Elmbridge Borough Council

Cabinet

Report of a meeting held on 7 February 2018

Members of the Cabinet:

* S.J. Selleck (Leader)
* A. Davis (Deputy Leader)

* B. Fairbank
* R. Green
* Mrs. R.J.M. Lyon
* Mrs. M. Marshall

* Mrs. K. Randolph
* C.R. Sadler
* Mrs. J.R. Turner

Also present:

J. Browne, G.P. Dearlove, Mrs. A.E. Hill-Purcell, A. Kelly, T.G. Oliver and Mrs. M.C. Sheldon

70/17 Declarations of Interest

C.R. Sadler declared a non-pecuniary interest under the Code of Conduct in respect of agenda item 8 (Minute No. 77/17 refers) – Revenue and Capital Budget and Council Tax 2018/19, by virtue of being a Director of the Riverhouse Barn that receives an annual grant from the Council.

J. Browne declared a pecuniary interest under the Code of Conduct in respect of agenda item 8 (Minute No. 77/17 refers) – Revenue and Capital Budget and Council Tax 2018/19 and specifically recommendation (D), by virtue of his wife being an employee of the Council. He indicated that he would leave the room should this element of the report be discussed but in the event there was no discussion in this regard.

71/17 Recommendations to Council on 21 February 2018

2018/19 Council Plan

(Link to Council Priorities: All)

The Leader introduced the report and reminded Members that the Council Plan set out how the Council was going to deliver its priorities for 2018/19.

The Cabinet reviewed the areas that related to the work of the Council and it was noted that the report would inform budget allocations.

The Leader thanked the Members of the Overview & Scrutiny Committee and the Performance & Finance Standing Panel for their comments on the draft work areas (Council Objectives) for 2018/19 which had been incorporated in
the document presented to the Cabinet. Whilst acknowledging that the additional comments made by Members had improved the document, he was pleased to note that the Plan included target dates for each activity which he hoped would be achieved.

During consideration of the item, the Portfolio Holder for Community and Corporate Development expressed her disappointment that the Council Plan did not have any references to environmental plans including those relating to the carbon footprint, air quality, noise etc. In this regard, as the Overview & Scrutiny Task & Finish Group for Energy and Sustainability was working hard on these issues, she requested that the Group's recommendations be included within the 2018/19 Council Plan, which the Cabinet supported.

The Portfolio Holder for Leisure and Culture further commented that she was pleased to note that the Council’s Asset Management and Property Services Team was boosting the local economy by using local contractors where possible for refurbishment projects and new builds.

**Recommended: that**

(a) the Council Plan 2018/19 be approved;

(b) the recommendations from the Overview & Scrutiny Committee and Performance & Finance Standing Panel, as set out in the report, be noted; and

(c) authority be delegated to the Chief Executive, in consultation with the Leader, to make any changes / additions that may be required to the Plan.

72/17 2017/18 3rd Quarter Council Performance Report

(Link to Council Priorities: All)

The Leader introduced the third quarter’s performance monitoring report in respect of the 2017/18 basket of performance indicators, Council Plan objectives and Flagship activities.

In the third quarter, 22 (79%) Council Plan objectives and 11 (85%) ‘Flagship’ activities were on target.

It was noted that the report had been presented to the Performance and Finance Standing Panel on 5 February 2018.

The Cabinet considered the progress made during the third quarter and the Portfolio Holders provided updates in respect of their areas of responsibility, particularly with regard to the Performance Indicators that had been denoted with a red indicator.
With regard to the Performance Indicators relating to Housing, the Portfolio Holder for Housing commented that performance was improving and whilst the number of homeless families had increased, measures were being taken to address this. He further commented that the setting up of the wholly-owned local authority housing company was progressing and he was pleased to update that the five proposed properties in Thames Ditton had now received planning permission.

In respect of Performance Indicator L-TP4 (Percentage of planning appeal decisions made in favour of the Council), the Portfolio Holder for Planning Services reported that whilst the target was 65%, the actual percentage for the third quarter had fallen to 52%. She commented that when turning the number of applications into percentages, this actually reflected a small number of applications. Whilst there had been similar variations in 2016/17 in the third quarter, the Portfolio Holder advised that the current performance had improved from that reported in the same quarter of 2016/17.

The Portfolio Holder for Planning Services also took the opportunity to update Members that the Planning Services Team would be measured against a new performance indicator in respect of the success of appeals. This related to the newly introduced criteria for designation and would specifically affect the target for success of appeals of major applications. In this regard, should more than 10% of appeals go against the Council, the Council would be at risk of designation. The Portfolio Holder reported that initially this would affect applications considered over the last 9 months and then would be reported on a 2-year rolling programme. If the Council was designated, this would involve an assessment on an annual basis.

