Holdback Small GRE differential (4)	Larger GRE differential (5)
HEREFORD AND WORCESTER	£182.494m	£11.770m	£-4.2ph	£7.614m	£5.432m
Bromsgrove	£2.635m	-	£-2.1ph		-
Hereford	£2.130m	£.215m	£12.3ph	£.165m	£.216m
Leominster	£1.320m	£.210m	£-.2ph	£.048m	£.036m
Malvern Hills	£3.056m	£.013m	£-1.5ph	£.031m	£.020m
Redditch	£3.976m	£.185m	£18.9ph	£.297m	£.431m
South Herefordshire	£1.632m	£.045m	£-.6ph	£.038m	£.027m
Worcester	£3.988m	£.470m	£13.2ph	£.324m	£.431m
Wychavon	£4.491m	£-.110m	£10.3ph	-	-
Wyre Forest	£6.318m	£1.021m	£22.4ph	£.440m	£.662m
HERTFORDSHIRE	£293.116m	£7.820m	£6.9ph	£10.019m	£8.263m
Broxbourne	£4.389m	£.562m	£-2.8ph	£.155m	£.083m
Dacorum	£5.257m	£-.492m	£11.6ph	-	-
East Hertfordshire	£5.100m	£.265m	£9.0ph	£.351m	£.422m
Hertsmere	£5.514m	£-.093m	£15.6ph	-	-
North Hertfordshire	£4.183m	£-.030m	£5.0ph	-	-
St Albans	£4.757m	£-.014m	£2.5ph	-	-
Stevenage	£5.987m	£.044m	£37.6ph	£.145m	£.145m
Three Rivers	£4.077m	£.004m	£10.9ph	£.077m	£.097m
Watford	£6.046m	£.357m	£12.4ph	£.401m	£.525m
Welwyn Hatfield	£5.260m	£-.194m	£25.4ph	-	-
HUMBERSIDE	£271.523m	£13.607m	£1.7ph	£3.651m	£6.709m
Beverley	£3.530m	£.318m	£-.7ph	£.157m	£.111m
Boothferry	£3.647m	£.460m	£16.6ph	£.162m	£.229m
Cleethorpes	£4.452m	£.045m	£17.5ph	£.065m	£.093m
Glanford	£3.525m	£.405m	£21.3ph	£.251m	£.373m
Great Grimsby	£5.283m	£.369m	£3.9ph	£.194m	£.190m
Holderness	£1.702m	£-.020m	£-.5ph	-	-
Kingston upon Hull	£19.397m	£2.337m	£19.1ph	£.893m	£1.299m
North Wolds	£3.853m	£.099m	£10.2ph	£.094m	£.116m
Scunthorpe	£6.093m	£.949m	£25.2ph	£.406m	£.627m
ISLE OF WIGHT	£34.013m	£2.682m	£-1.6ph	£1.241m	£.920m
Medina	£3.181m	£.144m	£6.0ph	£.144m	£.156m
South Wight	£2.795m	£.016m	£14.4ph	£.038m	£.052m
KENT	£421.285m	£19.062m	£-4.1ph	£16.715m	£11.940m
Ashford	£3.768m	£-.068m	£-.4ph		-
Canterbury	£6.960m	£.480m	£12.9ph	£.363m	£.480m
Dartford	£5.841m	£.163m	£18.7ph	£.321m	£.465m
Dover	£5.939m	£.039m	£7.0ph	£.055m	£.062m
Gillingham	£2.526m	£.326m	£-15.4ph	£.025m	£-.135m
Gravesham	£4.616m	£-.124m	£3.0ph	-	-
Maidstone	£5.864m	£-.098m	£1.5ph	-	-
Rochester upon Medway	£6.727m	£-.091m	£-5.6ph	-	-
Sevenoaks	£5.047m	£-1.050m	£9.7ph	-	-
Shepway	£5.153m	£-.049m	£9.8ph	-	-
Swale	£5.083m	£-.677m	£-.7ph	-	-
Thanet	£8.356m	£-.319m	£11.6ph	-	-
Tonbridge and Malling	£4.384m	£-.069m	£10.2ph	-	-
Tunbridge Wells	£4.226m	£.155m	£5.9ph	£.219m	£.235m

CONFIDENTIAL Table 2 Copy No....

The effect of holdback on individual authorities

	Budget total expenditure (1)	Performance against Volume target (2)	GRE (3)	£600m Holdback Small GRE differential (4)	Larger GRE differential (5)
...SHIRE	£416.529m	£18.427m	£-.9ph	£12.422m	£9.304m
...burn	£13.344m	£.284m	£31.2ph	£.348m	£.559m
...pool	£9.912m	£.166m	£11.2ph	£.266m	£.339m
...ley	£7.822m	£.546m	£30.5ph	£.350m	£.560m
...ler	£3.737m	£.679m	£.6ph	£.122m	£.097m
...e	£3.477m	£-.011m	£8.0ph	-	-
...burn	£5.195m	£.541m	£14.4ph	£.178m	£.241m
...ster	£7.442m	£-.180m	£14.0ph	-	-
...le	£5.796m	£.488m	£17.0ph	£.183m	£.259m
...ton	£7.771m	£.270m	£9.4ph	£.333m	£.406m
...le Valley	£2.430m	£.036m	£6.4ph	£.060m	£.066m
...endale	£4.438m	£-.106m	£31.5ph	-	-
...Ribble	£3.468m	£-.020m	£-3.6ph	-	-
...Lancashire	£4.759m	£-.007m	£.6ph	-	-
[illegible]	£4.610m	£.130m	£4.3ph	£.114m	£.113m
...ESTERSHIRE	£246.576m	£5.253m	£-9.0ph	£5.648m	£3.723m
...y	£2.288m	£-.013m	£-3.7ph	-	-
...rnwood	£4.568m	£-.083m	£-5.6ph	-	-
...rough	£2.149m	£.227m	£-3.8ph	£.084m	£.036m
...ler and Bosworth	£2.818m	£.176m	£-3.3ph	£.125m	£.060m
...ester	£21.018m	£2.975m	£11.9ph	£1.098m	£1.422m
...on	£1.508m	£.148m	£-1.6ph	£.068m	£.043m
...h West Leicestershire	£3.177m	£.232m	£4.3ph	£.174m	£.173m
...e and Wigston	£1.524m	£.086m	£-4.3ph	£.072m	£.027m
...and	£.918m	£.113m	£-2.3ph	£.045m	£.026m
...LNSHIRE	£161.980m	£7.733m	-	£5.522m	£4.186m
...on	£2.095m	£-.004m	£-.1ph	-	-
...Lindsey	£4.417m	£-3.243m	£-.5ph	£.164m	£.118m
...ln	£4.000m	£.039m	£12.6ph	£.061m	£.080m
...Kesteven	£2.711m	£.153m	£-4.5ph	£.080m	£.028m
...Holland	£2.880m	£.124m	£-4.9ph	£.067m	£.020m
...Kesteven	£3.657m	£-.006m	£.3ph		
...Lindsey	£3.151m	£.381m	£-1.0ph	£.100m	£.069m
...LK	£190.398m	£9.866m	£-5.1ph	£7.685m	£5.405m
...land	£2.964m	£-.091m	£-7.6ph	-	£-.011m
...land	£2.889m	£-.052m	£-2.8ph	-	-
...Yarmouth	£5.439m	£.088m	£20.2ph	£.219m	£.322m
...Norfolk	£3.335m	£-.008m	£-2.8ph	-	-
...ch	£9.563m	£.877m	£15.9ph	£.653m	£.910m
...Norfolk	£2.949m	-	£-9.1ph	-	£-.032m
...Norfolk	£5.533m	£-.198m	£1.4ph	-	-
...MPTONSHIRE	£150.295m	£-.007m	£-16.0ph	-	-
...y	£2.766m	£-.484m	£18.9ph	-	-
...try	£1.848m	£-.001m	£3.5ph	-	-
...Northamptonshire	£1.733m	£-.003m	£-4.0ph	-	-
...ering	£3.530m	£.106m	£-3.4ph	£.092m	£.043m
...ampton	£9.802m	£-.276m	£3.4ph	-	-
...h Northamptonshire	£1.985m	£.098m	£4.8ph	£.107m	£.109m
...borough	£2.731m	£.215m	£.5ph	£.119m	£.094m

