Elmbridge Borough Council

Cabinet

Report of a meeting held on 13 February 2019

Members of the Cabinet:

* J.W. Browne (Acting Leader)
  * A.P. Burley
  * G.P. Dearlove
  * M.F. Howard
  * A. Kelly
  * Mrs. R. Mitchell

Also present:

A. Davis, N. Haig-Brown, N. Houston, Rachael I. Lake, Mrs. V. Macleod, Mrs. C. Richardson, M. Rollings, C.R. Sadler, S.J. Selleck and Mrs. J.R. Turner

82/18 Acting Leader's Opening Remarks

The Acting Leader reported that, as advised at the Cabinet meeting on 9 January 2019, Councillor Oliver had resigned as Leader of the Council in order that he could concentrate on his duties and responsibilities as Leader of Surrey County Council. Accordingly, the Acting Leader placed on record his thanks to Councillor Oliver for all he did as Leader of Elmbridge Borough Council and wished him well in his new role.

In addition, the Acting Leader advised that, in line with the Council’s Constitution, as Councillor Oliver had resigned his position, he had taken over the role of Acting Leader and would hold that role until the Council meeting on 27 February 2019 at which point, the Council would be asked to appoint a new Leader of the Council. The Acting Leader further reported that he would be retaining his Portfolio Holder responsibilities in respect of Planning Services for the time being, in order that there remained continuity given the extensive work being undertaken in respect of a new Local Plan. With regard to a Deputy Leader, the Acting Leader advised that he had appointed Councillor Mrs. R. Mitchell to act as Acting Deputy Leader until the Council meeting on 27 February 2019.

83/18 Declarations of Interest

In respect of agenda item 9 (Minute No. 93/18 refers) – Walton-on-Thames Public Spaces Protection Order (PSPO) Extension, whilst not a disclosable pecuniary interest or other interest under the Code of Conduct, C.R. Sadler wished that it be noted that the road he lived in was included within the areas listed under the proposed PSPO extension.
Recommendations to Council on 27 February 2019

84/18 2019/20 Council Plan

(Link to Council Priorities: All)

The Acting Leader introduced the report and reminded Members that the Council Plan set out how the Council was going to deliver its priorities for 2019/20.

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 Acting 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 2019/20 and was pleased to update that the following feedback had been incorporated within the Council Plan:

- a milestone had been included to reflect the work in relation to the Heathrow expansion;
- as there had been no specific target for the improvement of air quality, the milestone ET1 had been reviewed to include the review and revocation of the status of the areas so that they met national air quality standards;
- the milestone that related to the Council funding railway station works through Community Infrastructure Levy funding had been removed;
- a specific item regarding the car park refurbishment programme had been added;
- the milestone with regard to Hersham Hall had been refined and the completed date amended to July 2019;
- a reference to Weybridge Hall had been included within milestone R3;
- a new objective, LD3, had been added to address a Strategy for Young People;
- a reference to Weybridge had been added to LD2 regarding reducing traffic congestion; and
- the milestone to install electric car charging points in two main car parks had been reinstated in ET1.

With regard to Hersham Village Hall, the Acting Leader reassured Members that no decision had been taken about its future. An active Member Reference Group was considering the various options and a report in this regard would be considered by the Cabinet in July 2019.

**Recommended**: that

(a) the Council Plan 2019/20 be approved;

(b) the recommendations from the Overview & Scrutiny Committee and Performance & Finance Standing Panel, as set out in the report, be noted; and
authority be delegated to the Chief Executive, in consultation with the Leader, to make any changes / additions that may be required to the Plan.

85/18 2018/19 3rd Quarter Council Performance Report

(Link to Council Priorities: All)


In the third quarter, 26 (72%) of the basket of performance indicators and 11 (61%) Council Plan objectives were on target.

The Cabinet considered the progress made during the third quarter and the opportunity was taken for each of the Portfolio Holders to provide updates in respect of their areas of responsibility.

With regard to the Leader’s Portfolio, the Acting Leader raised concern in respect of Performance Indicator L-OD5 (Percentage staff turnover (cumulative)). Whilst recognising that it was healthy to have a turnover of employees, the Acting Leader commented that it was also important that the Council held on to its best and most highly qualified staff. He reported that the Chief Executive and his Team were looking carefully at this issue and initiatives to improve this particular figure were currently being considered.

The Portfolio Holder for Environment and Transport then provided a brief update in respect of Performance Indicator LES2(a) (Percentage of household waste sent for recycling (Joint Waste Contract Service Objective Standard)). He was disappointed to note that the figures were lower than expected and whilst the collection service had not changed, some of the materials that were collected were not now marketable. In this regard, officers would be liaising with the other Surrey Boroughs and Districts, Surrey County Council and Grundons to see if this was a cross-Borough issue. Recycling contamination was also a problem that was being experienced. With regard to Performance Indicator LES9 (Missed bin collections per 100,000 (Joint Waste Contract Performance Standard)), work was being undertaken to reduce this number gradually and whilst the figure continued to decrease, discussions were ongoing with the contractor to see if further improvements could be made.