In answer to a question regarding what this meant for the Council, the Portfolio Holder for Planning Services advised that an action plan would need to be produced which would include areas for improvement such as further Member / Officer Training and the need to consider whether the Council’s policies were adequate etc.

The Leader stressed the importance of Member Training in respect of Planning and the Portfolio Holder for Planning Services advised that the 2018/19 Member training programme for Planning was currently being developed.

**Recommended:** that

(a) progress against the performance dashboard be noted;

(b) progress against Council Plan objectives be noted;

(c) progress against ‘Flagship’ activities be noted; and

(d) the comments provided for the targets showing an amber or red traffic light arising from (a), (b) and (c) above be noted.
73/17 Public Conveniences

(Link to Council Priorities: All)

The Portfolio Holder for Resources introduced the report and advised colleagues that, following the Council approval for the termination of the Automated Public Conveniences (APC) contract with JCDecaux in February 2017 and taking account of overall need and cost, suitable alternative facilities had been explored. Furthermore, a Member consultation had been carried out in the summer of 2017 on a Ward-by-Ward basis to ascertain what Members wanted to achieve in their respective Wards.

The Cabinet noted the outcome of the Ward consultation, the details of which were set out in the report.

In respect of the current APCs, the Cabinet noted that the contract with JCDecaux was due to expire on 26 February 2018. Whilst the contractor had agreed to remove and transport the existing 11 APC units at their own cost, unfortunately it was unable to commit to a date for the removal due to various issues. Given the uncertainty with regard to timings, it was acknowledged that there may be a need to install temporary APC units in some areas which could be hired on a week by week or month by month basis at a cost of £1,000 per week including cleaning. Providing the high-end temporary facilities in these areas for 3 months could cost up to £52,000.

With regard to replacement public conveniences, the Cabinet noted that as a result of a benchmarking exercise, DANFO, a Swedish supplier, had been identified as a company that could provide alternative APCs as they offered the best value for money option. It was therefore proposed that the Council use DANFO to provide Tetragon classic units to replace the existing APCs that need replacing. The estimated costs for each unit was £55,000 which would consist of 1 x Male cubicle; 1 x Female cubicle; and 1 x Disabled access friendly cubicle. Should the Council wish to opt into the yearly maintenance and cleaning charge, the estimated cost per unit was likely to be approximately £60,000.

The Portfolio Holder advised that it was challenging to meet all the Ward requirements and therefore this project was work in progress. In this regard, he proposed a change to Recommendation E so that the local Ward Councillors would be consulted, and that not only the type & model would be agreed but also the location of the replacement public convenience, which the Cabinet supported.

During consideration of the report, whilst welcoming the comprehensive report, the Portfolio Holder for Housing highlighted that there was a need for an APC at Hersham Station given that the station toilets had been closed for many years. In this regard, he suggested that this request be looked at in the future. In addition, whilst supporting the amended Recommendation E, he suggested that additional words be added so that should the proposed Capital allocation of £350,000 not be sufficient, the matter be referred back to the Cabinet, to
which the Portfolio Holder for Resources confirmed would be the normal process anyway.

The Portfolio Holder for Community and Corporate Development suggested that a survey be undertaken asking the residents whether they wanted replacement APCs or the Community Toilet Scheme. The Portfolio Holder for Resources commented that the consultation had already been undertaken and that he had hoped that the Ward Councillors had consulted with their residents before the Member consultation had taken place. He acknowledged the position in Claygate with regard to the lack of interest for a Community Toilet Scheme and hoped that a workable solution would be found.

During consideration of the report, the Leader invited Councillor T.G. Oliver, Group Leader of the Conservative Group, to address the meeting. Councillor Oliver considered that this was a sensible approach in respect of public conveniences but was concerned to note that new locations were being introduced such as a new facility at Hersham Station. He argued that all the Borough’s Railway stations could require the provision of an APC. The Portfolio Holder for Resources commented that having looked at the facilities near stations, the only stations that did not have public conveniences were at Hersham, Hinchley Wood and Thames Ditton.

