

North York Moors National Park Authority

14 December 2020

Medium Term Financial Strategy and Budget 21/22

1. Purpose of the Report

- 1.1 This report is intended to provide Members with the updated Medium Term Finance Strategy (MTFS) and a draft of the 2021/22 budget.

2. Introduction and Background

- 2.1 Each year we refresh our Medium Term Financial Strategy (MTFS). In 2019, we produced this prior to the 2020/21 budget setting process to help provide an initial strategic view of the financial position, to set the context for the detailed budget which is produced over the autumn. In 2020/21, as a result of the pandemic we have set a new revised budget in year. The process of producing this Medium Term Financial Strategy was consequently delayed and is now produced here alongside the draft budget proposal.
- 2.2 The covid-19 pandemic has had a significant impact on income in 2020/21, and whilst a balanced budget has been produced to mitigate the impact of this, this has included a higher than anticipated use of reserves.
- 2.3 Over the next 12 months a new management plan will be produced and an associated business plan will provide the strategic direction for the Authority for the 5 years from 2022/23. This will be underpinned by a detailed medium term financial strategy. This paper focusses on some of the key issues facing the Authority and proposes a balanced budget proposition for 2021/22, with future deficits from 2022/23 being addressed as part of the next business plan process.
- 2.4 In last year's MTFS, Members discussed the uncertainty and pressure on the public purse and the uncertainty around future funding. This uncertainty continues this year, and indeed is increased by the impact of the pandemic on both the National Park and the greater economy. This MTFS is set in that context, and some sensitivity analysis is conducted in the report to demonstrate the potential impacts of some of these uncertainties.

3. Economic Context and Risks

3.1 Covid-19

- 3.1.1 The pandemic has resulted in significant impact on commercial income streams such as car parking and visitor centre income. The year to date has illustrated that during the full lockdown between March and late May, these facilities were closed and therefore no income was received. However, following reopening footfall has returned to normal levels and indeed increased at some sites. It continues to be challenging to predict impacts in income from this unprecedented event and there is an ongoing risk of local and national lockdowns which can be introduced at very short notice, as we have seen with the month long national lockdown in November.

- 3.1.2 In this MTFS, the current mid-case assumption is that there will no further lockdowns next year and that income will continue as expected. The best case includes exceeding the challenging income targets by 10% whilst the worst case represents a 20% shortfall in key income streams which caters for a potential temporary risk of closure of facilities.

3.2 **Brexit (EU Funding)**

Whilst the potential impact of a hard Brexit on the economy and public finances may be overshadowed by the effects of the covid pandemic, Officers continue to watch for developments that may impact on the Authority as we approach the end of the Transitional Period.

3.3 **Landscapes Review**

- 3.3.1 The Protected Landscapes report by Julian Glover was published last autumn; to date it is uncertain how Government will respond to the report.
- 3.3.2 The report does contain recommendations that would constitute additional demands of National Park Authorities if the Authorities were asked to implement them. The financial position of the Authority in this report clearly indicates that additional activities with financial implications would need additional funding or would require a change to other priorities and delivery to be able to facilitate this.

3.4 **Climate Change and Environment**

- 3.4.1 Demand for greater action from protected landscapes remains with the Prime Minister recently committing to protect 30% of the UK's land and to improve the biodiversity value of protected sites. The authority itself will be under pressure to become carbon neutral in the coming years.
- 3.4.2 Potential financial impacts may include commitments to green technology, vehicles and working practices and well as funding progression towards being a carbon neutral Authority and doing more in respect of nature recovery. At present 50% of the salary of an officer post is included in the MTFS for 21/22.
- 3.4.3 In 2020/21, recruitment has recently been completed for a shared climate change officer post for an initial 12 month period with Scarborough Borough Council to progress this. Members have approved the funding for this from reserves.