In respect of the Housing Portfolio, the Portfolio Holder updated that for the first time since he had taken over this Portfolio, the target for the number of affordable homes delivered had been met. With regard to Performance Indicators L-HS3(b) (Days taken to process HB/CTB change events) and L-HS4 (Number of new placements in Private Rented Sector by the Rental Support Scheme – cumulative), the Portfolio Holder commented that these remained a challenge although improvements were being made. He further commented that in the future, there may be a need to have a more realistic target figure with regard to the number of homes in the private rented sector as it
was becoming more difficult to meet the target due to the market forces of the Borough. He was also pleased to update that 3 households had signed up for the temporary accommodation units at Albermarle House. He further advised that the work associated with the review of the Homelessness Reduction Act was due to be completed by the end of Quarter 2 in 2019. The Acting Leader also commented that it was pleasing to see a decrease in the numbers of households that had been placed in bed and breakfast accommodation.

In respect of the Community and Social Affairs Portfolio, the Portfolio Holder reported that the performance indicators for his Portfolio remained strong and on target. He also took the opportunity to highlight the significant number of meals on wheels delivered into the community which continued to increase. He further advised that 9% of the users of the service were aged between 95 and 105 so this service really did make a significant difference to the residents’ lives. With regard to the Council Objective CS3 (Introduce the nationally recognised Safe Places Scheme in Elmbridge to support vulnerable people when out in the community), the Portfolio Holder reported that the Council was engaging in this new Scheme which would enable vulnerable people in the community to seek safe refuge at any time if they felt vulnerable. It was hoped that this project would be going live shortly.

The Portfolio Holder for Leisure and Culture then provided a brief update in respect of his Portfolio. With regard to Performance Indicator L-LCS16 (Number of people engaging with Museum Learning Service activities), the Portfolio Holder advised that the Museum had been involved with the World War 1 project and unfortunately there had been lower than expected interest. He also took the opportunity to provide an update in respect of the Victorian Christmas workshop. With regard to Performance Indicator L-LCS21 (Number of external customer complaints recorded about green spaces and verges), he reported that Burleys had undertaken the first winter cut and it was hoped that this would show a significant improvement when the grass started to grow.

In respect of the Planning Services Portfolio, the Portfolio Holder provided a brief update in respect of Performance Indicator L-TP4 (Percentage of planning appeal decisions made in favour of the Council). Whilst the actual figures were well below the target figure, the Portfolio Holder advised Members that there had been a very small number of appeal decisions in the third quarter and unfortunately, they were ones where the Council had not been successful. In respect of Performance Indicator LTP7 (Percentage of planning applications processed: Other applications), the Portfolio Holder was pleased to update that apart from a Special Projects Officer, all outstanding vacancies in the Planning Services Team had been recruited to.

The Portfolio Holder for Resources then provided a brief update in respect of her Portfolio and was pleased to update that all of the Performance Indicators remained on target. With regard to Performance Indicator L-Customer7 (Percentage of customers who were satisfied with the service provided), the Portfolio Holder updated that the actual figure was above the target figure even though there had been significant problems with the waste collection service.
The Cabinet then took the opportunity to consider the quarterly Crime and Disorder Benchmarking Report and having been reminded of the recent serious event that had occurred within the Borough in respect of knife crime, the Portfolio Holder for Community and Social Affairs provided a brief update on progress that was being in this regard. Members were pleased to note that the Police were actively targeting knife crime and accordingly, knife possession had reduced by 37% over the last period. Furthermore, following the Borough Commander’s recently introduced Dispersal Order in Thames Ditton, Hinchley Wood and Weston Green, it was hoped that this would have a significant impact on the reduction of crime in the Borough.

**Recommended:** that

(a) progress against the performance dashboard be noted;

(b) progress against Council Plan objectives be noted; and

(c) the comments provided for the targets showing an amber or red traffic light arising from (a) and (b) above be noted.

86/18 **ICT Digital Strategy**

(Link to Council Priorities: All)

The Portfolio Holder for Resources introduced the report that set out the Council’s Information and Communications Technology (ICT) Digital Strategy for 2019-2021.

Members noted that whilst the key themes for the revised Strategy continued to be Customers, Technology, Processes and People, the Strategy would ensure that the Council could continue to meet the demands of improved service delivery for the internal and external customers for the next three years.

The Portfolio Holder advised that the format of the Strategy had changed and it was now more accessible, readable and understandable.