The Leader stressed the need to progress the matter given that the current contract would be ending at the end of February 2018 and accordingly the Cabinet

**Recommended: that**

(a) the outcome of the Member consultation carried out during the summer 2017 be noted;

(b) the approach taken to replace existing facilities on a need basis, complemented by the ongoing Community Toilet Schemes in each Ward, be supported;

(c) a Capital allocation of £350,000 as included in the Capital Programme for 2018/19 be agreed;

(d) any additional ongoing revenue costs be met by the saving from the termination of the Automated Public Conveniences contract; and

(e) authority be delegated to the Head of Asset Management and Property Services, in consultation with the Portfolio Holder for Resources and the local Ward Councillors, to agree on the type, model and location of replacement Public Convenience, working within the approval Capital sum.
74/17 Treasury Management Strategy

(2 Link to Council Priorities: All)

The Portfolio Holder for Resources introduced the report that outlined the Council’s Prudential Indicators for 2018/19 to 2020/21 together with the expected treasury operations for this period. Whilst this report had previously been included as an appendix within the Revenue and Capital Budget and Council Tax report, as a result of the increase in the investment property portfolio and the increase in borrowing, it was considered sensible to have it as a separate item.

The Cabinet noted that the Strategy fulfilled the following four key legislative requirements:

- the reporting of the Prudential Indicators setting out the expected Capital activities;
- the Council’s Minimum Revenue Provision (MRP) Policy, which set out how the Council would pay for Capital assets financed from borrowing Revenue each year;
- the Treasury Management Strategy Statement which set out how the Council’s treasury service would support the Capital decisions, the day to day treasury management and the limitations on activity through treasury prudential indicators; and
- the Investment Strategy which set out the Council’s criteria for choosing investment counterparties and limiting exposure to the risk of loss.

With regard to the Treasury Management Strategy and specifically the authorised limit for external debt, the Portfolio Holder reported that the limit was currently £43 million and it was proposed that this be increased to £50 million for the remainder of 2017/18. Furthermore, as a measured progression, it was proposed that the limits for 2018/19 be £70 million, for 2019/20 it be £80 million; and for 2019/20 it be £90 million.

In respect of the Council’s Counterparty List, additional counterparties had been looked at and in this regard, it was proposed that 8 major overseas banks be included on the list. The Portfolio Holder stressed that these banks had a good credit rating and were well known. A further suggestion had been to include UK Housing Associations. Given that these were no longer considered to be a part of the government, the Portfolio Holder advised that, at present, he proposed to not include these on the 2018/19 Counterparty List.

The Leader welcomed the broadening of the Counterparty List and supported the inclusion of international banks. He expressed concern regarding the inclusion of UK Housing Associations given that the Government had stated that these were now in the private sector.
During consideration of the report, the Leader invited Councillor T.G. Oliver, Group Leader of the Conservative Group, to address the meeting. With regard to the Minimum Revenue Provision, Councillor Oliver referred to the consultation that had been undertaken by the Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government in respect of how to report investments. In this regard, following the response to the consultation which had been published the previous week, he asked the Strategic Director and Deputy Chief Executive whether this would change the Council’s Minimum Revenue Provision Policy. The Strategic Director and Deputy Chief Executive confirmed that the proposed Policy was the same as that had been used in previous years and whilst she had not seen the final response to the consultation she was confident that the Policy conformed with the current requirements and the report indicated that any changes resulting from the Government’s consultation would be reported to a future Committee.

**Recommended: that**

(a) the prudential indicators and limits for 2018/19 to 2020/21, as attached at Appendix A to this report, be agreed;

(b) the Minimum Revenue Provision (MRP) statement, as contained within Appendix A attached to this report, which sets out the Council’s policy on MRP, be approved;

(c) the Treasury Management Strategy 2018/19 to 2020/21 and the Treasury Prudential Indicators, as attached at Appendix A to this report, be approved; and

(d) the Investment Strategy 2018/19 contained in the Treasury Management Strategy including the detailed criteria; the Treasury Management Scheme of Delegation; and the 2018/19 Counterparty List with the exception of the Housing Associations, as attached at Appendix C to this report, be approved.

**75/17 Corporate Strategic Risk Register**

(Link to Council Priorities: All)

The Portfolio Holder for Resources introduced the report and informed the Cabinet that the Council’s Risk Management Strategy required the Corporate Strategic Risk Register to be reviewed on an annual basis. The Register contained details of major identified risks, which could affect the Council’s ability to achieve its priorities during the financial year. The report gave details of action taken to compile a new Register for 2018/19, and in this regard, the Portfolio Holder considered that the new Register was a sensible approach for ongoing management of risk.

As outlined in the report, a new risk, Item A, had been included within the Register, which related to the reduction in or elimination of grant funding from external bodies including Surrey County Council.
With regard to the definition of the risk under item B relating to the failure to ensure adequate protection of data, this definition had been expanded to include the General Data Protection Regulations.