The effect of holdback on individual authorities

	Budget total expenditure (1)	Performance against Volume target (2)	GRE (3)	£600m Holdback Small GRE differential (4)	Larger GRE differential (5)
NORTHUMBERLAND	£94.539m	£1.797m	£17.4ph	£2.008m	£1.836m
Alnwick	£1.476m	£-.005m	£2.2ph	-	-
Berwick-upon-Tweed	£1.148m	£-.015m	£10.9ph	-	-
Blyth Valley	£4.851m	£.099m	£9.7ph	£.095m	£.116m
Castle Morpeth	£1.838m	£-.004m	£-.4ph	-	-
Tynedale	£2.637m	£.021m	£1.9ph	£.022m	£.019m
Wansbeck	£4.589m	£-.007m	£31.3ph	-	-
NORTH YORKSHIRE	£201.711m	£9.070m	£5.6ph	£7.227m	£5.875m
Craven	£2.203m	£.037m	£7.1ph	£.057m	£.064m
Hambleton	£2.400m	£-.059m	£-.6ph	-	-
Harrogate	£8.448m	£2.210m	£19.0ph	£.493m	£.716m
Richmondshire	£2.028m	£.077m	£5.9ph	£.080m	£.086m
Ryedale	£2.883m	£.056m	£1.9ph	£.071m	£.062m
Scarborough	£5.457m	£-.601m	£10.1ph	-	-
Selby	£3.490m	£.105m	£4.2ph	£.131m	£.130m
York	£5.040m	£-.020m	£4.5ph	-	-
NOTTINGHAMSHIRE	£301.842m	£14.587m	£-5.7ph	£10.429m	£7.269m
Ashfield	£4.905m	£.388m	£4.1ph	£.175m	£.173m
Bassetlaw	£6.076m	£.373m	£18.5ph	£.504m	£.728m
Broxtowe	£4.390m	£.093m	£-.2ph	£.099m	£.073m
Gedling	£4.026m	£.411m	£4.6ph	£.194m	£.196m
Mansfield	£5.659m	£.492m	£4.9ph	£.173m	£.177m
Newark	£4.300m	£.374m	£4.7ph	£.194m	£.197m
Nottingham	£18.353m	£.745m	£13.1ph	£1.060m	£1.406m
Rushcliffe	£4.065m	£-.029m	£9.5ph	-	-
OXFORDSHIRE	£155.912m	£2.470m	£12.8ph	£2.027m	£1.778m
Cherwell	£3.894m	£.036m	£-.9ph	£.051m	£.035m
Oxford	£5.753m	£-.192m	£-5.6ph	-	-
South Oxfordshire	£4.489m	£-.116m	£-2.2ph	-	-
Vale of White Horse	£3.131m	£-.128m	£-1.7ph	-	-
West Oxfordshire	£2.577m	£.019m	£-2.8ph	£.028m	£.015m
SHROPSHIRE	£112.565m	£6.126m	£-4.5ph	£3.933m	£2.793m
Bridgnorth	£1.614m	£-.011m	£1.2ph	-	-
North Shropshire	£1.743m	£-.043m	£2.4ph	-	-
Oswestry	£1.160m	£.040m	£11.8ph	£.052m	£.067m
Shrewsbury and Atcham	£3.243m	£-.057m	£1.7ph	-	-
South Shropshire	£1.472m	£.100m	£5.5ph	£.058m	£.061m
The Wrekin	£7.506m	£.630m	£17.5ph	£.445m	£.635m
SOMERSET	£123.755m	£3.888m	£1.4ph	£2.861m	£2.209m
Mendip	£2.670m	£.002m	£-5.4ph	£.024m	£.006m
Sedgemoor	£3.537m	£-.298m	£4.1ph	-	-
Taunton Deane	£3.559m	£-.043m	-	-	-
West Somerset	£1.124m	£.084m	£-16.3ph	£.010m	£-.084m
Yeovil	£4.722m	£.036m	£4.0ph	£.061m	£.060m

CONFIDENTIAL Table 2 Copy No....

The effect of holdback on individual authorities

	Budget total expenditure (1)	Performance against Volume target (2)	GRE (3)	£600m Holdback Small GRE differential (4)	Larger GRE differential (5)
FORDSHIRE	£307.537m	£9.667m	£8.3ph	£7.438m	£6.228m
k Chase	£3.577m	£.517m	£-2.1ph	£.134m	£.080m
Staffordshire	£3.779m	£.097m	£3.8ph	£.215m	£.210m
field	£2.692m	£.035m	£3.9ph	£.044m	£.043m
stle-under-Lyme	£5.862m	£.532m	£15.2ph	£.356m	£.490m
Staffordshire	£3.057m	£.253m	£-.1ph	£.161m	£.120m
ford	£4.538m	£.236m	£2.5ph	£.254m	£.230m
rdshire Moorlands	£2.989m	£.492m	£1.3ph	£.142m	£.120m
on-Trent	£12.510m	£.701m	£6.8ph	£.620m	£.692m
rth	£3.153m	£-.073m	£.5ph	-	-
LK	£170.999m	£7.160m	£8.6ph	£7.757m	£6.517m
rgh	£3.359m	£.426m	£4.7ph	£.159m	£.161m
t Heath	£2.087m	£-.200m	£7.8ph	-	-
ich	£7.737m	£2.576m	£16.1ph	£.530m	£.741m
Suffolk	£2.692m	£.195m	£1.3ph	£.118m	£.099m
mundsbury	£3.119m	£-.008m	£1.9ph	-	-
lk Coastal	£3.950m	£.233m	£.1ph	£.188m	£.144m
ney	£4.911m	£.247m	£.7ph	£.162m	£.130m
EY	£266.502m	£6.532m	£5.0ph	£9.483m	£7.651m
ridge	£5.202m	£-.250m	£.7ph	-	-
m and Ewell	£3.409m	£-.105m	£.2ph	-	-
ford	£4.780m	£.093m	£-3.1ph	£.155m	£.078m
Valley	£3.059m	£-.130m	£.1ph	-	-
ate and Banstead	£4.735m	£-.193m	£3.3ph	-	-
nede	£2.744m	£-.019m	£-5.8ph	-	-
horne	£3.834m	£-.343m	£-4.6ph	-	-
h Heath	£3.027m	£.095m	£4.7ph	£.223m	£.227m
ridge	£2.517m	£.027m	£-.9ph	£.033m	£.023m
ler	£4.529m	£-.132m	£2.8ph	-	-
[illegible]	£3.644m	£-.006m	£-7.0ph	-	£-.002m
CKSHIRE	£140.489m	£7.442m	£.5ph	£6.322m	£4.824m
Warwickshire	£3.112m	£.281m	£10.5ph	£.193m	£.242m
ton and Bedworth	£7.874m	£.548m	£22.1ph	£.455m	£.683m
[illegible]	£3.641m	£-.037m	£4.1ph	-	-
ford on Avon	£4.623m	£-.056m	£16.9ph	-	-
ck	£5.058m	£.374m	£-.2ph	£.256m	£.191m
SUSSEX	£172.596m	£9.457m	£-3.1ph	£8.844m	£6.414m
[illegible]	£3.660m	£.266m	£20.2ph	£.272m	£.400m
hester	£6.009m	£-.014m	£-1.9ph	-	-
[illegible]	£4.127m	£-.023m	£-2.7ph	-	-
[illegible]	£5.630m	£1.016m	£36.5ph	-	-
Sussex	£3.565m	£.002m	£-3.3ph	£.039m	£.019m
[illegible]	£4.882m	£.103m	£2.5ph	£.154m	£.140m
[illegible]	£5.802m	£.036m	£10.5ph	£.083m	£.104m
SHIRE	£150.558m	£5.504m	£-6.4ph	£5.273m	£3.636m
[illegible]	£2.466m	£-.005m	£4.7ph	-	-
Wiltshire	£3.608m	£.183m	£-3.6ph	£.118m	£.053m
sbury	£3.472m	£-.067m	£-2.9ph	-	-
ndon	£11.925m	£-.119m	£34.9ph	-	-
Wiltshire	£2.826m	£.380m	£-10.6ph	£.065m	£-.061m

CONFIDENTIAL Table 2 Copy No....