The Cabinet was advised that the Digital Strategy focussed on ways of using ICT technologies to change the way that services were delivered with a view to moving away from the manual and paper culture to more online services and self-service. The Portfolio Holder commented that there was also a need to ensure that none of the Council’s customers were excluded and accordingly, the more traditional channels of communication would still remain available.

Members noted that the Digital Strategy would make better and more efficient use of the ICT investments that were already in place by enabling the technology to do more focusing particularly on integrating the various systems to make them more efficient.

The Portfolio Holder took the opportunity to update on two initiatives that had been included within the ICT Digital Strategy for the Customer Services Team,
specifically a replacement Customer Relationship System (CRM) and the new Contact Centre Telephony System. The Cabinet noted that the new CRM system would provide the Customer Service Advisers with a more holistic view of the customer which it was hoped would give the customer a positive experience. With regard to the new Contact Centre Telephony System, this would guide the customer to the most appropriate and skilled Adviser so that the customer received the best customer service every time.

The Cabinet welcomed the new ICT Digital Strategy 2019-2021 which would be reviewed on an annual basis to ensure that it continued to meet the needs of the Council.

**Recommended:** that the ICT Digital Strategy be approved.

87/18 **Capital Strategy 2019 to 2039**

(Link to Council Priorities: All)

In accordance with the Local Government Act 2003, the Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government (MHCLG) had issued Investment Guidance that required every local authority to prepare a Capital Strategy before 1 April 2019. In this regard, the Portfolio Holder for Resources presented to the Cabinet the Council’s Capital Strategy for 2019 to 2039.

The Cabinet was advised that the Capital Strategy demonstrated that the Council takes capital investment decisions in line with service objectives and properly takes account of stewardship, value for money, prudence, sustainability and affordability in the long-term context.

The Portfolio Holder advised that the Strategy was intended to align with and inform the existing three-year rolling programme and capital bid process and all capital schemes would still be the subject of Member approval before being incorporated into any future approved Capital Programme.

The Strategy analysed the estimated demand for capital expenditure in the long-term and compared this against predicted availability of capital resources to identify any potential funding gap that would need to be met from other funding sources.

The Portfolio Holder for Resources reported that the Capital Strategy drew together existing good practice within the Council into a single document and introduced new guidance on limiting the use of capital receipts to approximately £750,000 per annum with this not exceeding £2 million in any rolling three-year period. The guidance also stated that the balance of capital receipts should not be less than £5 million and held as a contingency against unforeseen capital expenditure.

It was further noted that the Capital Strategy also set out a principle that moving forward, at least 10% of the total capital expenditure on asset renewal and refurbishment should be financed from Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) receipts.
The Acting Leader thanked the Portfolio Holder for Resources for her detailed introduction and whilst noting that this was a very useful document, he thanked the Finance Team for all the work involved in preparing the comprehensive Capital Strategy. He further acknowledged the large capital receipts that had been received during the previous year which it was hoped would give the Council opportunities in the future to make further investments.

The Leader then invited Councillor S.J. Selleck, Group Leader of the Residents’ Associations Political Group, to address the meeting. Councillor Selleck advised the Cabinet that at the meeting of the Performance and Finance Standing Panel that had been held on 11 February 2019, he had made a number of comments with regard to the Capital Strategy. He commented that whilst in principle he did not have a problem with at least 10% of the total capital expenditure on asset renewal and refurbishment being financed from Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) receipts, he considered that a maximum level should be set given that for some projects it could be assumed that 100% of CIL receipts could be used and therefore there would be no monies left for other projects.

The Strategic Director and Deputy Chief Executive took the opportunity to clarify the position and commented that it was unlikely that such a scenario would happen whereby 100% of CIL receipts would be used. However, Members were not being asked to approve that it would always be funded from CIL receipts but that at least 10% be utilised from those receipts so that it would provide some funding for those infrastructure requirements that had been included within the Capital Strategy.

The Acting Leader reminded the Cabinet that it was ultimately up to Members to decide what was spent and in his opinion, it would be unlikely that the Council would choose to spend all CIL receipts on one particular project.

**Recommended:** that

(a) the use of capital receipts be limited to circa. £750,000 per annum and not exceed £2 million in any three-year rolling programme;

(b) a £5 million balance of capital receipts be held as a contingency for any unforeseen changes to the Capital Programme; and

(c) the Capital Strategy for 2019-2039, attached at Appendix A to these minutes, be adopted.

88/18  Treasury Management Strategy

(Linked to Council Priorities: All)

The Portfolio Holder for Resources introduced the report that outlined the Council’s Prudential Indicators for 2019/20 to 2021/22 together with the expected treasury operations for this period.
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.