In addition, the probability rating for item D in respect of services not being delivered due to the failure of a major contractor, had been increased to 3 as a result of the recent history of failures of major contracts.

During consideration of the report, whilst noting the inclusion of a new Item A in respect of the reduction in or elimination of grant funding from Surrey County Council, the Portfolio Holder for Environment emphasised his disappointment in this regard.

The Portfolio Holder for Highways and Transport acknowledged the industry standard “5 x 5” matrix that the Council used to assess the risks facing the organisation. In respect of high impact and low probability risks, he commented that these tended to be downplayed but they could in fact be catastrophic. In this regard, he asked the Portfolio Holder for Resources whether he was comfortable with using this standard matrix. The Portfolio Holder for Resources advised that the matrix used was a tool to look at risk. With regard to high impact and low probability risks, he reminded Members about the flooding that had occurred in the Borough four years ago which would have fallen into this category.

With regard to Item P (Failure to react appropriately to a major civil emergency within or adjacent to the Borough (e.g. flooding, terrorism etc.)), the Portfolio Holder for Community and Corporate Development commented that she was concerned about the location of the Council’s assembly point for fire drills which was currently by the bins in the public car park. The Chief Executive commented that this issue had been raised before and advised that the bins in this location were to be relocated shortly which would mitigate this issue.

**Recommended**: that the Corporate Strategic Risk Register, as attached at Appendix D to this report, be approved.

76/17  **Appointment of External Auditor from 2018/19**

(Link to Council Priorities: All)

The Portfolio Holder for Resources introduced the report and advised colleagues that for audits of the accounts from 2018/19, Public Sector Audit Appointments (PSAA) were responsible for appointing an auditor to principal Local Government and Police bodies that had chosen to opt into its national auditor appointment arrangements.

As the Council had opted into PSAA’s auditor appointment arrangements, the Portfolio Holder was pleased to advise that Grant Thornton had been approved by the PSAA Board to undertake the role of the Council’s auditors from 2018/19 for five years.
Recommended: that Grant Thornton be appointed as the Authority’s auditors from 2018/19 for five years.

77/17 Revenue and Capital Budget and Council Tax 2018/19

(Link to Council Priorities: All)

The Cabinet was requested to consider and recommend to the Council the 2018/19 Budget and the Borough Council’s element of the overall Band ‘D’ Council Tax to apply for 2018/19.

The Portfolio Holder for Resources introduced the report and whilst commending the recommendations to the Cabinet, thanked the Strategic Director & Deputy Chief Executive, the Head of Finance and the Finance Team for all their hard work and helpfulness in bringing the budget documents to this point.

The Portfolio Holder advised Members of the Administration’s proposals for the Council’s Revenue & Capital Budgets and Council Tax precept for 2018/19.

He reported that the Council had maintained its services at existing levels for residents and had avoided having to make cuts to services. The Gross Budget for 2018/19 was reported as being £34.8 million which was an increase of 3% and which was in line with inflation.

He further commented that the Council continued to cope with severe cuts in funding from central Government and from Surrey County Council which meant for 2018/19 savings totalling £1.27 million had to be found.

The Cabinet noted that a significantly increased programme of Capital expenditure had been proposed which it was hoped would address the excessive use of out of Borough Bed and Breakfast accommodation for the statutorily homeless, would boost the Council’s portfolio of investment properties together with increasing the net income streams to help fund ongoing revenue expenditure. It was envisaged that these Capital expenditures would underpin the Council’s ability to continue delivering services to residents in an efficient and effective manner.

The Portfolio Holder reported that staff pay had been addressed and in this regard a 2.5% pay award was proposed. The Cabinet, as a whole, considered that the staff did a very good job and were loyal, motivated and well qualified. In addition, whilst the offer was below the consumer price inflation at 3%, it was higher than the latest national pay offer, and slightly higher than recent average wage growth figures. In addition, to reflect the increased workloads, restructures in Asset Management and Housing Options were proposed.

The Portfolio Holder advised that a prudent balanced revenue budget had been created which put the Council in a better position to face the possibility of a sizeable negative Revenue Support Grant position in 2019/20.
With regard to the Band D Council Tax, the Portfolio Holder advised that it was proposed to increase the precept by £4 for 2018/19 which was less than 8 pence a week or 1.9%. He further reported that the increase in the precept for Surrey County Council was almost 6% and for Surrey Police, the precept increase was 5.3%. In this regard, the Council Tax bill for a Band D property would go up by over 5.4%, amounting to £95.74, which was made up from a nearly £80 increase from Surrey County Council, £12 for Surrey Police and £4 for Elmbridge.