3.5 **Inflation and Interest**

- 3.5.1 CPI Inflation at October 2020 is currently 0.7% compared to 1.7% at the same time last year. Low inflation does help notionally to keep costs down with the DEFRA grant currently frozen, although pressures on particular supply sectors do need to be considered in the current climate. Pay inflation in 20/21 was 2.75% which exceeds the DEFRA grant and therefore increases pressure on the Authority finances. The MTFS assumes 2% increase in pay in future years and 2% inflation on rents, rates and pay award linked contracts. Inflation is not included in spend budgets that are not contracted to inflation increases, which therefore means a cut in budgets in real terms.
- 3.5.2 Interest rate levels have been low for some considerable time resulting in relatively low returns. However, in response to the covid-19 pandemic, the Bank of England has cut rates to 0.1% which will reduce returns further. An increase in rates is considered to be unlikely in the next 18 months. Cash balances are also expected to reduce as we spend more of the earmarked reserves, therefore any potential small increases in the base rate are expected to be negated by reducing cash balances. Movements in the base rate are difficult to predict in the current political environment and the uncertainties of Brexit, but may be expected to remain very low for the foreseeable future.

The MTFS assumes interest returns remain the same over the period; there is considerable risk that very low rates will continue for some years.

3.6 Large Capital Projects

- 3.6.1 As we increase our resources through external funding, we are starting to deliver larger capital projects; this brings an additional risk in respect of the potential for cost overruns. This risk is mitigated by the Authority through close project management, but it continues to be an increasing risk factor in the Authority budgets. There is no change in the MTFS for this, but project contingencies should always be considered for all financial projections on large projects and an annual assessment of levels of emergency reserves carried out as part of the budget process, including an assessment of potential risk from up and coming large scale projects.
- 3.6.2 Some externally funded projects also require a long term legacy plan to sustain the work once the initial grant funded phase is completed. This adds an additional demand on both financial and staff resource. For each individual project, this element is usually a relatively small proportion of the overall project spend but cumulatively, this can start to have a significant impact on our longer term resource requirement. Legacies for Land of Iron and Ryevitalise are already included in budgets.
- 3.6.3 Covid-19 has not to date resulted in any increase in costs for externally funded projects, but some delays do have the potential to result in reduced outcomes if there is no additional funding. The providers of external funding have worked with the Authority to amend timelines and outcomes but have not provided additional funding. The MTFS assumes the projects are completed within the current timescales and with the agreed match funding, no additional funding is assumed.

3.7 Property

- 3.7.1 There remains a property risk, with potential capital works required to our existing portfolio in the next few years. There is currently a reserve set aside that has been previously approved by Members to improve the standard of HQ office accommodation.
- 3.7.2 One of the impacts of the pandemic has been the introduction of remote working at the Authority and the longer term potential to reduce the number of people working at key office sites.
- 3.7.3 With this in mind, it seems appropriate to undertake a review of our property portfolio and ways of working to get an understanding how each of our properties are used and how important they are to our priorities and delivering Park purposes plus their current condition and asset plans for the coming years.
- 3.7.4 Funding for future major capital works on our buildings will be needed and as part of the review, options will be looked at including borrowing, contributions from revenue to a smoothing reserve and rationalising of our property portfolio to fund capital works.
- 3.7.5 Considering the potential for changes in our ways of working, it is therefore requested that the existing reserve for improving the HQ office accommodation is changed to become a building reserve to assist with works required across the portfolio.

4. MTFS Summary Position

- 4.1 The table below illustrates the current projected outturn for the MTFS based on a mid-case scenario for the current level of activity being carried out, with the assumptions illustrated in section 5 of the report. **Appendix 3** illustrates the movements between the scenarios. The detailed budget process will be looking at ways to mitigate the indicative deficit.

4.2

	21/22	22/23	23/24	24/25
2021/22 MTFS Deficit mid case	374	432	518	541
2021/22 MTFS Deficit best case	104	75	-12	-108
2021/22 MTFS Deficit worst case	580	685	756	812

5. Medium Term Financial Strategy – Updated Assumptions

This section of the report is to provide Members with a high level initial view of the current key assumptions before we enter the process of agreeing the MTFS and setting next year's budget.

5.1 DEFRA Grant

5.1.1 A 4 year settlement which included an annual inflationary increase of 1.7% ended in 2019/20. Last year following a drawn out process, the Authority received late notification that the grant in 2020/21 would be frozen for one year. This was principally as a result of the delay in the overall Government spending review as a result of Brexit.

