Consultation

Did you take part in either of the Scottish Consultation exercises which preceded the Bill and, if so, did you comment on the financial assumptions made.
1. No.
2. Not applicable.
3. Not applicable.

Costs

If the Bill has any financial implications for your organisation, do you believe that these have been accurately reflected in the FM?
4. Yes.

Do you consider that the estimated costs and savings set out in the FM and projected over 15 years for each service are reasonable and accurate?
5. No comment.

If relevant, are you content that your organisation can meet the financial costs associated with the Bill which your organisation will incur?
6. Yes.

Does the FM accurately reflect the margins of uncertainty associated with the estimates and the timescales over which such costs would be expected to arise?

Wider Issues

Do you believe that the FM reasonably captures costs associated with the Bill.
7. Yes.

Do you believe that there may be future costs associated with the Bill, for example through subordinate legislation?
8. No.

Additional Comments

The bottom line is that the Charging Order system provides a certain means by which a local authority can recover the costs it has incurred when dealing with defective and dangerous buildings. The expense of invoking the Charging Order is more than offset by the gain of debt recovery. Without the Charging Order, the cost to the local authority of undertaking work on dangerous and defective buildings
would be the entire debt in those cases where the debtor refused to pay. Alternative legal means through normal debt recovery processes, are more costly and time consuming.

10. In conclusion therefore the City of Edinburgh Council fully supports the provisions of the Bill as introduced and which is intended to be enacted in 2014.