With regard to the development of the General Fund Revenue Budget, the Portfolio Holder provided an update on the Medium Term Financial Strategy (MTFS) which set out the Council’s approach to financial management and which provided the basis for the delivery of the Council’s vision and priorities. Fundamental to the development of the Budget and MTFS was an overarching Budget Strategy, the objective of which was a safe and sustainable Budget delivering the policies and aspirations of the Council over the medium term. The Portfolio Holder reported that the Revenue reserves, excluding the Community Infrastructure Levy fund, and the General Fund balance were estimated to stand at £15 million as at March 2019. The comparative figure in the budget papers for the previous year was £14.8 million which confirmed the Council continued to move in the right direction.

The Leader and Portfolio Holder for Resources therefore recommended a net Budget for 2018/19, after the use of reserves, of £16,805,210. At this level of budgeted net expenditure, it was proposed that there should be a Band D Council Tax in 2018/19 of £215.00, which represented an increase of 1.9%.

During consideration of the report, the Leader acknowledged the extensive work that had been undertaken in preparing the budget and was pleased to propose a 1.9% increase in Elmbridge’s element of the Council Tax which he believed was the lowest in Surrey for the Boroughs and Districts. He further supported the 2.5% pay award for all staff, which was slightly higher than the Government’s 2% target, which he felt recognised the efforts of all staff in delivering the Council’s services.

The Portfolio Holder for Housing thanked the Portfolio Holder for Resources for his comprehensive report and reiterated the comments in respect of the 2.5% pay award for all staff. He considered that this pay award acknowledged the effort, hard work and willingness of all staff to go the extra mile.

During consideration of the report, the Leader invited Councillor T.G. Oliver, Group Leader of the Conservative Group, to address the meeting. Councillor Oliver endorsed the report and whilst recognising the financial pressures facing the Council, advised that the Conservative Group would not be opposing the proposed budget. Councillor Oliver also took the opportunity to provide the rationale behind the 5.99% increase in Surrey County Council’s element of the Council Tax, which included a 3% precept in respect of adult social care services. Councillor Oliver commented that Elmbridge’s finances were in good shape with excellent policies in place for property investments. He further commented that the financial position may be different in 2019/20 given that the
Council’s participation in the Business Rates Retention pilot was for one year only, and given the implications of the Negative Revenue Support Grant. Finally, Councillor Oliver stressed the importance of the Council continuing to manage its finances in a way that it could deliver sustainable services for residents in the future.

In respect of the Council’s participation in the Business Rates Retention pilot and the Negative Revenue Support Grant, the Leader reported that all the Surrey Leaders including Surrey County Council were lobbying the Government to obtain an extension to the Business Rates Retention pilot and to remove the Negative Revenue Support Grant.

**Recommended**: that

(a) with regard to the Borough Council’s element of the Council Tax:

   (i) the Council Tax requirement on the Collection Fund for 2018/19 be set at £13,789,888;

   (ii) at this level of spending, the Council’s net precept requirement for 2018/19 be £215.00 per Band ‘D’ Dwelling, as attached at Appendix E to this report;

(b) the growth items, totaling £907,000, including the additional growth items of £45,000, as outlined in paragraph 4.6 of the report, be approved;

(c) in addition to the income and savings of £1,018,000 approved at Council in December 2017, the additional income and savings, as outlined in paragraph 7.1 of the report, totaling £683,000, be approved;

(d) a Pay Award of 2.5% be implemented with effect from 1 April 2018 for all employees on the Elmbridge Borough Council Local Pay Scheme;

(e) the new Capital Bids for 2018/19, 2019/20 & 2020/21 and the Capital Programme, as attached at Appendices F and G respectively to this report, be approved for inclusion in the Capital Programme;

(f) the revenue estimates for 2018/19, as summarised at Appendix H attached to this report, be approved;

(g) the Medium Term Financial Strategy and the Statement of Reserves, as attached at Appendices I and J to this report, be approved;

(h) any shortfall in interest income earned below the budgeted level during 2018/19, will be funded by the Interest Equalisation Reserve, subject to variation depending on the 2018/19 outturn position;

(i) the Pay Policy Statement for 2018/19, as attached at Appendix K to this report, be adopted as required under the Localism Act 2011;
(j) the Claygate Parish Grant of £2,600 in respect of the localisation of Council Tax Benefits continue to be included in the Elmbridge budget;