The effect of holdback on individual authorities

	Budget total expenditure (1)	Performance against Volume target (2)	Performance against GRE (3)	£600m Holdback Small GRE differential (4)	£600m Holdback Larger GRE differential (5)
METROPOLITAN AUTHORITIES					
GREATER MANCHESTER	£219.180m	£21.994m	£15.6ph	£10.969m	£13.940m
Bolton	£82.392m	£5.551m	£12.8ph	£2.618m	£2.313m
Bury	£55.745m	£4.328m	£32.2ph	£2.159m	£2.238m
Manchester	£241.177m	£13.624m	£133.2ph	£13.778m	£20.516m
Oldham	£74.202m	£2.082m	£-4.7ph	£1.167m	£.823m
Rochdale	£76.587m	£6.526m	£52.9ph	£2.648m	£3.131m
Salford	£86.298m	£.171m	£27.6ph	£.691m	£.691m
Stockport	£82.943m	£3.709m	£-.7ph	£3.389m	£2.542m
Tameside	£72.385m	£2.649m	£20.1ph	£2.260m	£2.136m
Trafford	£64.897m	£.049m	£-13.3ph	£.758m	£.451m
Wigan	£100.728m	£4.899m	£24.8ph	£3.347m	£3.283m
MERSEYSIDE	£139.844m	£19.332m	£15.7ph	£6.626m	£8.435m
Knowsley	£64.109m	£2.570m	£5.7ph	£2.047m	£1.673m
Liverpool	£205.065m	£14.195m	£43.2ph	£7.943m	£8.896m
St Helens	£65.129m	£1.455m	£34.4ph	£1.624m	£1.712m
Sefton	£82.575m	£.730m	£-26.3ph	£.628m	£.244m
Wirral	£102.437m	£.773m	£1.4ph	£.955m	£.739m
SOUTH YORKSHIRE	£148.629m	£22.280m	£49.1ph	£8.694m	£14.238m
Barnsley	£73.627m	£2.703m	£36.8ph	£2.209m	£2.370m
Doncaster	£98.070m	£-.285m	£51.5ph	-	-
Rotherham	£82.845m	£-.138m	£28.8ph	-	-
Sheffield	£202.317m	£14.931m	£85.6ph	£10.645m	£14.281m
TYNE AND WEAR	£127.417m	£11.507m	£33.1ph	£6.397m	£9.724m
Gateshead	£69.041m	£3.754m	£29.7ph	£2.367m	£2.405m
Newcastle upon Tyne	£118.555m	£5.701m	£112.8ph	£7.697m	£11.042m
North Tyneside	£67.571m	£.777m	£52.8ph	£.667m	£.788m
South Tyneside	£59.485m	£1.502m	£50.8ph	£1.090m	£1.276m
Sunderland	£98.252m	£7.064m	£42.3ph	£3.141m	£3.497m
WEST MIDLANDS	£198.765m	£19.753m	£6.6ph	£10.326m	£10.460m
Birmingham	£348.553m	£11.780m	£15.5ph	£15.531m	£14.091m
Coventry	£106.725m	£5.170m	£10.6ph	£4.287m	£3.701m
Dudley	£75.791m	£5.594m	£-9.6ph	£3.487m	£2.244m
Sandwell	£104.488m	£7.272m	£28.7ph	£5.605m	£5.654m
Solihull	£55.853m	£-.467m	£-11.9ph	-	-
Walsall	£91.381m	£12.791m	£41.2ph	£4.811m	£5.319m
Wolverhampton	£94.023m	£9.350m	£44.2ph	£5.042m	£5.680m
WEST YORKSHIRE	£164.601m	£22.416m	£12.8ph	£6.551m	£7.904m
Bradford	£147.731m	£.544m	£15.8ph	£1.028m	£.935m
Calderdale	£62.154m	£.427m	£39.0ph	£.456m	£.497m
Kirklees	£115.740m	£10.794m	£12.9ph	£3.196m	£2.827m
Leeds	£212.454m	£12.069m	£8.0ph	£7.919m	£6.651m
Wakefield	£95.526m	£-.030m	£27.7ph	-	-

CONFIDENTIAL Table 2 Copy No....

The effect of holdback on individual authorities

	Budget total expenditure (1)	Performance against Volume target (2)	Performance against GRE (3)	£600m Holdback Small GRE differential (4)	£600m Holdback Larger GRE differential (5)
[illegible] AUTHORITIES					
[illegible] of London	£60.144m	£7.581m	£8,942.7ph	-	-
[illegible]	£102.427m	£10.761m	£232.0ph	-	-
[illegible]ich	£49.923m	£3.112m	£86.4ph	£2.561m	£4.113m
[illegible]	£71.040m	£2.155m	£127.3ph	£4.123m	£7.047m
[illegible]rsmith and Fulham	£51.936m	£.392m	£69.6ph	£.658m	£1.015m
[illegible]	£69.360m	£2.309m	£125.9ph	£5.942m	£10.140m
[illegible]ington and Chelsea	£36.139m	£-1.200m	£17.4ph	-	-
[illegible]	£98.831m	£4.813m	£117.2ph	£6.383m	£10.779m
[illegible]	£74.206m	£3.482m	£128.0ph	£3.793m	£6.488m
[illegible]wark	£87.032m	£-.037m	£131.9ph	-	-
[illegible] Hamlets	£60.775m	£6.101m	£190.9ph	£4.990m	£8.964m
[illegible]worth	£60.000m	£-7.084m	£24.9ph	-	-
[illegible]inster	£67.927m	£.051m	£47.3ph	-	-
[illegible] and Dagenham	£60.384m	£1.498m	£96.8ph	£2.248m	£3.138m
[illegible]	£89.053m	£-2.145m	£2.3ph	-	-
[illegible]	£74.792m	£-.031m	£41.5ph	-	-
[illegible]	£121.421m	£6.854m	£87.5ph	£7.526m	£10.249m
[illegible]	£89.461m	£-.370m	£9.8ph	-	-
[illegible]	£101.636m	£-.002m	£10.9ph	-	-
[illegible]	£105.850m	£-.123m	£25.1ph	-	-
[illegible]	£88.942m	£3.564m	£28.2ph	£4.619m	£4.676m
[illegible]	£109.638m	£3.758m	£130.4ph	£6.279m	£9.382m
[illegible]	£68.359m	£2.360m	£46.8ph	£3.842m	£4.441m
[illegible]	£81.135m	£-.073m	£35.4ph	-	-
[illegible]	£83.067m	£-1.177m	£54.5ph	-	-
[illegible]	£85.460m	£5.866m	£82.4ph	£6.465m	£8.670m
[illegible]-upon-Thames	£43.490m	£-1.484m	£27.0ph	-	-
[illegible]	£54.489m	£-2.028m	£27.0ph	-	-
[illegible]	£112.187m	£8.118m	£100.1ph	£5.661m	£7.966m
[illegible]	£70.761m	£2.377m	£8.7ph	£2.978m	£2.530m
[illegible]-upon-Thames	£48.794m	£-.048m	£27.6ph	-	-
[illegible]	£51.699m	£1.601m	£2.2ph	£1.327m	£1.038m
[illegible] Forest	£99.545m	£6.745m	£106.4ph	£5.154m	£7.357m
[illegible] London Education Authority	£693.928m	£36.190m	£93.0ph	£4.806m	£4.806m
[illegible] London Council	£455.844m	£5.606m	£7.2ph	£7.851m	£8.931m

CONFIDENTIAL Table 3 Copy No....

The effect of holdback on individual authorities

	Performance against		£600m Holdback	
	Volume target (1)	GRE (2)	Small GRE differential (3)	Larger GRE differential (4)
AVON	3.4%	£9.0ph	5.9p	5.0p
Bath	-4.2%	£-5.6ph	-	-
Bristol	24.7%	£23.7ph	3.7p	5.6p
Kingswood	15.3%	£-4.9ph	1.1p	.3p
Northavon	12.6%	£-3.1ph	1.2p	.6p
Wansdyke	1.7%	£-4.2ph	.3p	.1p
Woodspring	-.1%	£3.1ph	-	-
BEDFORDSHIRE	3.8%	£33.3ph	7.3p	7.5p
North Bedfordshire	-3.7%	£5.0ph	-	-
Luton	.9%	£3.3ph	.4p	.4p
Mid Bedfordshire	-3.5%	£2.5ph	-	-
South Bedfordshire	13.2%	£3.5ph	1.7p	1.7p
BERKSHIRE	5.9%	£-.4ph	9.3p	7.0p
Bracknell	7.5%	£12.4ph	2.2p	2.9p
Newbury	17.2%	£-1.9ph	1.3p	.8p
Reading	14.8%	£23.1ph	3.6p	5.5p
Slough	-9.1%	£-.2ph	-	-
Windsor and Maidenhead	6.3%	£-5.0ph	1.1p	.3p
Wokingham	-.3%	£-1.8ph	-	-
BUCKINGHAMSHIRE	12.6%	£16.9ph	11.0p	10.0p
Aylesbury Vale	-1.2%	£1.6ph	-	-
South Buckinghamshire	-9.6%	£-8.0ph	-	-.2p
Chiltern	-.5%	£3.9ph	-	-
Milton Keynes	7.1%	£21.8ph	3.5p	5.2p
Wycombe	-.2%	£-1.5ph	-	-
CAMBRIDGESHIRE	9.9%	£.8ph	9.7p	7.5p
Cambridge	-2.0%	£-.1ph	-	-
East Cambridgeshire	.5%	£.3ph	.4p	.3p
Fenland	-2.8%	£-4.2ph	-	-
Huntingdon	-.5%	£-2.2ph	-	-
Peterborough	9.9%	£23.1ph	3.6p	5.5p
South Cambridgeshire	2.5%	£-8.0ph	.5p	-.2p
CHESHIRE	5.3%	£16.4ph	11.0p	9.9p
Chester	21.8%	£12.1ph	2.5p	3.3p
Congleton	-.1%	£9.6ph	-	-
Crewe and Nantwich	-3.3%	£6.8ph	-	-
Ellesmere Port and Neston	10.7%	£7.7ph	2.1p	2.4p
Halton	10.7%	£12.9ph	2.6p	3.5p
Macclesfield	-1.6%	£1.1ph	-	-
Vale Royal	.1%	£10.5ph	.6p	.7p
Warrington	-7.0%	£13.5ph	-	-

CONFIDENTIAL Table 3 Copy No....