5.1.2 Currently as at November 2020 there is still some uncertainty about the DEFRA grant for 2021/22. A one year spending review suggests that a one year settlement is the likely outcome. The spending review indicated that there would be additional funding in National Park's and Areas of Outstanding National Beauty, though there is no insight currently on how this will be deployed other than the indications set out in the Annex to the Agricultural Transition Plan set out on Monday 30th November. The MTFS continues to take a cautious approach and assumes frozen grant throughout. If confirmation is received before FRASC in February, the assumptions will be updated to reflect any changes to funding in the final 21/22 budget and any impacts on the current proposed deficit mitigation measures.

£m	21/22	22/23	23/24	24/25	
Best case	4.470	4.559	4.650	4.743	Based on increase of 1.7%, in line with previous CPI
Mid case	4.382	4.382	4.382	4.382	Freeze in the grant
Worst case	4.294	4.294	4.294	4.294	2% reduction in the grant in yr. 1, then freeze thereafter

5.2 Pay and General Inflation

5.2.1 Employee costs are the Authority's single largest item of expenditure, with a budget of £3.4m estimated in 2020/21. Last year's MTFS included a pay award assumption of 2% per annum based on the increases of the previous two years after the removal of the sliding scale. The 2020/21 national pay award was settled at 2.75%. When considered alongside the freeze in DEFRA grant this results in a real terms cut in budgets.

5.2.2 Recent announcements from Central Government indicate a desire to freeze pay across the majority of the public sector. Pay award for the Authority is set by a separate body, and there has been no announcement on this to date. Although a freeze in pay seems increasingly likely, the MTFS remains at 2% as a cautious approach until further announcements are forthcoming.

5.2.3 Each 1% change in pay award will increase or decrease the cost to the Authority by £35k based on current employee levels. A freeze in pay would reduce the deficit by c£70k. A number of scenarios are illustrated below.

Freeze	Increase of 2% (Inc. in the MTFS) £k	Increase of 2.5% £k	Increase of 3% (worst case) £k
0	70	86	105

5.2.4 There is also a considerable pension risk to consider. The last triennial valuation showed a very successful investment return over the three years which resulted in the pension scheme being 120% funded, an increase from the 100% funded position in 2016. As a result, the employer pension contribution had a tapered reduction over the three years to 15.4% and a proposal was put forward to put half of this to savings and half to reserves. It was noted that this would be kept under review. As a result of the pandemic, it is anticipated that the next valuation will result in an increase in the primary rate which will result in higher pension costs to the Authority. The reserves contribution will help to smooth this and it is now proposed that all of the savings from the rate reduction are put into reserves for the years 2021/22 and 2022/23. The table below shows the saving from the reduced rates going to reserves for the next three years before an increase in the pension rate from 2023/24 onwards. The reserve will help to smooth this increase until 2025/26, but thereafter if the rate remains high, the Authority will have to fund the full increase. The example below shows that a rate of 21% in 2026/27 will result in the Authority needing to fund an additional £103k of pension costs.

	20/21	21/22	22/23	23/24	24/25	25/26	26/27
Pension Rate (Est from 23/24)	17.1%	16.3%	15.4%	19.7%	20.5%	21.0%	21.0%
Pension cost v 2019/20 18.1% rate (£k)	36.8	56.6	71.3	-47.4	-78.7	-102.9	-102.9
Contribution to (-) / from (+) reserves	-10	-56.6	-71.3	30	50	58	0
Impact on the I&E (£k)	26.8	0	0	-17.4	-28.7	-44.9	-102.9

5.3 Grants

5.3.1 For the past two years, grants paid out from core funding have been reduced to help to balance the budget. It is to be noted that total grants paid out by the Authority remain high across all sources of income including external funding and S106.

5.3.2 In 2021/22 MTFS currently, all grants paid from core funds are reinstated to business plan levels as follows :-

	£k
Traditional boundary scheme	50
PAWS restoration	80
Historic building grants	50
Ranger grants	56
Tourism grants	56
Village caretaker grants	28
Total	320

5.3.3 As there is currently a deficit within the MTFS, it is proposed in the budget section of the paper that this area of core budgets may form part of mitigation measures in order to be able to produce a balanced budget in 2021/22.

5.4 Key Income Streams

5.4.1 Car parking income follows the assumption from last year's budget, with a target of £651k set including the tariff increase implemented in 2020/21. This is an increase of £65k from the current year which is to cater for the additional parking at Sutton Bank.