(k) authority be delegated to the Strategic Director and Deputy Chief Executive, in consultation with the Portfolio Holder for Resources, to sign the Pilot Memorandum of Understanding for the Surrey Area Pilot for the 100% Business Rate Retention Scheme, as outlined in paragraph 1.14 of the report;

(l) the additional posts in Housing Options and Asset Management & Property Services, as outlined in paragraph 4.6 of the report, be approved;

(m) it be noted that, at its meeting on 5 December 2017, the Council calculated the amount of 64,139 as its Council Tax Base for the year 2018/19, Item T in the formula in Section 31B of the Local Government Finance Act 1992, As Amended (The “Act”);

(n) it be noted that the Council Tax Base of 64,139 for the Elmbridge Borough area comprises 3,453 for that part of the Borough comprising the area covered by Claygate Parish Council and 60,686 for the remaining part of the Borough;

(o) the following amounts be now calculated by the Council for the year 2018/19 in accordance with Sections 31 to 36 of the Local Government Finance Act 1992;

(i) £94,728,863 being the aggregate of the amounts which the Council estimates for the items set out in Section 31A (2) of the Act taking into account all precepts issued to it by Parish Councils;*

(ii) £80,890,115 being the aggregate of the amounts which the Council estimates for the items set out in Section 31A (3) of the Act;*

(iii) £13,838,748 being the amount by which the aggregate at (i) above exceeds the aggregate at (ii) above, calculated by the Council in accordance with Section 31A (4) of the Act, as its Council Tax requirement for the year (Item R in the formula in Section 31B of the Act);

(iv) £215.76 being the amount at (iii) above (Item R), all divided by Item T, calculated by the Council in accordance with Section 31B of the Act, as the uniform amount of its Council Tax for the year (including Parish precepts);

(v) £48,860 being the aggregate amount of all special items (Parish precepts) referred to in Section 34 (1) of the Act;
These Minutes should be referred to in conjunction with the Minutes of the subsequent meeting of the Council, where they are presented; and for completeness to the next relevant meeting when the Minutes are adopted.

(vi) £215.00 being the amount at (iv) above less the result given by dividing the amount at (v) above by Item T, calculated by the Council in accordance with Section 34 (2) of the Act, as the basic amount of its Council Tax for the year for dwellings in those parts of its area to which no Parish precept relates;

The above has been calculated in accordance with the requirements for the formal council tax resolution as set out in the Localism Act 2011.

*In order to comply with the legislation in relation to the Localisation of Business Rates, these figures include approximately £15.7 million for the Council’s tariff payment.

(vii) **Valuation Bands**

**Claygate Parish Council Area**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>E</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>G</th>
<th>H</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>£</td>
<td>£</td>
<td>£</td>
<td>£</td>
<td>£</td>
<td>£</td>
<td>£</td>
<td>£</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>152.76</td>
<td>178.23</td>
<td>203.69</td>
<td>229.15</td>
<td>280.07</td>
<td>331.00</td>
<td>381.91</td>
<td>458.30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Remainder of the Borough (excluding Claygate)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>E</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>G</th>
<th>H</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>£</td>
<td>£</td>
<td>£</td>
<td>£</td>
<td>£</td>
<td>£</td>
<td>£</td>
<td>£</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>143.33</td>
<td>167.22</td>
<td>191.11</td>
<td>215.00</td>
<td>262.78</td>
<td>310.56</td>
<td>358.33</td>
<td>430.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

being the amounts given by multiplying the amount at o(vi) above by the number which, in the proportion set out in Section 5 (1) of the Act, is applicable to dwellings listed in a particular valuation band divided by the number which in that proportion is applicable to dwellings listed in valuation band D, calculated by the Council in accordance with Section 36 (1) of the Act, as the amounts to be taken into account for the year in respect of categories of dwellings listed in different valuation bands;

(p) it be noted that for the year 2018/19 the Claygate Parish Council has stated the following amounts in precept issued to the Council in accordance with Section 40 of the Local Government Finance Act 1992 for each of the categories of the dwellings shown below:

**Precepting Authority – Claygate Parish Council**

**Valuation Bands**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>E</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>G</th>
<th>H</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>£</td>
<td>£</td>
<td>£</td>
<td>£</td>
<td>£</td>
<td>£</td>
<td>£</td>
<td>£</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.43</td>
<td>11.01</td>
<td>12.58</td>
<td>14.15</td>
<td>17.29</td>
<td>20.44</td>
<td>23.58</td>
<td>28.30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
These Minutes should be referred to in conjunction with the Minutes of the subsequent meeting of the Council, where they are presented; and for completeness to the next relevant meeting when the Minutes are adopted.