The effect of holdback on individual authorities

	Performance against		£600m Holdback	
	Volume target (1)	GRE (2)	Small GRE differential (3)	Larger GRE differential (4)
	5.7%	£25.6ph	11.3p	11.0p
	12.6%	£14.7ph	2.8p	3.8p
	14.3%	£36.8ph	4.9p	8.2p
	10.7%	£32.9ph	4.6p	7.4p
	13.3%	£17.0ph	3.0p	4.3p
	8.8%	£-5.8ph	9.1p	6.3p
	8.0%	£5.3ph	1.9p	2.0p
	6.3%	£4.1ph	1.8p	1.7p
	-5.1%	£-6.6ph	-	-
	26.6%	£1.9ph	1.6p	1.4p
	-1.0%	£3.1ph	-	-
	-2.5%	£-2.3ph	-	-
	4.1%	£7.8ph	9.8p	8.2p
	-15.3%	£7.5ph	-	-
	4.9%	£7.6ph	2.1p	2.4p
	14.5%	£21.2ph	3.4p	5.1p
	-.3%	£23.4ph	-	-
	-25.0%	£-5.5ph	-	-
	-.1%	£.6ph	-	-
	5.1%	£8.6ph	10.0p	8.4p
	-.5%	£-3.6ph	-	-
	10.0%	£7.2ph	2.1p	2.3p
	11.4%	£20.2ph	3.3p	4.9p
	13.4%	£19.3ph	3.2p	4.7p
	-3.1%	£1.7ph	-	-
	-4.0%	£6.0ph	-	-
	10.5%	£13.5ph	2.5p	3.4p
	-.1%	£-4.3ph	-	-
	6.4%	£-.8ph	1.4p	1.0p
	6.8%	£-.1ph	9.5p	7.2p
	-13.2%	£-1.7ph	-	-
	-6.1%	£.5ph	-	-
	4.9%	£1.9ph	1.6p	1.4p
	.6%	£-6.4ph	.2p	-
	-.6%	£-7.2ph	-	-
	1.5%	£.3ph	.4p	.3p
	-.3%	£-.2ph	-	-
	24.4%	£5.3ph	1.9p	2.0p
	3.2%	£1.0ph	.9p	.8p
	16.9%	£-11.0ph	.6p	-.6p
	-	£8.2ph	-	-
	-8.4%	£4.9ph	-	-
	3.5%	£3.2ph	1.0p	1.0p
	7.3%	£-3.9ph	1.1p	.5p
	-12.3%	£2.3ph	-	-
	6.0%	£-7.3ph	.9p	-.1p
	-5.5%	£-12.1ph	-	-.8p
	4.4%	£4.1ph	1.8p	1.7p
	2.4%	£-7.8ph	.5p	-.1p

CONFIDENTIAL Table 3 Copy No....

The effect of holdback on individual authorities

	Performance against Volume target (1)	GRE (2)	£600m Holdback Small GRE differential (3)	Larger GRE differential (4)
DURHAM	6.5%	£28.2ph	11.0p	10.9p
Chester-le-Street	8.4%	£17.7ph	2.9p	4.2p
Darlington	-.2%	£33.5ph	-	-
Derwentside	22.1%	£32.0ph	4.4p	7.1p
Durham	9.3%	£29.7ph	3.6p	5.7p
Easington	3.4%	£4.8ph	1.1p	1.1p
Sedgefield	3.5%	£24.4ph	2.2p	3.4p
Teesdale	5.7%	£2.1ph	1.6p	1.4p
Wear Valley	9.0%	£26.9ph	4.0p	6.2p
EAST SUSSEX	.9%	£10.7ph	2.5p	2.1p
Brighton	-1.6%	£16.1ph	-	-
Eastbourne	7.6%	£18.5ph	3.4p	4.8p
Hastings	-2.9%	£4.9ph	-	-
Hove	-.3%	£-7.7ph	-	-.1p
Lewes	-2.4%	£4.6ph	-	-
Rother	-	£.8ph	-	-
Wealden	.1%	£2.2ph	.4p	.4p
ESSEX	7.1%	£-.5ph	9.3p	7.0p
Basildon	13.9%	£22.6ph	3.6p	5.4p
Braintree	9.2%	£-1.4ph	1.3p	.9p
Brentwood	8.0%	£-4.6ph	1.1p	.4p
Castle Point	-1.9%	£4.5ph	-	-
Chelmsford	2.7%	£4.2ph	1.0p	1.0p
Colchester	-1.0%	£.4ph	-	-
Epping Forest	4.7%	£3.6ph	1.7p	1.7p
Harlow	19.1%	£41.5ph	3.4p	3.4p
Maldon	.8%	£-4.8ph	.3p	.1p
Rochford	1.5%	£-2.6ph	.3p	.2p
Southend-on-Sea	9.2%	£8.0ph	2.2p	2.6p
Tendring	-3.4%	£5.3ph	-	-
Thurrock	-1.5%	£1.6ph	-	-
Uttlesford	2.6%	£-9.5ph	.4p	-.4p
GLOUCESTERSHIRE	3.5%	£6.2ph	6.0p	4.9p
Cheltenham	-9.0%	-	-	-
Cotswold	-.4%	£-5.7ph	-	-
Forest of Dean	4.2%	£-10.5ph	.6p	-.6p
Gloucester	.2%	£-8.6ph	.2p	-.3p
Stroud	-4.1%	£.6ph	-	-
Tewkesbury	2.9%	£-1.0ph	.7p	.5p
HAMPSHIRE	2.7%	£-1.4ph	5.7p	4.2p
Basingstoke and Deane	-12.7%	£10.6ph	-	-
East Hampshire	11.6%	£-2.3ph	1.3p	.7p
Eastleigh	-6.6%	£4.4ph	-	-
Fareham	17.8%	£10.0ph	2.3p	2.9p
Gosport	2.3%	£-4.5ph	.7p	.2p
Hart	22.1%	£5.4ph	1.9p	2.0p
Havant	-6.9%	£-4.9ph	-	-
New Forest	3.9%	£-.4ph	.9p	.6p
Portsmouth	7.1%	£6.9ph	3.2p	3.6p
Rushmoor	-.4%	£11.2ph	-	-
Southampton	-2.9%	£8.6ph	-	-
Test Valley	2.4%	£-.5ph	.8p	.6p
Winchester	-1.0%	£.5ph	-	-

CONFIDENTIAL Table 3 Copy No....

The effect of holdback on individual authorities

	Performance against Volume target (1)	GRE (2)	£600m Holdback Small GRE differential (3)	Larger GRE differential (4)
...ORD AND WORCESTER	7.6%	£-4.2ph	9.4p	6.7p
...grove	-	£-2.1ph	-	-
...ford	14.2%	£12.3ph	2.6p	3.3p
...inster	25.0%	£-.2ph	1.4p	1.1p
...rn Hills	.6%	£-1.5ph	.3p	.2p
...itch	7.2%	£18.9ph	3.2p	4.6p
... Herefordshire	3.9%	£-.6ph	.8p	.6p
...ester	18.5%	£13.2ph	2.6p	3.5p
...von	-2.9%	£10.3ph	-	-
... Forest	25.6%	£22.4ph	3.5p	5.3p
...FORDSHIRE	3.1%	£6.9ph	6.1p	5.0p
...bourne	18.9%	£-2.8ph	1.3p	.7p
...rum	-9.9%	£11.6ph	-	-
... Hertfordshire	7.9%	£9.0ph	2.2p	2.7p
...smere	-2.1%	£15.6ph	-	-
... Hertfordshire	-.8%	£5.0ph	-	-
...Albans	-.4%	£2.5ph	-	-
...enage	1.0%	£37.6ph	1.1p	1.1p
... Rivers	.1%	£10.9ph	.6p	.8p
...ford	8.6%	£12.4ph	2.6p	3.4p
... Hatfield	-4.7%	£25.4ph	-	-
...ERSIDE	5.8%	£1.7ph	9.2p	7.1p
...ley	13.6%	£-.7ph	1.4p	1.0p
...ferry	24.8%	£16.6ph	3.0p	4.2p
...thorpes	1.5%	£17.5ph	.8p	1.1p
...ford	20.9%	£21.3ph	3.1p	4.6p
... Grimsby	12.1%	£3.9ph	1.8p	1.7p
...erness	-1.6%	£-.5ph	-	-
...ston upon Hull	21.9%	£19.1ph	3.2p	4.7p
... Wolds	3.4%	£10.2ph	1.4p	1.8p
...thorpe	33.1%	£25.2ph	3.8p	5.9p
...E OF WIGHT	9.5%	£-1.6ph	9.6p	7.1p
...ina	6.6%	£6.0ph	1.9p	2.1p
... Wight	.8%	£14.4ph	.7p	.9p
...T	5.2%	£-4.1ph	9.4p	6.7p
...ford	-2.9%	£-.4ph	-	-
...erbury	12.0%	£12.9ph	2.6p	3.5p
...ford	4.1%	£18.7ph	3.2p	4.6p
...er	.8%	£7.0ph	.5p	.6p
...lingham	20.1%	£-15.4ph	.2p	-1.3p
...esham	-3.6%	£3.0ph	-	-
...dstone	-2.2%	£1.5ph	-	-
...ester upon Medway	-2.1%	£-5.6ph	-	-
...noaks	-19.9%	£9.7ph	-	-
...way	-1.2%	£9.8ph	-	-
...le	-15.3%	£-.7ph	-	-
...et	-4.6%	£11.6ph	-	-
...bridge and Malling	-1.7%	£10.2ph	-	-
...bridge Wells	4.6%	£5.9ph	1.9p	2.1p