The Portfolio Holder advised that the new Treasury Management Strategy had been prepared taking into account the recently revised Chartered Institute of Public Finance and Accountancy (CIPFA) Codes. The revised code had broadened the definition of investments to include non-financial assets including investment property portfolios which were not managed as part of normal treasury management activities.

With regard to the Treasury Management Strategy, the Portfolio Holder reported that as a result of the continuing development of inter-authority lending in recent years, rates had now started to rival those of building societies. In this regard, as Local Authorities had been deemed by the Council’s advisors to have a UK Sovereign Rating (‘AA’), it was proposed to extend the term permitted from 2 years to 5 years.

The Cabinet was advised that having reviewed the Treasury Management Strategy for 2018/19, the only change incorporated into the 2019/20 Strategy had been to remove the reference to specified funds from the Money Market Funds section and increase the term over which local authority investments were permitted.

The Acting Leader thanked the Portfolio Holder for Resources for her detailed introduction and also thanked the Finance Team for all the work involved in preparing the comprehensive Treasury Management Strategy.

The Leader then invited Councillor S.J. Selleck, Group Leader of the Residents’ Associations Political Group, to address the meeting. Councillor Selleck advised the Cabinet that at the meeting of the Performance and Finance Standing Panel that had been held on 11 February 2019, he had suggested that the capacity to lend to the other Surrey Boroughs and Districts should be increased. The Portfolio Holder for Resources advised that this had been discussed and she did
not see a problem with this suggestion. Accordingly, a report in this regard would be brought to a future meeting of the Council for consideration.

**Recommended:** that

(a) the prudential indicators and limits for 2019/20 to 2021/22, as attached at Appendix B to this report, be agreed;

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

(c) the Treasury Management Strategy 2019/20 to 2021/22 and the Treasury Prudential Indicators, as attached at Appendix C to this report, be approved; and

(d) the Investment Strategy 2019/20 contained in the Treasury Management Strategy including the detailed criteria; the Treasury Management Scheme of Delegation; and the 2019/20 Counterparty List, as attached at Appendix D to this report, be approved.

89/18 Revenue and Capital Budget and Council Tax 2019/20

(Link to Council Priorities: All)

The Cabinet was requested to consider and recommend to the Council the 2019/20 Budget and the Borough Council’s element of the overall Band ‘D’ Council Tax to apply for 2019/20.


The Cabinet noted that the report being considered was a prudent response to a number of very significant pressures facing the Council. The Acting Leader reminded Members that for at least the last 10 years, every Leader of the Council and every Portfolio Holder for Resources had had to find savings. This was as a result of the reduction, year on year, of Government funding and the requirement that the Council was still expected to provide the same level of services as well as providing the voluntary services that the residents valued so much.

The Acting Leader reported that the present budget was going to absorb extra spending pressures of £1.67 million, of which £858,000 would be of additional expenditure and £812,000 of contract inflation and pay. In respect of pay, it had been proposed that a 2.3% pay award for the hard-working staff be agreed.

Disappointingly, the New Homes Bonus income continued to decrease and for 2019/20, the Council would receive £958,000. Whilst further savings and additional income of £700,000 had been included in the budget, the Acting
Leader reminded Members that under all the previous Administrations, the Council had made savings of £15 million pounds within the last 10 years, so it was increasingly more difficult to identify further savings.

In respect of the Negative Revenue Support Grant, the Council was safe from being taxed by the Government for 2019/20. However, future years remained uncertain in this regard.

An update was also provided in respect of the Fair Funding Review and the Business Rates Retention Scheme.

With regard to BREXIT, the Acting Leader assured Members that the Council was making the necessary preparations and had also been liaising with the Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government in respect of concerns associated with the labour supply for the Council’s contractors.

An update was also provided with regard to Surrey County Council and the Surrey Next Programme. The Acting Leader reminded Members that there were significant budget challenges facing the County Council and as a result, for 2019/20, the Council would be losing £120,000 in recycling income and £70,000 in reduced support for the services that the Council provides for the elderly and infirm of the Borough. The Acting Leader reassured Members that the Council would not let the vulnerable residents down and therefore these services would continue with the Council making up the required funding gap.

In respect of the Council Tax for 2019/20, the Acting Leader proposed a modest increase of 2.93%. Out of the other Surrey Boroughs and Districts that had announced their settlements, Elmbridge would be the second lowest in Surrey. This had been done by using £436,000 of the Council’s reserves within the revenue budget for 2019/20 together with the prudent property investments in recent years which had resulted in approximately an extra £3.8 million to the Council’s annual revenue budget.