5.4.2 This is made up of an additional £20k income at Sutton Bank which is benefiting from increased footfall plus £45k from the initiative that is looking at ways of generating increased income from our assets. The additional footfall at Sutton Bank means that £5k has been added into the budget for staffing costs to cope with demand at peak times.

5.4.3 Car park income currently is at challenging levels so there is no proposal to revise this further given the current uncertainty. As we saw earlier in the year, the pandemic resulted in the closure of car parking facilities and loss of income, but following reopening the 'staycation' affect has resulted in higher income figures. This provides a level of uncertainty regarding the final level of income which means car parking figures will be kept under close review. The table below illustrates the value of any shortfall in income with every 1% resulting in £6,510 less income based on 21/22 MTFS income level.

21/22 Budget Income	Decrease of 1%	Decrease of 5%	Decrease of 10%	Decrease of 20% (worst case scenario)
651,000	-6,510	-32,550	-65,100	-130,200

5.4.4 Planning fees are also assumed to continue at levels set in the previous MTFS with the exception of pre-application fees. The volume of these has reduced, and as such the income has been reduced by £15k in the budget. In 2020/21 it was expected that planning income would be impacted by covid-19. However, application volumes have shown no sign of reduction, and indeed to October 2020, the value and volume of applications has increased and is running higher than budget.

5.4.5 Planning income can be impacted by economic factors, so some caution is considered and MTFS assumes application volumes to remain stable.

5.4.6 The table below illustrates the potential impacts of a reduction in planning income, should there be external factors impacting on volumes of applications.

21/22 Budget Income	Decrease of 1%	Decrease of 5%	Decrease of 10%	Decrease of 20% Worst Case Scenario
275,000	-2,750	-13,750	-27,500	-55,000

5.4.7 In the business plan, a target was included in the final year for additional generation of £50k from other funders. It is considered that this is a challenging target to achieve, and in the mid case is included at £25k. Details behind how this will be generated will form part of detailed budget discussions.

5.5 Future Match Funding

- 5.5.1 The strategy of generating external funding to help deliver more substantial projects has been very successful with sizeable projects such as Land of Iron, Ryevitalise and the development of facilities at Sutton Bank.
- 5.5.2 The Land of Iron and Ryevitalise projects require the Authority to commit to significant match funding through both reserves and revenue. The Land of Iron project enters its final year in 2021/22 so consideration will need to be given to how future match funding should be budgeted for - an annual contribution to reserves to build up a match fund pot for use on major projects, or funded from existing revenue budgets. This will be a key point to be addressed in the development of the next business plan and will be discussed further as part of the budget process. The current MTFS does not budget for any additional match funding contributions for new projects unless these are taken from existing core budgets which is already challenging given the current level of deficit. The current level of reserves does not allow for substantial match funding, so these may need to be funded from revenue in the future.

5.6 Reserves

- 5.6.1 In line with the current Business Plan, most of the reserves are earmarked to spend over the period of the MTFS with the value expected to reduce to £789k at the end of the period based on current spending proposals. This includes assumed spending on the property programme, although that is subject to the review referred to in 3.7.
- 5.6.2 As per last year, it is recommended that the reserves contributions profile is maintained in order to help to smooth the impact of replacement of our IT and vehicles.
- 5.6.3 A business plan target was set that a minimum level of 5% of gross expenditure excluding S106 is to be maintained in the emergency reserve at any time. Again, if this was to dip below that level we would need to top this reserve back up from revenue budgets. The 2021/22 MTFS currently shows an expenditure level excluding S106 of £7.413m, 5% of this equates to £371k. In the 2020/21 revised budget, £111k usage of the emergency reserve has been approved which leaves a balance of £274k. To top this back up to 5% levels, an additional £97k would be required. It is recommended that this is reallocated from the current unallocated reserve in 21/22.
- 5.6.4 The reserves table in **Appendix 4** shows the anticipated movement in reserves over the period of the MTFS.