The effect of holdback on individual authorities

	Performance against Volume target (1)	GRE (2)	£600m Holdback Small GRE differential (3)	Larger GRE differential (4)
LANCASHIRE	5.0%	£-.9ph	9.0p	6.8p
Blackburn	3.7%	£31.2ph	2.6p	4.2p
Blackpool	2.4%	£11.2ph	1.5p	1.9p
Burnley	13.1%	£30.5ph	4.3p	6.9p
Chorley	28.0%	£.6ph	1.5p	1.2p
Fylde	-.4%	£8.0ph	-	-
Hyndburn	16.2%	£14.4ph	2.8p	3.8p
Lancaster	-3.1%	£14.0ph	-	-
Pendle	11.8%	£17.0ph	3.0p	4.3p
Preston	5.6%	£9.4ph	2.3p	2.8p
Ribble Valley	2.1%	£6.4ph	1.2p	1.3p
Rossendale	-3.0%	£31.5ph	-	-
South Ribble	-.8%	£-3.6ph	-	-
West Lancashire	-.2%	£.6ph	-	-
Wyre	3.6%	£4.3ph	1.1p	1.1p
LEICESTERSHIRE	2.4%	£-9.0ph	5.2p	3.4p
Blaby	-.8%	£-3.7ph	-	-
Charnwood	-2.3%	£-5.6ph	-	-
Harborough	16.0%	£-3.8ph	1.2p	.5p
Hinckley and Bosworth	10.1%	£-3.3ph	1.2p	.6p
Leicester	24.2%	£11.9ph	2.8p	3.6p
Melton	15.7%	£-1.6ph	1.3p	.8p
North West Leicestershire	11.7%	£4.3ph	1.8p	1.8p
Oadby and Wigston	7.3%	£-4.3ph	1.1p	.4p
Rutland	16.0%	£-2.3ph	1.3p	.7p
LINCOLNSHIRE	5.4%	-	9.4p	7.1p
Boston	-.2%	£-.1ph	-	-
East Lindsey	10.0%	£-.5ph	1.4p	1.0p
Lincoln	1.2%	£12.6ph	.6p	.9p
North Kesteven	7.2%	£-4.5ph	1.1p	.4p
South Holland	5.6%	£-4.9ph	1.1p	.3p
South Kesteven	-.2%	£.3ph	-	-
West Lindsey	19.0%	£-1.0ph	1.4p	.9p
NORFOLK	6.0%	£-5.1ph	8.8p	6.2p
Breckland	-3.6%	£-7.6ph	-	-.1p
Broadland	-2.2%	£-2.8ph	-	-
Great Yarmouth	2.5%	£20.2ph	2.0p	2.9p
North Norfolk	-.3%	£-2.8ph	-	-
Norwich	16.9%	£15.9ph	3.0p	4.2p
South Norfolk	-	£-9.1ph	-	-.3p
West Norfolk	-5.3%	£1.4ph	-	-
NORTHAMPTONSHIRE	-	£-16.0ph	-	-
Corby	-20.0%	£18.9ph	-	-
Daventry	-.1%	£3.5ph	-	-
East Northamptonshire	-.2%	£-4.0ph	-	-
Kettering	4.7%	£-3.4ph	1.2p	.6p
Northampton	-4.8%	£3.4ph	-	-
South Northamptonshire	9.0%	£4.8ph	1.6p	1.6p
Wellingborough	21.0%	£.5ph	1.5p	1.2p

CONFIDENTIAL Table 3 Copy No....

The effect of holdback on individual authorities

	Performance against Volume target (1)	GRE (2)	£600m Holdback Small GRE differential (3)	Larger GRE differential (4)
...MBERLAND	2.1%	£17.4ph	6.5p	5.9p
...ick	-.6%	£2.2ph	-	-
...-upon-Tweed	-1.9%	£10.9ph	-	-
...Valley	3.5%	£9.7ph	1.4p	1.7p
...Morpeth	-.3%	£-.4ph	-	-
...dale	1.3%	£1.9ph	.4p	.4p
...beck	-.2%	£31.3ph	-	-
...YORKSHIRE	5.1%	£5.6ph	9.9p	8.1p
...	2.2%	£7.1ph	1.2p	1.4p
...ldon	-3.1%	£-.6ph	-	-
...gate	45.2%	£19.0ph	3.2p	4.7p
...ondshire	4.9%	£5.9ph	1.9p	2.1p
...le	2.6%	£1.9ph	1.0p	.8p
...orough	-12.0%	£10.1ph	-	-
...	4.0%	£4.2ph	1.1p	1.1p
...	-.6%	£4.5ph	-	-
...GHAMSHIRE	5.5%	£-5.7ph	8.6p	6.0p
...ield	13.1%	£4.1ph	1.8p	1.7p
...law	11.1%	£18.5ph	3.2p	4.6p
...owe	3.0%	£-.2ph	.9p	.6p
...ing	15.5%	£4.6ph	1.8p	1.8p
...field	17.4%	£4.9ph	1.8p	1.9p
...k	14.8%	£4.7ph	1.8p	1.8p
...gham	5.8%	£13.1ph	2.6p	3.5p
...cliffe	-1.0%	£9.5ph	-	-
...SHIRE	1.9%	£12.8ph	2.6p	2.3p
...ell	1.2%	£-.9ph	.3p	.2p
...rd	-5.4%	£-5.6ph	-	-
...Oxfordshire	-3.3%	£-2.2ph	-	-
...of White Horse	-4.7%	£-1.7ph	-	-
...Oxfordshire	.9%	£-2.8ph	.3p	.2p
...SHIRE	6.4%	£-4.5ph	9.3p	6.6p
...north	-.9%	£1.2ph	-	-
...Shropshire	-3.0%	£2.4ph	-	-
...try	4.5%	£11.8ph	1.8p	2.4p
...bury and Atcham	-2.3%	£1.7ph	-	-
...Shropshire	9.4%	£5.5ph	1.9p	2.0p
...Wrekin	13.5%	£17.5ph	3.1p	4.4p
...SET	3.7%	£1.4ph	5.9p	4.5p
...ip	.1%	£-5.4ph	.3p	.1p
...moor	-9.3%	£4.1ph	-	-
...on Deane	-1.8%	-	-	-
...Somerset	10.9%	£-16.3ph	.2p	-1.5p
...il	1.2%	£4.0ph	.4p	.4p

CONFIDENTIAL   Table 3   Copy No....

The effect of holdback on individual authorities

	Performance against Volume target (1)	GRE (2)	£600m Holdback Small GRE differential (3)	£600m Holdback Larger GRE differential (4)
STAFFORDSHIRE	3.6%	£8.3ph	6.2p	5.2p
Cannock Chase	26.5%	£-2.1ph	1.3p	.8p
East Staffordshire	4.2%	£3.8ph	1.7p	1.7p
Lichfield	1.6%	£3.9ph	.4p	.4p
Newcastle-under-Lyme	13.8%	£15.2ph	2.8p	3.9p
South Staffordshire	11.5%	£-.1ph	1.4p	1.1p
Stafford	7.8%	£2.5ph	1.6p	1.5p
Staffordshire Moorlands	20.1%	£1.3ph	1.6p	1.3p
Stoke-on-Trent	8.2%	£6.3ph	2.0p	2.3p
Tamworth	-3.7%	£.5ph	-	-
SUFFOLK	5.1%	£8.6ph	10.4p	8.7p
Babergh	23.1%	£4.7ph	1.8p	1.8p
Forest Heath	-14.5%	£7.8ph	-	-
Ipswich	62.4%	£16.1ph	2.9p	4.1p
Mid Suffolk	11.2%	£1.3ph	1.5p	1.3p
St Edmundsbury	-.3%	£1.9ph	-	-
Suffolk Coastal	8.0%	£.1ph	1.5p	1.1p
Waveney	7.7%	£.7ph	1.5p	1.2p
SURREY	2.7%	£5.0ph	5.7p	4.6p
Elmbridge	-5.8%	£.7ph	-	-
Epsom and Ewell	-3.6%	£.2ph	-	-
Guildford	2.7%	£-3.1ph	.7p	.4p
Mole Valley	-5.1%	£.1ph	-	-
Reigate and Banstead	-5.1%	£3.3ph	-	-
Runnymede	-.9%	£-5.8ph	-	-
Spelthorne	-10.5%	£-4.6ph	-	-
Surrey Heath	4.5%	£4.7ph	1.8p	1.3p
Tandridge	1.3%	£-.9ph	.3p	.2p
Waverley	-3.5%	£2.8ph	-	-
Woking	-.3%	£-7.0ph	-	-
WARWICKSHIRE	6.2%	£.5ph	9.7p	7.4p
North Warwickshire	15.3%	£10.5ph	2.4p	3.0p
Nuneaton and Bedworth	12.0%	£22.1ph	3.5p	5.3p
Rugby	-1.3%	£4.1ph	-	-
Stratford on Avon	-1.9%	£16.9ph	-	-
Warwick	10.7%	£-.2ph	1.4p	1.1p
WEST SUSSEX	6.4%	£-3.1ph	9.4p	6.8p
Adur	12.6%	£20.2ph	3.3p	4.9p
Arun	-.3%	£-1.9ph	-	-
Chichester	-.8%	£-2.7ph	-	-
Crawley	37.8%	£36.5ph	-	-
Horsham	.1%	£-3.3ph	.3p	.1p
Mid Sussex	3.0%	£2.5ph	1.0p	.9p
Worthing	.8%	£10.5ph	.6p	.7p
WILTSHIRE	4.2%	£-6.4ph	9.2p	6.3p
Kennet	-.3%	£4.7ph	-	-
North Wiltshire	7.0%	£-3.6ph	1.2p	.5p
Salisbury	-2.7%	£-2.9ph	-	-
Thamesdown	-2.2%	£34.9ph	-	-
West Wiltshire	19.0%	£-10.6ph	.6p	-.6p

CONFIDENTIAL   Table 3   Copy No....