The Acting Leader 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 for Resources further commented that the most important and significant part of the report was the proposed increase in Council Tax. The proposed 2.93% equated to 12p a week for a Band D taxpayer. In this regard, it was considered that 12p a week was affordable particularly as it enabled the Council to continue to deliver the valuable services that the residents of the Borough expected. With regard to the use of reserves, the Portfolio Holder advised that the current Administration would use reserves when necessary and in fact for 2019/20, an additional £180,000 of reserves had been earmarked over the amount utilised in 2018/19. In addition, £1 million of additional Business Rates was also being used to balance the budget. Furthermore, she reported that this was the first year when the Council had forecasted an overspend of £322,000 in this year’s budget. The Portfolio Holder stressed that the
overarching priority was to maintain existing services and where possible, improve them.

Having recommended a Band D Council Tax precept of 2.93% (£6.30) for 2019/20, it was noted that there would also be increases in the precept for Surrey County Council of 2.99% and for Surrey Police, a precept increase of 10.14%.

The Leader and Portfolio Holder for Resources therefore recommended a net Budget for 2019/20, after the use of reserves, of £17,667,600. At this level of budgeted net expenditure, it was proposed that there should be a Band D Council Tax in 2019/20 of £221.30, which represented an increase of 2.93%.

**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 2019/20 be set at £14,322,561;

(ii) at this level of spending, the Council’s net precept requirement for 2019/20 be £221.30 per Band ‘D’ Dwelling, as attached at Appendix E to these minutes;

(b) the growth items, totaling £858,000, as outlined in paragraph 4.6 of the report, be approved;

(c) in addition to the income and savings of £285,000 approved at Council in December 2018, the additional income and savings, as outlined in paragraph 7 of the report, totaling £714,000, be approved;

(d) a Pay Award of 2.3% be implemented with effect from 1 April 2019 for all employees on the Elmbridge Borough Council Local Pay Scheme;

(e) the new Capital Bids for 2019/20, 2020/21 & 2021/22 and the Capital Programme, as attached at Appendices F and G respectively to these minutes, be approved for inclusion in the Capital Programme;

(f) the revenue estimates for 2019/20, 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 these minutes, be approved;

(h) any shortfall in interest income earned below the budgeted level during 2019/20, will be funded by the Interest Equalisation Reserve, subject to variation depending on the 2019/20 outturn position. If resources allow, any surplus on interest earned in 2018/19 and 2019/20 will be transferred to the Interest Equalisation Reserve;
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.

(i) the Strategic Director and Deputy Chief Executive, in consultation with the Portfolio Holder for Resources, respond to the Government's consultation on the Fair Funding Review;

(ii) the Pay Policy Statement for 2019/20, as attached at Appendix K to these minutes, be adopted as required under the Localism Act 2011;

(k) the Claygate Parish Grant of £2,650 in respect of the localisation of Council Tax Benefits continue to be included in the Elmbridge budget;

(l) it be noted that, at its meeting on 5 December 2018, the Council calculated the amount of 64,720 as its Council Tax Base for the year 2019/20, Item T in the formula in Section 31B of the Local Government Finance Act 1992, As Amended (The “Act”);

(m) it be noted that the Council Tax Base of 64,720 for the Elmbridge Borough area comprises 3,474 for that part of the Borough comprising the area covered by Claygate Parish Council and 61,246 for the remaining part of the Borough;

(n) the following amounts be now calculated by the Council for the year 2019/20 in accordance with Sections 31 to 36 of the Local Government Finance Act 1992;

(i) £102,629,802 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) £88,258,084 being the aggregate of the amounts which the Council estimates for the items set out in Section 31A (3) of the Act;*

(iii) £14,371,718 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) £222.06 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) £49,157 being the aggregate amount of all special items (Parish precepts) referred to in Section 34 (1) of the Act;
(vi) £221.30 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 £22.7 million for the Council's tariff payment.

(vii) **Valuation Bands**

**Claygate Parish Council Area**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></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>156.96</td>
<td>183.13</td>
<td>209.29</td>
<td>235.45</td>
<td>287.77</td>
<td>340.10</td>
<td>392.41</td>
<td>470.90</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></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>147.53</td>
<td>172.12</td>
<td>196.71</td>
<td>221.30</td>
<td>270.48</td>
<td>319.66</td>
<td>368.83</td>
<td>442.60</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

being the amounts given by multiplying the amount at n(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;

(o) it be noted that for the year 2019/20 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></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>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.