(q) it be noted that for the year 2018/19 the Surrey County Council has stated the following amounts in precept issued to the Council in accordance with Section 40 of the Local Government Finance Act 1992 for each of the categories of the dwellings shown below;

Precepting Authority – Surrey County Council

Valuation Bands

<p>| | | | | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>£</td>
<td>£</td>
<td>£</td>
<td>£</td>
<td>£</td>
<td>£</td>
<td>£</td>
<td>£</td>
<td>£</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>872.60</td>
<td>1,018.03</td>
<td>1,163.47</td>
<td>1,308.90</td>
<td>1,599.77</td>
<td>1,890.63</td>
<td>2,181.50</td>
<td>2,617.80</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

in addition, Surrey County Council have levied an additional Council Tax in respect of Adult Social Care for each of the categories of the dwellings shown below:

Valuation Bands

<p>| | | | | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>£</td>
<td>£</td>
<td>£</td>
<td>£</td>
<td>£</td>
<td>£</td>
<td>£</td>
<td>£</td>
<td>£</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68.26</td>
<td>79.64</td>
<td>91.01</td>
<td>102.39</td>
<td>125.14</td>
<td>147.90</td>
<td>170.65</td>
<td>204.78</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

this gives a total precept issued for 2018/19 for Surrey County Council in accordance with Section 40 of the Local Government Finance Act 1992 for each of the categories of the dwellings shown below:

Valuation Bands

<p>| | | | | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>£</td>
<td>£</td>
<td>£</td>
<td>£</td>
<td>£</td>
<td>£</td>
<td>£</td>
<td>£</td>
<td>£</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>940.86</td>
<td>1,097.67</td>
<td>1,254.48</td>
<td>1,411.29</td>
<td>1,724.91</td>
<td>2,038.53</td>
<td>2,352.15</td>
<td>2,822.58</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(r) it be noted that for the year 2018/19, Surrey Police have stated the following amounts in precepts issued to the Council in accordance with Section 40 of the Local Government Act 1992 for each of the categories of the dwellings shown below:

Precepting Authority – Surrey Police

Valuation Bands

<p>| | | | | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>£</td>
<td>£</td>
<td>£</td>
<td>£</td>
<td>£</td>
<td>£</td>
<td>£</td>
<td>£</td>
<td>£</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>157.71</td>
<td>184.00</td>
<td>210.28</td>
<td>236.57</td>
<td>289.14</td>
<td>341.71</td>
<td>394.28</td>
<td>473.14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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(s) having calculated the aggregate in each case of the amounts of o(vii), q and r above, the Council, in accordance with Section 30 (2) of the Local Government Finance Act 1992, hereby sets the following amounts as the amounts of Council Tax for the year 2018/19 for each of the categories of the dwellings shown below:

Parts of the Council’s Area (Excluding Adult Social Care)

for that part of the Elmbridge Borough Council area within the Claygate Parish Council area:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Valuation Bands</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>E</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>G</th>
<th>H</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>£</td>
<td>1,183.07</td>
<td>1,380.26</td>
<td>1,577.44</td>
<td>1,774.62</td>
<td>2,168.98</td>
<td>2,563.34</td>
<td>2,957.69</td>
<td>3,549.24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

for that area of Elmbridge Borough Council not within the Claygate Parish Council area:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Valuation Bands</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>E</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>G</th>
<th>H</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>£</td>
<td>1,173.64</td>
<td>1,369.25</td>
<td>1,564.86</td>
<td>1,760.47</td>
<td>2,151.69</td>
<td>2,542.90</td>
<td>2,934.11</td>
<td>3,520.94</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Parts of the Council’s Area (Including Adult Social Care)

for that part of the Elmbridge Borough Council area within the Claygate Parish Council area:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Valuation Bands</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>E</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>G</th>
<th>H</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>£</td>
<td>1,251.33</td>
<td>1,459.90</td>
<td>1,668.45</td>
<td>1,877.01</td>
<td>2,294.12</td>
<td>2,711.24</td>
<td>3,128.34</td>
<td>3,754.02</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

for that area of Elmbridge Borough Council not within the Claygate Parish Council area:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Valuation Bands</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>E</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>G</th>
<th>H</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>£</td>
<td>1,241.90</td>
<td>1,448.89</td>
<td>1,655.87</td>
<td>1,862.86</td>
<td>2,276.83</td>
<td>2,690.80</td>
<td>3,104.76</td>
<td>3,725.72</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Matters of Report

78/17 Joint Waste Collection Contract - Potential New Joiner

(Link to Council Priorities: E1)

The Portfolio Holder for Environment introduced the report and reminded Members that the Joint Waste Collection Contract had been procured to enable other Surrey District and Borough Councils to have the opportunity to join during the period of the Contract.