6. MTFS Summary

- 6.1 This is a challenging time financially for much of the public sector, and yet as a result of increasing earned income and external funding, more volunteering and S106 arrangements we continue to deliver a considerable amount of on the ground activity.
- 6.2 Whilst the DEFRA grant remains behind inflation, the financial pressures will continue with a risk that core services will tend to continue to decline in order to support project and programme work. Confirmation of the grant and impacts on funding from the spending review are still awaited.
- 6.3 Immediate efficiency savings may be challenging to achieve although there is some potential for new technology combined with changes in working practices to generate savings and productivity gains. There is still pressure for further innovation on income streams and the budget for 2021/22 includes additional income generated from our car parking assets.

- 6.4 The covid-19 pandemic may continue to make 2021/22 challenging and income streams could continue to be affected. Equally, UK based visitors could help maintain levels of visitors to the National Park. This is an area that continues to be very challenging to predict.
- 6.5 Reserves will continue to smooth the impact of necessary acquisitions of new vehicles and new IT kit as well as supporting building works. This will help to manage those costs into the future. However, unallocated balances in the reserves are much lower, in accordance with the Business Plan, but reducing flexibility. Therefore we need to consider where funding will come from for future match fund large scale projects. This is a significant issue given other pressures on core resources.

7. Draft Budget Proposal

- 7.1 Officers have discussed at length and recommend the following draft budget proposal for 2021/22. This is based on the mid-case scenario illustrated in the MTFS. This proposal is a one year solution for 2021/22, with deficits from 2022/23 to be addressed through the business and management plan process which will be underpinned by a balanced MTFS focussing on the priorities and purposes contained within those plans.
- 7.2 Members will recall that this year's DEFRA grant freeze and higher pay award were covered from reserves by a surplus generated in the previous year, but a longer term solution is needed to cover the impacts of that in 2021/22 plus a further grant freeze which is currently assumed in the budget.
- 7.3 The mid-case scenario shows a deficit of £374k. The table below sets out a proposal by Officers to balance the budget.

Area of Spend	Current MTFS Budget 20/21	Proposed Mitigation	Proposed 2021/22 Budget
Biodiversity action plan (no longer required)	13.0	-13.0	0.0
Connectivity	175.0	-75.0	100.0
PAWS	80.0	-20.0	60.0
Traditional Boundary Scheme	60.0	-25.0	35.0
Archive Services	3.0	-3.0	0.0
Historic Buildings Grants	50.0	-25.0	25.0
Committee Costs	76.0	-10.0	66.0
Corporate overheads (e.g. printing / postage)	73.0	-20.0	53.0
Volunteers	113.0	-15.0	98.0
Rangers overheads budgets	143.0	-5.0	138.0
Rosedale access route	9.5	-4.0	5.5
Tourism grant	56.0	-56.0	0.0
Village improvement grant	56.0	-30.0	26.0
Admin Apprentice	10.0	-10.0	0.0
Target Outreach net saving	18.0	-3.6	14.4
Community Champions	1.5	-0.6	0.9
Access works budget	136.0	-16.0	120.0
Contingency	50.0	-20.0	30.0
Total	1,123.0	-351.2	771.8
Reserves contribution		-22.8	-22.8
Total Balanced Budget	1,123.0	-374.0	749.0

7.4 This proposal is for one year, with a longer term strategic view underpinning the new Management Plan from 2022/23. Key areas of mitigation are detailed below:-

- **One-Year Savings.** Some one year savings have been identified within ranger budgets. Overall expenses for volunteers are expected to reduce next year also.
- **Sustainable Savings.** Longer term savings have been identified in the admin apprentice role which is currently vacant and no longer required, archive services and corporate overheads in committee costs, printing and postage which are generated from increased remote and electronic working.
- **Conservation works.** Projects such as the Rye and Esk are delivering considerable connectivity and biodiversity outcomes and are the focus for the team in 2021/22. As a result, connectivity budgets have been reduced for one year, but £100k of connectivity works will still be delivered. The biodiversity spend related specifically to the action plan which is not required next year. Considerable biodiversity work is being delivered through projects such as Esk, Ryevitalise and our S106 work.
- **Contingency.** This budget in previous years has been a contribution to reserves to cover inflation. The new business plan proposal should include applying inflation to budgets as appropriate rather than separately as a contingency. For this one year extension, instead of a contribution to reserves, this will be maintained as a contingency budget within revenue. It is proposed to reduce the MTFS £50k contingency to £30k.
- **Grants.** The option has been taken to reduce grants as per earlier years. The tourism grant has been reduced in full as grants are already provided from alternative sources of income and the team will be focussing on the development of the new website in 21/22 and this reduction will allow resources to focus on this key project. Proposal is to then reduce the village improvement, traditional boundary, PAWS and heritage building grants. Village caretaker and archaeology grants will be preserved at full value. A detailed breakdown of grants can be found in **Appendix 5.**

7.5 The steps above will help to mitigate the majority of the budget deficit for 2021/22 but there is a small call on the unallocated reserve of £22.8k which it is recommended to take from the unallocated reserve.