The effect of holdback on individual authorities

	Performance against Volume target (1)	GRE (2)	£600m Holdback Small GRE differential (3)	£600m Holdback Larger GRE differential (4)
…POLITAN AUTHORITIES				
…ER MANCHESTER	9.9%	£15.6ph	3.4p	4.4p
	9.0%	£12.8ph	9.6p	8.5p
	10.1%	£32.2ph	11.5p	11.9p
…hester	8.1%	£133.2ph	19.1p	28.4p
	3.8%	£-4.7ph	5.2p	3.7p
	11.5%	£52.9ph	13.0p	15.3p
	.3%	£27.6ph	2.2p	2.2p
	5.6%	£-.7ph	9.0p	6.8p
	4.6%	£20.1ph	10.7p	10.1p
	.1%	£-13.3ph	2.0p	1.2p
	6.5%	£24.8ph	11.0p	10.8p
…SIDE	12.5%	£15.7ph	3.5p	4.4p
	4.9%	£5.7ph	9.5p	7.8p
	9.1%	£43.2ph	11.3p	12.7p
	2.9%	£34.4ph	7.3p	7.7p
	1.1%	£-26.3ph	1.8p	.7p
	.9%	£1.4ph	2.3p	1.8p
…YORKSHIRE	17.8%	£49.1ph	6.4p	10.5p
	4.7%	£36.8ph	11.8p	12.7p
	-.4%	£51.5ph	-	-
	-.2%	£28.8ph	-	-
	10.6%	£85.6ph	16.3p	21.9p
…AND WEAR	9.9%	£33.1ph	5.1p	7.8p
	6.9%	£29.7ph	11.1p	11.3p
…stle upon Tyne	6.6%	£112.8ph	18.8p	27.0p
…Tyneside	1.5%	£52.8ph	3.3p	3.9p
…Tyneside	3.3%	£50.8ph	7.0p	8.2p
…rland	9.4%	£42.3ph	11.8p	13.2p
…MIDLANDS	10.0%	£6.6ph	2.6p	2.6p
	4.2%	£15.5ph	9.7p	8.8p
	6.3%	£10.6ph	9.9p	8.6p
	9.6%	£-9.6ph	8.3p	5.4p
	9.4%	£28.7ph	11.3p	11.4p
	-1.0%	£-11.9ph	-	-
	20.0%	£41.2ph	12.5p	13.8p
…ampton	14.3%	£44.2ph	12.3p	13.9p
…YORKSHIRE	13.3%	£12.8ph	3.2p	3.8p
	.4%	£15.8ph	2.4p	2.2p
	.8%	£39.0ph	2.8p	3.1p
	12.6%	£12.9ph	10.1p	8.9p
	7.6%	£8.0ph	9.3p	7.8p
	-	£27.7ph	-	-

CONFIDENTIAL Table 3 Copy No....

The effect of holdback on individual authorities

	Performance against Volume target (1)	GRE (2)	£600m Holdback Small GRE differential (3)	£600m Holdback Larger GRE differential (4)
LONDON AUTHORITIES				
City of London	34.6%	£8,942.7ph	-	-
Camden	24.2%	£232.0ph	-	-
Greenwich	9.9%	£86.4ph	8.0p	12.9p
Hackney	5.7%	£127.3ph	11.8p	20.1p
Hammersmith and Fulham	1.1%	£69.6ph	2.0p	3.1p
Islington	6.0%	£125.9ph	11.8p	20.2p
Kensington and Chelsea	-4.3%	£17.4ph	-	-
Lambeth	8.4%	£117.2ph	11.2p	18.9p
Lewisham	8.3%	£128.0ph	11.4p	19.5p
Southwark	-.1%	£131.9ph	-	-
Tower Hamlets	15.4%	£190.9ph	11.5p	20.7p
Wandsworth	-14.0%	£24.9ph	-	-
Westminster	.1%	£47.3ph	-	-
Barking and Dagenham	3.4%	£96.8ph	8.5p	11.8p
Barnet	-2.7%	£2.3ph	-	-
Bexley	-.1%	£41.5ph	-	-
Brent	7.6%	£87.5ph	15.0p	20.4p
Bromley	-.5%	£9.8ph	-	-
Croydon	-	£10.9ph	-	-
Ealing	-.1%	£25.1ph	-	-
Enfield	5.2%	£28.2ph	9.7p	9.9p
Haringey	4.5%	£130.4ph	18.3p	27.4p
Harrow	4.4%	£46.8ph	11.4p	13.2p
Havering	-.1%	£35.4ph	-	-
Hillingdon	-1.7%	£54.5ph	-	-
Hounslow	9.9%	£82.4ph	13.6p	18.3p
Kingston-upon-Thames	-4.1%	£27.0ph	-	-
Merton	-4.3%	£27.0ph	-	-
Newham	10.9%	£100.1ph	16.1p	22.6p
Redbridge	4.2%	£8.7ph	8.4p	7.1p
Richmond-upon-Thames	-.1%	£27.6ph	-	-
Sutton	3.9%	£2.2ph	4.8p	3.7p
Waltham Forest	9.9%	£106.4ph	16.6p	23.7p
Inner London Education Authority	6.0%	£93.0ph	.4p	.4p
Greater London Council	1.5%	£7.2ph	.4p	.5p

CONFIDENTIAL Table 4 Copy No....

The effect of holdback on individual authority rate bills

	Volume over spend (1)	1981/82 Average rate bill (2)	£600m Holdback Small GRE differential (3)	£600m Holdback Larger GRE differential (4)
	3.4%			
	-4.2%	£178	£10	£9
...tol	24.7%	£210	£16	£18
...wood	15.3%	£188	£13	£10
...havon	12.6%	£192	£13	£11
...dyke	1.7%	£198	£12	£10
...spring	-.1%	£227	£12	£10
...DSHIRE	3.8%			
...h Bedfordshire	-3.7%	£252	£15	£16
...n	.9%	£285	£18	£19
...Bedfordshire	-3.5%	£256	£16	£16
...Bedfordshire	13.2%	£299	£22	£23
...SHIRE	5.9%			
...knell	7.5%	£276	£29	£25
...ury	17.2%	£263	£26	£19
...ing	14.8%	£280	£29	£28
...gh	-9.1%	£258	£22	£17
...or and Maidenhead	6.3%	£299	£30	£21
...ngham	-.3%	£306	£27	£20
...GHAMSHIRE	12.6%			
...sbury Vale	-1.2%	£249	£25	£23
... Buckinghamshire	-9.6%	£396	£39	£35
...tern	-.5%	£390	£38	£34
...on Keynes	7.1%	£241	£29	£31
...mbe	-.2%	£319	£32	£29
...IDGESHIRE	9.9%			
...ridge	-2.0%	£275	£24	£18
... Cambridgeshire	.5%	£185	£17	£13
...land	-2.8%	£169	£15	£11
...ingdon	-.5%	£213	£19	£14
...erborough	9.9%	£237	£24	£23
... Cambridgeshire	2.5%	£265	£25	£18
...SHIRE	5.3%			
...ter	21.8%	£252	£28	£27
...leton	-.1%	£232	£22	£20
... and Nantwich	-3.3%	£219	£20	£18
...mere Port and Neston	10.7%	£254	£27	£26
...ton	10.7%	£212	£23	£23
...esfield	-1.6%	£280	£26	£24
... Royal	.1%	£223	£21	£20
...rington	-7.0%	£220	£20	£18

CONFIDENTIAL Table 4 Copy No....

