

## Response to Councillor Bateson's Request for a Breakdown of the £107k Overspend Reported to the Committee as at Quarter 1

The analysis for the response is as follows.

Employees	257,900	162,600	0	(95,300)	(95,300)	Savings expected against the employee Retention Allowance budget
Other Expenditure	1,011,600	1,119,000	36,850	70,550	107,400	Main variances: Consultants fees higher by £20k; High Street Recovery expenditure of £31k funded by government grants; River Thames Improvement Programme of £42k funded through reserves; and remainder relates to legal costs paid towards dispute with KPMG relating to audit of accounts. - re later but we accrued for the costs relating to 17/18 VFM in 20-21 and we built in additional £200k
Income	(400,000)	(425,200)	(25,200)	0	(25,200)	Additional KGE recharges
<b>Corporate Management</b>	<b>869,500</b>	<b>856,400</b>	<b>11,650</b>	<b>(24,750)</b>	<b>(13,100)</b>	

The £107k overspend reported to Regulatory and Administrative Committee as at quarter 1 is analysed next, followed by breakdown of the related consultant spend at that point.

### Overspend forecast

£'000

20	Consultant (related costs analysed below)
31	Recovery expenditure (grant-funded)
42	River Thames Improvement Programme
14	Audit-related legal costs (above existing provisions made)
<b>107</b>	<b>Total analysed</b>

### Projects re consultants analysed

£'000

11	Property consultants (mainly £8k for Stanwell New Start works/ professional fees)
19	Committee changes (mainly £17k on barrister fees re work on constitutional change)
<b>30</b>	<b>Consultants spend analysed</b>
10	Budget
<b>20</b>	<b>Overspend</b>