8. Next Steps

8.1 The formal process for the development and approval of the 2021/22 budget at member level following this meeting is as follows;

Final proposed 21/22 budget	FRASC	February 2021
Final 21/22 budget for sign off	NPA	March 2021

9. Recommendations
9.1 Members are asked to approve the MTFS.
9.2 Members are asked to comment on the draft budget proposals in section 7 including use of the unallocated reserve to top the emergency reserve back up and balance the budget in 21/22 as per points 5.6.3 and 7.3.
9.3 Members are asked to approve the change in the purpose of the building reserve as laid out in 3.7.5.

Contact Officers
Peter Williams
Chief Financial Officer

Appendix 1 - MTFS by Function	2021/22 Budget	2022/23 Budget	2023/24 Budget	2024/25 Budget
Income	£k	£k	£k	£k
Conservation Of Cultural Heritage	94	1	1	1
Conservation Of The Natural Environment	755	694	127	32
Corporate Management	221	221	221	222
Development Control	270	270	270	270
Forward Planning	17	17	17	17
Promoting Understanding	397	404	359	359
Rangers & Volunteers	0	0	0	0
Recreation Management	904	904	904	904
Resources (DEFRA Grant)	4,382	4,382	4,382	4,382
Total Income	7,038	6,891	6,279	6,185
Expenditure				
Conservation Of Cultural Heritage	-306	-197	-203	-205
Conservation Of The Natural Environment	-1,563	-1,493	-949	-795
Corporate Management	-1,635	-1,678	-1,625	-1,635
Development Control	-579	-587	-613	-628
Forward Planning	-261	-254	-260	-263
Promoting Understanding	-1,300	-1,319	-1,313	-1,337
Rangers & Volunteers	-704	-710	-736	-749
Recreation Management	-1,065	-1,085	-1,099	-1,115
Total Expenditure	-7,413	-7,323	-6,798	-6,726
Deficit	-374	-432	-518	-541

Appendix 2 – MTFS by Subjective	2021/22 Budget	2022/23 Budget	2023/24 Budget	2024/25 Budget
Income	£	£	£	£
Other Grants	839	687	288	199
Sales	234	234	234	234
Lettings	92	92	92	92
Booking Fees	65	65	65	65
Car Park Income	651	651	651	651
Planning Fees	270	270	270	270
Other Income	120	116	116	117
Donations & Sponsorship	48	48	48	48
Investment Income	10	10	10	10
Capital Receipts	17	17	17	17
External Match Funding	212	220	6	0
S106 staff recharge	100	100	100	100
DEFRA Grant	4,382	4,382	4,382	4,382
Total Income	7,038	6,891	6,279	6,185
Expenditure				
Employees	-3,646	-3,712	-3,798	-3,878
Premises	-390	-405	-401	-407
Transport	-181	-181	-181	-181
Supplies & Services	-2,040	-1,865	-1,254	-1,092
Grants	-576	-576	-576	-576
Third Party	-380	-384	-388	-392
Contribution to reserves	-150	-150	-150	-150
Inflation contingency	-50	-50	-50	-50
Total Expenditure	-7,413	-7,323	-6,798	-6,726
Deficit	-374	-432	-518	-541