(p) it be noted that for the year 2019/20 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

<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>900.74</td>
<td>1,050.86</td>
<td>1,200.99</td>
<td>1,351.11</td>
<td>1,651.36</td>
<td>1,951.60</td>
<td>2,251.85</td>
<td>2,702.22</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

<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>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>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

this gives a total precept issued for 2019/20 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

<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>969.00</td>
<td>1,130.50</td>
<td>1,292.00</td>
<td>1,453.50</td>
<td>1,776.50</td>
<td>2,099.50</td>
<td>2,422.50</td>
<td>2,907.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(q) it be noted that for the year 2019/20, 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

<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>173.71</td>
<td>202.67</td>
<td>231.62</td>
<td>260.57</td>
<td>318.47</td>
<td>376.38</td>
<td>434.28</td>
<td>521.14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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(r) having calculated the aggregate in each case of the amounts of n(vii), p and q 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 2019/20 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:

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>1,231.41</td>
<td>1,436.66</td>
<td>1,641.90</td>
<td>1,847.13</td>
<td>2,257.60</td>
<td>2,668.08</td>
<td>3,078.54</td>
<td>3,694.26</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

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>1,221.98</td>
<td>1,425.65</td>
<td>1,629.32</td>
<td>1,832.98</td>
<td>2,240.31</td>
<td>2,647.64</td>
<td>3,054.96</td>
<td>3,665.96</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:

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>1,299.67</td>
<td>1,516.30</td>
<td>1,732.91</td>
<td>1,949.52</td>
<td>2,382.74</td>
<td>2,815.98</td>
<td>3,249.19</td>
<td>3,899.04</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

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>1,290.24</td>
<td>1,505.29</td>
<td>1,720.33</td>
<td>1,935.37</td>
<td>2,365.45</td>
<td>2,795.54</td>
<td>3,225.61</td>
<td>3,870.74</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
90/18 Corporate Strategic Risk Register

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 the most significant risks, which could affect the Council’s ability to achieve its priorities during the financial year.

The Cabinet noted that a Members Training Session had been held in respect of Risk Management and Members had been asked to judge the risk appetite and the perception of risk. The Portfolio Holder reported that from the Session, the Members’ perception of risk facing the Council had been lower than the officers.

With regard to BREXIT, the Portfolio Holder advised that the Council was working with its partners and the Government in its preparations so as to minimise any potential impact. She reported that the main risks facing the Council had not broadly changed from previous years and in this regard, funding cuts from Surrey County Council and significant changes in the economy affecting the Council’s income streams, remained high. Whilst the Council had no direct control over the possibility of these risks, it was in a strong position to manage the impact over the short to medium term by having a strong financial position and adequate reserves.

The Portfolio Holder also took the opportunity to highlight various initiatives that were taking place which included a Borough Emergency Control Centre exercise that would be held in March 2019. She also provided a brief update in respect of fraud management and advised that in 2018, the Council’s Internal Audit and Counter Fraud Teams became a combined unit and the investigative practices of both had been aligned. She was pleased to report that in the pursuit of fraud, there had been £611,650 of savings to the public purse.

**Recommended**: that the Corporate Strategic Risk Register, as attached at Appendix L to these minutes, be approved.

91/18 Walton-on-Thames Business Improvement District

The Acting Leader introduced the report that explored the potential offered by Business Improvement District (BID) to support the longer-term vitality and viability of town centres and the possible development of a BID within the centre of Walton-on-Thames.

The Cabinet was advised that over the last two years, the Walton-on-Thames Trading Alliance (WoTTA), which was a partnership of businesses, residents, The Heart, Councillors and local groups, had worked with the Council,
businesses and partners to kick start the renewal of Walton-on-Thames and tackle some of the important issues businesses had raised to help ensure a bright future for the Town.

To help build on the work to date, WoTTA had applied for and were granted funding from the Council to undertake a Business Improvement District (BID) feasibility study to understand if a BID could help drive new investment in local priorities and enhance and adapt the Town Centre over the next five years to ensure Walton’s future vitality and viability.

The Cabinet was advised that Business Improvement Districts (BIDs) were business-led, business-funded bodies that delivered on a business plan agreed through a formal balloted process within the defined area. To be approved, BIDs needed to receive a majority in both:

- the total number of votes cast; and
- the rateable values of the businesses voting.

If established the funding to deliver the business plan would come from a levy on rateable values of usually between 1% and 1.5% with all business rate payers obliged to pay the levy irrespective of how they voted in the ballot. It was noted that those previously created BIDs across the country had helped to increase footfall and spend; reduced business costs; enhanced marketing and promotion; given businesses a greater voice; and enhanced town centre environments.

In respect of Walton-on-Thames, an informal BID task group had been set up by WoTTA to help engage businesses and oversee the study. The Group had included representatives from WoTTA, The Heart and businesses from across the Town including McDonald's and Sainsbury's. WoTTA and the businesses had been working with the Mosaic Partnership on the study which had progressed across the key elements to gather evidence, understand the data and continue the conversation with businesses about a potential BID.