The effect of holdback on individual authority rate bills

	Volume over spend (1)	1981/82 Average rate bill (2)	£600m Holdback: Small GRE differential (3)	£600m Holdback: Larger GRE differential (4)
CLEVELAND	5.7%			
Hartlepool	12.6%	£182	£19	£20
Langbaurgh	14.3%	£233	£26	£31
Middlesbrough	10.7%	£234	£25	£30
Stockton-on-Tees	13.3%	£223	£24	£26
CORNWALL	8.8%			
Caradon	8.0%	£161	£17	£13
Carrick	6.3%	£159	£17	£13
Kerrier	-5.1%	£144	£13	£9
North Cornwall	26.6%	£157	£17	£12
Penwith	-1.0%	£148	£13	£9
Restormel	-2.5%	£164	£14	£10
CUMBRIA	4.1%			
Allerdale	-15.3%	£146	£12	£10
Barrow in Furness	4.9%	£133	£13	£12
Carlisle	14.5%	£174	£18	£18
Copeland	-.3%	£142	£11	£9
Eden	-25.0%	£135	£12	£10
South Lakeland	-.1%	£170	£15	£13
DERBYSHIRE	5.1%			
Amber Valley	-.5%	£167	£15	£13
Bolsover	10.0%	£142	£15	£13
Chesterfield	11.4%	£177	£19	£19
Derby	13.4%	£204	£23	£23
Erewash	-3.1%	£172	£15	£13
High Peak	-4.0%	£155	£14	£12
North East Derbyshire	10.5%	£183	£19	£18
South Derbyshire	-.1%	£176	£17	£14
West Derbyshire	6.4%	£185	£19	£16
DEVON	6.8%			
East Devon	-13.2%	£192	£18	£14
Exeter	-6.1%	£183	£17	£13
North Devon	4.9%	£146	£16	£12
Plymouth	.6%	£194	£19	£14
South Hams	-.6%	£179	£16	£12
Teignbridge	1.5%	£183	£17	£13
Mid Devon	-.3%	£153	£14	£11
Torbay	24.4%	£207	£23	£18
Torridge	3.2%	£127	£13	£10
West Devon	16.9%	£159	£16	£10
DORSET				
Bournemouth	-8.4%	£275	-	-
Christchurch	3.5%	£268	£2	£2
North Dorset	7.3%	£200	£2	£1
Poole	-12.3%	£270	-	-
Purbeck	6.0%	£224	£2	-
West Dorset	-5.5%	£188	-	£(1)
Weymouth and Portland	4.4%	£214	£3	£3
Wimbourne	2.4%	£276	£1	-

CONFIDENTIAL Table 4 Copy No....

The effect of holdback on individual authority rate bills

	Volume over spend (1)	1981/82 Average rate bill (2)	£600m Holdback: Small GRE differential (3)	£600m Holdback: Larger GRE differential (4)
	6.5%			
…ter-le-Street	8.4%	£184	£20	£22
…ington	-.2%	£202	£16	£16
…entside	22.1%	£165	£18	£21
…am	9.3%	£178	£21	£24
…ington	3.4%	£140	£13	£13
…efield	3.5%	£167	£16	£18
…dale	5.7%	£123	£14	£13
…r Valley	9.0%	£143	£16	£18
… SUSSEX	.9%			
…	-1.6%	£260	£5	£4
…bourne	7.6%	£295	£14	£17
…ings	-2.9%	£211	£5	£4
…	-.3%	£261	£6	£5
…es	-2.4%	£259	£6	£5
…er		£262	£6	£5
…lden	-.1%	£233	£6	£5
…	7.1%			
…ildon	13.9%	£289	£32	£31
…ntree	9.2%	£215	£22	£16
…ntwood	8.0%	£312	£32	£22
…le Point	-1.9%	£260	£23	£17
…lmsford	2.7%	£265	£26	£20
…chester	-1.0%	£217	£20	£15
…ing Forest	4.7%	£309	£31	£24
…	19.1%	£306	£29	£24
…	.8%	£223	£21	£15
…ford	1.5%	£274	£25	£19
…hend-on-Sea	9.2%	£273	£29	£24
…ring	-3.4%	£218	£19	£14
…rock	-1.5%	£250	£22	£17
…tlesford	2.6%	£253	£25	£17
…ESTERSHIRE	3.5%			
…ltenham	-9.0%	£240	£12	£10
…swold	-.4%	£240	£13	£10
…est of Dean	4.2%	£164	£10	£6
…cester	.2%	£187	£10	£8
…oud	-4.1%	£205	£11	£9
…kesbury	2.9%	£237	£14	£11
…PSHIRE	2.7%			
…ingstoke and Deane	-12.7%	£248	£12	£9
… Hampshire	11.6%	£270	£17	£12
…tleigh	-6.6%	£241	£12	£9
…eham	17.8%	£267	£19	£17
…port	2.3%	£222	£13	£9
…	22.1%	£309	£20	£17
…ant	-6.9%	£244	£13	£9
… Forest	3.9%	£228	£13	£10
…tsmouth	7.1%	£216	£16	£14
…hmoor	-.4%	£280	£13	£10
…thampton	-2.9%	£211	£10	£8
…t Valley	2.4%	£252	£15	£11
…chester	-1.0%	£259	£13	£10

The effect of holdback on individual authority rate bills

	Volume over spend (1)	1981/82 Average rate bill (2)	£600m Holdback Small GRE differential (3)	Larger GRE differential (4)
HEREFORD AND WORCESTER	7.6%			
Bromsgrove	-	£268	£23	£17
Hereford	14.2%	£199	£20	£17
Leominster	25.0%	£168	£17	£12
Malvern Hills	.6%	£228	£21	£15
Redditch	7.2%	£238	£26	£23
South Herefordshire	3.9%	£181	£18	£13
Worcester	18.5%	£262	£26	£22
Wychavon	-2.9%	£267	£22	£16
Wyre Forest	25.6%	£243	£26	£24
HERTFORDSHIRE	3.1%			
Broxbourne	18.9%	£260	£17	£14
Dacorum	-9.9%	£303	£16	£13
East Hertfordshire	7.9%	£278	£20	£18
Hertsmere	-2.1%	£348	£17	£14
North Hertfordshire	-.8%	£288	£15	£13
St Albans	-.4%	£313	£17	£14
Stevenage	1.0%	£328	£17	£15
Three Rivers	.1%	£365	£20	£17
Watford	8.6%	£288	£21	£20
Welwyn Hatfield	-4.7%	£332	£16	£13
HUMBERSIDE	5.8%			
Beverley	13.6%	£182	£21	£16
Boothferry	24.8%	£121	£15	£14
Cleethorpes	1.5%	£159	£15	£13
Glanford	20.9%	£143	£19	£18
Great Grimsby	12.1%	£138	£16	£13
Holderness	-1.6%	£134	£14	£11
Kingston upon Hull	21.9%	£120	£15	£14
North Wolds	3.4%	£128	£14	£12
Scunthorpe	33.1%	£170	£21	£21
ISLE OF WIGHT	9.5%			
Medina	6.6%	£192	£19	£15
South Wight	.8%	£209	£18	£14
KENT	5.2%			
Ashford	-2.9%	£208	£18	£13
Canterbury	12.0%	£209	£22	£18
Dartford	4.1%	£210	£22	£20
Dover	.8%	£177	£16	£12
Gillingham	20.1%	£187	£18	£10
Gravesham	-3.6%	£213	£18	£13
Maidstone	-2.2%	£203	£18	£13
Rochester upon Medway	-2.1%	£195	£17	£12
Sevenoaks	-19.9%	£224	£19	£14
Shepway	-1.2%	£223	£18	£13
Swale	-15.3%	£156	£14	£10
Thanet	-4.6%	£218	£17	£12
Tonbridge and Malling	-1.7%	£202	£17	£12
Tunbridge Wells	4.6%	£208	£21	£17

CONFIDENTIAL Table 4 Copy No....

The effect of holdback on individual authority rate bills

	Volume over spend (1)	1981/82 Average rate bill (2)	£600m Holdback Small GRE differential (3)	Larger GRE differential (4)
…SHIRE	5.0%			
…burn	3.7%	£140	£13	£13
…pool	2.4%	£183	£18	£15
…ley	13.1%	£121	£13	£13
…ler	28.0%	£152	£17	£13
…	-.4%	£201	£18	£13
…burn	16.2%	£120	£13	£11
…ster	-3.1%	£170	£14	£11
…le	11.8%	£110	£12	£11
…ton	5.6%	£149	£16	£13
…le Valley	2.1%	£173	£17	£13
…endale	-3.0%	£131	£10	£7
…Ribble	-.8%	£154	£14	£11
…Lancashire	-.2%	£196	£18	£13
…	3.6%	£177	£18	£14
…ESTERSHIRE	2.4%			
…r	-.8%	£199	£11	£7
…rwood	-2.3%	£200	£11	£7
…rough	16.0%	£203	£13	£8
…ler and Bosworth	10.1%	£179	£12	£8
…ster	24.2%	£162	£12	£11
…on	15.7%	£200	£13	£8
…West Leicestershire	11.7%	£176	£12	£9
…and Wigston	7.3%	£212	£14	£8
…and	16.0%	£210	£14	£9
…LNSHIRE	5.4%			
…n	-.2%	£180	£15	£12
…Lindsey	10.0%	£160	£16	£12
…ln	1.2%	£173	£14	£11
…Kesteven	7.2%	£177	£17	£12
…Holland	5.6%	£171	£16	£11
…Kesteven	-.2%	£186	£16	£12
…Lindsey	19.0%	£168	£16	£12
…FOLK	6.0%			
…land	-3.6%	£166	£15	£10
…dland	-2.2%	£195	£17	£12
…Yarmouth	2.5%	£183	£17	£14
…Norfolk	-.3%	£168	£14	£10
…ch	16.9%	£201	£20	£17
…Norfolk	-	£183	£17	£11
…Norfolk	-5.3%	£162	£14	£10
…HAMPTONSHIRE				
…y	-20.0%	£211	-	-
…try	-.1%	£225	-	-
…Northamptonshire	-.2%	£169	-	-
…ering	4.7%	£183	£2	£1
…ampton	-4.8%	£210	-	-
…Northamptonshire	9.0%	£210	£3	£3
…borough	21.0%	£188	£3	£2

CONFIDENTIAL Table 4 Copy No....