In this regard, the Portfolio Holder reported that the Joint Waste Collection Services Committee had considered a report at its meeting on 15 January 2018 on the potential expansion of the Contract. The Committee had agreed to recommend to the Partner Authorities that should Tandridge District Council request admission to the Joint Contract, then on the basis no existing partner was financially disadvantaged the request should be approved.

The basis of discussion with Tandridge District Council was for the inclusion of only its waste collection services within the Joint Contract and Partnership. Given the distances between the district of Tandridge and the existing contract areas, the Cabinet noted that there would be no immediate savings for the Partner Authorities. However, should Tandridge District Council be admitted, the Joint Contractor (Amey) had indicated it would make an annual contribution to an Environment Fund of £25,000 to help deliver efficiency and service performance.

The Portfolio Holder advised that other opportunities would result in the medium-term from the admission of an additional Contract Partner which included reducing the client contract management costs, as well as the strategic benefit of taking a further step towards creating a single waste entity to deliver all of Surrey’s waste services.

Whilst the proposed admission of Tandridge District Council could slightly increase the combined Joint Contract prices, the Portfolio Holder reported that Tandridge District Council would give an undertaking to meet any such increase to ensure existing Partner Authorities were no worse off as a result of it joining.

The Portfolio Holder reported that the other three Partner Authorities had considered the expansion of the contract to include Tandridge District Council, which they had all supported. However, he further commented that a formal request from Tandridge District Council was still awaited as that decision required consideration by Tandridge’s full Council at the end of February 2018.

During consideration of the report, the Leader invited Councillor G.P. Dearlove to address the meeting. Councillor Dearlove advised that he did not have any objection to the request. However, he was disappointed to note that should Tandridge District Council join the contract, they would not be required to pay a joining fee. He considered that a payment should be incurred given the amount
These Minutes should be referred to in conjunction with the Minutes of the subsequent meeting of the Council, where they are presented; and for completeness to the next relevant meeting when the Minutes are adopted.

of money that had already been paid over the last four years in respect of advice, consultants, officer time etc. which they would not be contributing to.

The Strategic Director responded and commented that a number of discussions had taken place in this regard. Tandridge District Council had paid a fee in respect of advice from Amey. However, whilst a joining fee was initially included in the Inter-Authority Agreement (IAA), at the request of the other three Partner Authorities, a joining fee requirement was not included within the current IAA. He further explained that should Tandridge District Council join the contract there would be a number of benefits over time which would make savings generally.

Resolved that, on receipt of the request from Tandridge District Council to become a party to the Joint Waste Collection Contract and Inter-Authority Agreement, consent to admission be given, provided no existing partner is financially disadvantaged as a consequence and subject to the satisfactory completion of all admission formalities as set out in clause 4 of the Joint Contract.

79/17 Recommendations from the Countryside Consultative Group Meeting held on 23 November 2017

(Link to Council Priorities: A5, A6, P4, P5)

The Portfolio Holder for Leisure and Culture informed the Cabinet that, at its meeting on 18 January 2018, the Overview and Scrutiny Committee had considered two recommendations from the Countryside Consultative Group (CCG) meeting held on 23 November 2017.

Firstly, in respect of the Commons Car Parks, now that the six-month trial closure of both the Flying Circle, Fairmile Common and Common Lane, Claygate Common car parks had ended and as a result of the review of the trial, the Overview and Scrutiny Committee had supported the CCG’s recommendation that both these car parks be permanently closed.

Secondly, as there was no longer a requirement for dog waste to be separated from standard waste, the Overview and Scrutiny Committee had supported the CCG’s recommendation that a six-month trial for using mixed waste bins be undertaken at both the Horseshoe Clump and Copsem Lane car parks.

The Cabinet supported the recommendations from both the CCG and Overview & Scrutiny Committee and accordingly

Resolved that:

(a) with regard to the Commons Car Parks, the car parks at Flying Circle, Fairmile Common and Common Lane, Claygate Common be permanently closed; and

(b) a six-month trial be carried out using mixed waste bins on Horseshoe Clump and Copsem Lane car parks.
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