Appendix 3 : Budget Proposal by Function	2021/22 Budget	Proposed Mitigation	Proposed 2021/22 Budget
Income	£	£	£
Conservation Of Cultural Heritage	94		94
Conservation Of The Natural Environment	755		755
Corporate Management	221		221
Development Control	270		270
Forward Planning	17		17
Promoting Understanding	397		397
Rangers & Volunteers	0		0
Recreation Management	904		904
DEFRA Grant	4,382		4,382
Total Income	7,038	0	7,038
Expenditure			
Conservation Of Cultural Heritage	-306	25	-281
Conservation Of The Natural Environment	-1,563	133	-1,430
Corporate Management	-1,635	60	-1,575
Development Control	-579	3	-576
Forward Planning	-261	86	-175
Promoting Understanding	-1,300	4	-1,296
Rangers & Volunteers	-704	36	-668
Recreation Management	-1,065	4	-1,061
Total Expenditure	-7,413	351	-7,061
Deficit (funded from reserves)	-374		-23

Appendix 4 : Reserve Summary	20/21 Opening Position	Cont from Reserve	Cont to Reserve	20/21 Closing Position	Cont from Reserve	Cont to Reserve	21/22 Closing Position	Cont from Reserve	Cont to Reserve	22/23 Closing Position	Cont from Reserve	Cont to Reserve	23/24 Closing Position
Emergency Reserve	385	-111		274		97	371			371			371
TELI Match Funding	381	-381		0			0			0			0
Section 106 Reserve	628	-400		228			228			228			228
Restricted and Committed Reserves	1,394	-892	0	502	0	97	599	0	0	599	0	0	599
Capital : Sutton Bank Visitor Centre	50	-50		0			0			0			0
Capital : Vehicle Replacements	60	-63	75	72	-80	75	67	-58	75	84	-146	75	13
Capital : IT Replacements	55	-104	75	26	-50	75	51	-96.5	75	29.5	-77.25	75	27.25
Capital : Office Building Works	280			280	-50		230	-115		115	-115		0
Projects : Ryevitalise Match Funding	153	-40		113	-55		58	-22		36	-36		0
Projects : Asset Income Generation	80	-25		55	-55		0			0			0
Projects : Climate change post	18	-4.5		13.5	-13.5		0			0			0
Projects : Car park machines	115	-115		0			0			0			0
Projects : Disability access routes	8	-8		0			0			0			0
Pension Smoothing Reserve	0		10	10		57	67		71	138	-30		108
Allocated to support 20/21	115	-115		0			0			0			0
2019/20 carry forwards	52	-52		0			0			0			0
Committee Approved Reserves	986	-576.5	160	569.5	-303.5	207	473	-291.5	221	402.5	-404.25	150	148.25
General Unallocated Reserve	198	-36		162	-120.2		41.8			41.8			41.8
Total	2,578	-1,505	160	1,234	-424	304	1,114	-292	221	1,043	-404	150	789

Appendix 5 - Grants by Income Source	Area of Delivery	2018/19	2019/20	Revised 2020/21	2021/22 Proposed
Core Grants	Archaeology	628	0	0	20,000
	Connectivity	20,000	9,000	0	0
	Conservation Agreements	6,388	11,000	13,000	20,000
	Village Caretakers	28,500	26,000	28,500	28,500
	PAWS	32,087	28,000	51,000	60,000
	Village Community Grants	56,908	14,000	28,000	26,000
	Tourism Community Grants	26,330	29,000	12,000	0
	Historic Buildings Grant(20/21 Rural Recovery fund)	35,010	27,000	25,000	25,000
	Traditional Boundary Scheme (TBS) (20/21 Rural Recovery Fund)	64,393	38,000	20,000	35,000
	Other Conservation Grants (Rural Recovery Fund)	0	0	50,000	0
	Core Total	270,244	182,000	227,500	214,500
S106 Grants (21/22 estimated as yet to be finalised)	S106 - Core Policy D	99,872	94,500	400000	500000
	S106 - Landscape and Ecology	20,000	60,180	50000	60000
	S106 – Tourism	55,820	49,100	55000	55000
		S106 Total	175,692	203,780	505,000
External Funding	External Funding – Monuments for the Future	6,705	3,900	0	0
	External Funding -Land of Iron	65,509	76,500	82,400	0
	External Funding – Ryevitalise	0	6,000	75,000	75,000
	External Funding - Turtle Doves	2,700	4,100	7,000	0
	External Funding -WEG	0	0	10,500	10,500
	External Funding - Blue Corridors				tbc
	External Funding - Green Recovery Fund				tbc
	External Funding Total	74,914	90,500	174,900	85,500
	Total Grants	520,850	476,280	907,400	915,000