The effect of holdback on individual authority rate bills

	Volume over spend (1)	1981/82 Average rate bill (2)	£600m Holdback Small GRE differential (3)	£600m Holdback Larger GRE differential (4)
NORTHUMBERLAND	2.1%			
Alnwick	-.6%	£169	£9	£8
Berwick-upon-Tweed	-1.9%	£170	£8	£8
Blyth Valley	3.5%	£195	£12	£11
Castle Morpeth	-.3%	£229	£12	£11
Tynedale	1.3%	£180	£10	£9
Wansbeck	-.2%	£184	£8	£7
NORTH YORKSHIRE	5.1%			
Craven	2.2%	£143	£15	£12
Hambleton	-3.1%	£194	£17	£14
Harrogate	45.2%	£212	£23	£22
Richmondshire	4.9%	£196	£21	£18
Ryedale	2.6%	£159	£16	£13
Scarborough	-12.0%	£161	£14	£11
Selby	4.0%	£156	£16	£13
York	-.6%	£143	£13	£11
NOTTINGHAMSHIRE	5.5%			
Ashfield	13.1%	£122	£14	£10
Bassetlaw	11.1%	£155	£17	£15
Broxtowe	3.0%	£147	£16	£11
Gedling	15.5%	£162	£19	£14
Mansfield	17.4%	£142	£15	£11
Newark	14.8%	£128	£16	£12
Nottingham	5.8%	£136	£17	£15
Rushcliffe	-1.0%	£185	£17	£12
OXFORDSHIRE	1.9%			
Cherwell	1.2%	£234	£6	£5
Oxford	-5.4%	£268	£6	£5
South Oxfordshire	-3.3%	£253	£6	£5
Vale of White Horse	-4.7%	£257	£6	£5
West Oxfordshire	.9%	£214	£6	£5
SHROPSHIRE	6.4%			
Bridgnorth	-.9%	£210	£18	£13
North Shropshire	-3.0%	£180	£15	£11
Oswestry	4.5%	£164	£16	£13
Shrewsbury and Atcham	-2.3%	£206	£17	£12
South Shropshire	9.4%	£160	£16	£12
The Wrekin	13.5%	£213	£22	£19
SOMERSET	3.7%			
Mendip	.1%	£188	£11	£8
Sedgemoor	-9.3%	£211	£11	£8
Taunton Deane	-1.8%	£195	£10	£8
West Somerset	10.9%	£182	£11	£5
Yeovil	1.2%	£184	£11	£9

CONFIDENTIAL Table 4 Copy No....

The effect of holdback on individual authority rate bills

	Volume over spend (1)	1981/82 Average rate bill (2)	£600m Holdback Small GRE differential (3)	£600m Holdback Larger GRE differential (4)
FFORDSHIRE	3.6%			
ck Chase	26.5%	£197	£13	£11
Staffordshire	4.2%	£196	£14	£12
field	1.6%	£251	£15	£13
stle-under-Lyme	13.8%	£200	£15	£16
Staffordshire	11.5%	£243	£18	£14
ford	7.8%	£219	£16	£14
rdshire Moorlands	20.1%	£181	£13	£11
-on-Trent	8.2%	£167	£12	£11
rth	-3.7%	£211	£12	£10
LK	5.1%			
gh	23.1%	£214	£23	£20
t Heath	-14.5%	£194	£18	£15
ich	62.4%	£231	£24	£24
Suffolk	11.2%	£206	£21	£18
mundsbury	-.3%	£212	£19	£16
lk Coastal	8.0%	£233	£24	£20
ey	7.7%	£198	£20	£17
EY	2.7%			
ridge	-5.8%	£355	£19	£15
m and Ewell	-3.6%	£339	£18	£14
ford	2.7%	£291	£17	£13
Valley	-5.1%	£281	£15	£12
ate and Banstead	-5.1%	£295	£16	£13
mede	-.9%	£265	£14	£11
thorne	-10.5%	£259	£14	£11
ey Heath	4.5%	£332	£23	£20
ridge	1.3%	£267	£15	£12
erley	-3.5%	£312	£16	£13
ng	-.3%	£307	£16	£13
ICKSHIRE	6.2%			
h Warwickshire	15.3%	£225	£23	£20
eaton and Bedworth	12.0%	£237	£26	£25
y	-1.3%	£241	£21	£16
tford on Avon	-1.9%	£290	£25	£19
ick	10.7%	£281	£28	£21
SUSSEX	6.4%			
r	12.6%	£240	£26	£24
n	-.3%	£219	£20	£15
hester	-.8%	£220	£20	£15
ley	37.8%	£239	£18	£13
sham	.1%	£226	£21	£15
Sussex	3.0%	£250	£25	£18
thing	.8%	£237	£22	£16
SHIRE	4.2%			
et	-.3%	£195	£17	£12
h Wiltshire	7.0%	£171	£17	£11
sbury	-2.7%	£204	£18	£13
esdown	-2.2%	£205	£14	£10
Wiltshire	19.0%	£168	£16	£10

The effect of holdback on individual authority rate bills

	Volume over spend (1)	1981/82 Average rate bill (2)	£600m Holdback: Small GRE differential (3)	£600m Holdback: Larger GRE differential (4)
METROPOLITAN AUTHORITIES				
GREATER MANCHESTER	9.9%			
Bolton	9.0%	£191	£21	£20
Bury	10.1%	£267	£27	£29
Manchester	8.1%	£309	£37	£54
Oldham	3.8%	£173	£12	£11
Rochdale	11.5%	£216	£22	£27
Salford	.3%	£199	£9	£11
Stockport	5.6%	£251	£27	£24
Tameside	4.6%	£201	£20	£20
Trafford	.1%	£246	£12	£12
Wigan	6.5%	£222	£22	£23
MERSEYSIDE	12.5%			
Knowsley	4.9%	£231	£23	£22
Liverpool	9.1%	£242	£24	£27
St Helens	2.9%	£255	£18	£20
Sefton	1.1%	£224	£11	£10
Wirral	.9%	£262	£12	£12
SOUTH YORKSHIRE	17.8%			
Barnsley	4.7%	£195	£21	£27
Doncaster	-.4%	£235	£9	£14
Rotherham	-.2%	£199	£8	£14
Sheffield	10.6%	£255	£30	£43
TYNE AND WEAR	9.9%			
Gateshead	6.9%	£199	£21	£25
Newcastle upon Tyne	6.6%	£315	£37	£54
North Tyneside	1.5%	£250	£13	£18
South Tyneside	3.3%	£186	£17	£22
Sunderland	9.4%	£200	£22	£28
WEST MIDLANDS	10.0%			
Birmingham	4.2%	£249	£25	£23
Coventry	6.3%	£255	£24	£22
Dudley	9.6%	£238	£23	£17
Sandwell	9.4%	£247	£26	£26
Solihull	-1.0%	£325	£7	£7
Walsall	20.0%	£289	£31	£34
Wolverhampton	14.3%	£280	£32	£35
WEST YORKSHIRE	13.3%			
Bradford	.4%	£158	£7	£7
Calderdale	.8%	£130	£6	£7
Kirklees	12.6%	£136	£15	£14
Leeds	7.6%	£160	£18	£17
Wakefield	-	£161	£4	£5

CONFIDENTIAL Table 4 Copy No....

The effect of holdback on individual authority rate bills

	Volume over spend (1)	1981/82 Average rate bill (2)	£600m Holdback: Small GRE differential (3)	£600m Holdback: Larger GRE differential (4)
…N AUTHORITIES	34.6%	£511	-	-
…of London	24.2%	£578	£3	£3
…	9.9%	£275	£19	£30
…wich	5.7%	£399	£31	£52
…	1.1%	£334	£7	£10
…rsmith and Fulham	6.0%	£424	£37	£62
…ton	-4.3%	£565	£5	£5
…ton and Chelsea	8.4%	£423	£30	£49
…	8.3%	£353	£28	£47
…	-.1%	£368	£2	£2
…wark	15.4%	£382	£31	£54
…Hamlets	-14.0%	£254	£2	£2
…sworth	.1%	£518	£5	£5
…minster				
…ing and Dagenham	3.4%	£281	£19	£27
…	-2.7%	£366	£1	£2
…	-.1%	£284	£1	£1
…	7.6%	£456	£43	£59
…	-.5%	£279	£1	£1
…	-	£241	£1	£1
…	-.1%	£304	£1	£1
…	5.2%	£296	£27	£28
…	4.5%	£473	£47	£70
…	4.4%	£405	£36	£41
…	-.1%	£322	£1	£1
…ingdon	-1.7%	£301	£1	£1
…	9.9%	£380	£36	£48
…ston-upon-Thames	-4.1%	£286	£1	£1
…	-4.3%	£269	£1	£1
…	10.9%	£364	£34	£48
…bridge	4.2%	£293	£25	£21
…ond-upon-Thames	-.1%	£243	£1	£1
…	3.9%	£265	£14	£12
…tham Forest	9.9%	£386	£39	£56
…r London Education Authority	6.0%	-	-	-
…er London Council	1.5%	-	-	-