The key findings from the feasibility study had included:

- a recommendation from the Mosaic Partnership that it was viable to progress to the next stage of a Business Improvement District in Walton-on-Thames;
- a Walton-on-Thames BID could raise approximately £898,000 over 5 years (based on a 1.5% levy) to invest in the Town;
- If a BID progressed, a representative task group should be established to formalise the steering group that had supported the development to date;
- a dedicated staff and project fund were required to provide the necessary resources for the development and campaign phase; and
- Future business plan priorities covered: Marketing, promotion and events; Safe, welcoming and accessible; Clean and green; Backing business.

As part of the feasibility study, the resources required to successfully deliver the development and campaign phases of the BID had been costed and Members noted that the total cost including VAT was £42,000. Whilst WoTTA had offered
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£1,500 in local match funding towards these costs, it was proposed that the balance of £40,500 be funded from the Elmbridge Civic Improvement Fund. The funding would be split with 50% (£20,250) offered as a grant and 50% (£20,250) offered as a loan to be repaid from the BID levies should the development and campaign phase be successful in securing a YES vote to establish a BID.

In accordance with Part 5-30 of the Council’s Constitution, the Acting Leader invited Councillor Mrs. C. Richardson to address the Cabinet. Whilst in favour of this BID which it was considered would be good for Walton Town Centre, Councillor Mrs. Richardson raised concern regarding whether WoTTA was a large enough organisation to be able to implement and deliver the Business Plan if a BID was established.

The Acting Leader referred Members to the report and the proposal that if the BID was successful, it was likely that a professional staff member would be recruited to help deliver the Business Plan. However, it was recognised that this issue was something that WoTTA would be required to deal with and not for the Council to get involved in.

The Portfolio Holder for Resources commented that she had attended the Mosaic Partnership presentation the previous week and in light of their track record, she had every confidence that they would be able to manage and deliver this project.

The Portfolio Holder for Housing, who was also a Walton North Ward Councillor, commented that a major concern of residents in the area was the number of empty units within Walton Town Centre. Whilst he was pleased to support the Council’s assistance, he considered that credit should be given to WoTTA for all the fantastic work they had done for the Town over the past three years.

The Portfolio Holder for Leisure and Culture, who was also a Walton South Ward Councillor, commented that he was also pleased to endorse this project and that in his opinion, WoTTA did have the expertise and enthusiasm to deliver this project.

The Leader then invited Councillor Rachael I. Lake, a Walton North Ward Councillor, to address the meeting. Councillor Lake queried whether the other areas of Walton Town Centre would be included within this BID given that there were shops and businesses in Terrace Road and at The Halfway. The Acting Leader advised that whilst this BID was for a specific defined area, if successful, there was nothing stopping it being extended further in Walton-on-Thames, or rolled out to other areas of the Borough.

The Portfolio Holder for Community and Social Affairs commented that this was an excellent investment for Walton Town Centre and it was all about the concept of footfall. If increased footfall was created then all areas of Walton-on-Thames would benefit greatly.

Resolved that
(a) the recommendations from the Walton-on-Thames Business Improvement District Feasibility Study be noted;

(b) the development and campaign phase of the Walton-on-Thames Business Improvement District be funded and the £40,500 be allocated from the Elmbridge Civic Improvement Fund; and

(c) the £40,500 funding be offered to the Walton-on-Thames Trading Alliance based on a 50% grant (£20,250) and a 50% loan (£20,250).

92/18 Walton-on-Thames Public Spaces Protection Order (PSPO) Extension

(Link to Council Priorities: Community Wellbeing)

The Portfolio Holder for Community and Social Affairs introduced the report that sought approval to implement an extension to the duration of the existing Public Spaces Protection Order (PSPO) in Walton-on-Thames Town Centre.

The Cabinet was reminded that a PSPO had come into force in Walton-on-Thames Town Centre on 1 March 2018 and was due to expire at midnight on 28 February 2019.

Due to the likelihood of specific behaviours returning to this area and the detrimental effect that these behaviours would have on those living in the locality, it was proposed to extend the PSPO by a further two-years until 28 February 2021.

The Portfolio Holder advised that the PSPO had enabled the Council to impose restrictions in a particular area with the aim of stopping individuals, or groups, committing anti-social behaviour in public spaces.

In order to satisfy the requirements for extending the PSPO in Elmbridge, a public consultation exercise was undertaken in January 2019. The majority of the consultation responses and comments received, from both residents and the local business community, fully supported extending the PSPO in Walton-on-Thames Town Centre.

The Portfolio Holder reported that, having considered the evidence regarding anti-social behaviour in Walton-on-Thames Town Centre since the PSPO had been implemented and having noted the results of the public consultation exercise, the overall conclusion was that an extension to the existing time-limited PSPO was a reasonable and justified response to the problems being experienced within that area of the Borough.

The Portfolio Holder for Housing, who was also a Walton North Ward Councillor, advised that he fully supported the extension to the PSPO and thanked the Policy Officer (Partnerships) for all his work in this regard.

Resolved that
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(a) the evidence regarding anti-social behaviour in Walton-on-Thames Town Centre since the Public Spaces Protection Order (PSPO) had been implemented together with the results of the consultation on proposals to extend the duration of the PSPO for the said area be noted;

(b) being satisfied on reasonable grounds that the statutory conditions for making such an order were still met, the Elmbridge Borough Council (Walton-on-Thames Town Centre) Public Spaces Protection Order 2019, in the form and covering the locations shown in the Appendices to the report, be made in accordance with Sections 59, 64 and 72 of the Anti-Social Behaviour, Crime and Policing Act 2014; and

(c) officers be authorised to carry out all necessary steps to further consult on, publicise and extend the said order for a period of two years up to March 2021.

Recommendations from the Countryside Consultative Group meeting held on 22 November 2018

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

The Portfolio Holder for Leisure and Culture informed the Cabinet that, at its meeting on 17 January 2019, the Overview and Scrutiny Committee had considered three recommendations from the Countryside Consultative Group (CCG) meeting held on 22 November 2018.

Firstly, in respect of Glaxosmithkline (GSK) Access Weybridge Heath, the Overview and Scrutiny Committee had supported the CCG’s recommendation that permission should be granted to resurface the existing vehicular track located on Heath Road together with the creation of a new pedestrian access path adjacent to the existing track accessway, on the condition that the Council was involved with the specifications as well as directing the works.

With regard to the Mixed Waste Bin Trial, the Overview and Scrutiny Committee had supported the CCG’s recommendation that mixed bins be used across the Countryside Estate, replacing bins when they became damaged or were no longer fit for purpose.

Finally, in respect of the Old Cranleighans Track, the Overview and Scrutiny Committee had supported the CCG’s recommendation that the track on Ditton Common should be changed to a hard-wearing tarmac-based surface given that this access track was one of the most heavily used countryside tracks owned by the Council.

On consideration of the report from the Overview and Scrutiny Committee, the Cabinet concurred with the recommendations and accordingly,

Resolved that

(a) with regard to the Glaxosmithkline Access on Weybridge Heath:
(i) permission to resurface the existing track be granted; and

(ii) permission to work with the Council to create a new safe pedestrian access path adjacent to the existing vehicular track be granted;

(b) in respect of the Mixed Waste Bin Trial, these bins be used across the Countryside Estate replacing bins when they became damaged or were not fit for purpose; and

(c) with regard to the Old Cranleighans Track, the track on Ditton Common be changed to a hard-wearing tarmac-based surface.

94/18 Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) Strategic Project Programme - Brooklands Business Park Accessibility Project

(Link to Council Priorities: P3)

The Portfolio Holder for Planning Services introduced the report that sought approval of the allocation of £625,000 from the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) Strategic Infrastructure Project Programme to the Brooklands Business Park Accessibility Project.

Members were reminded that in July 2017, the Cabinet had discussed and recommended that the CIL Allocation Process be revised to include the ringfencing within CIL of a Strategic Infrastructure Project Programme (SIPP) fund.

The Portfolio Holder advised that the SIPP fund allowed the Council to address larger issues through priority projects which had a longer-term approach and which gave partners certainty to progress schemes. Furthermore, it also increased the Council’s eligibility to access other sources of funding for infrastructure projects including Local Enterprise Partnership (LEP) funding.

One of the projects discussed in July 2017 that required SIPP funding was the Brooklands Business Park Accessibility Project. The primary focus of this project was to improve accessibility to the Brooklands Business Park, which was the Borough’s principal strategic employment area. It was noted that this project would include the following components:

- the provision of a continuous walking / cycling route between the Brooklands Business Park, Weybridge Railway Station and Weybridge Town Centre;
- enhancements to pedestrian and road safety including vital improvements around Weybridge Railway Station;
- improvements at Weybridge Railway Station including improving cycle storage and better integration of rail / bus travel through real-time information;
- safeguarding access through the private road network in Brooklands; and
• improvements to bus facilities.

The Portfolio Holder reported that this project was being delivered in partnership with Surrey County Council and had received Enterprise M3 LEP funding of £2,172,000. However, this award of funding was reliant on £625,000 of local match funding from the Council which it had been proposed would be allocated from the CIL Strategic Infrastructure Project Programme.

The Cabinet considered the request and as the Business Case for the project had now been approved, the allocation of £625,000 from the SIPP to the Brooklands Business Park Accessibility Project was supported. Members acknowledged that the multiple components of this project would strategically address the pressures on infrastructure from development in and around the area.

During the consideration of the report, the Acting Leader invited Councillor S.J. Selleck, Group Leader of the Residents’ Associations Political Group, to address the meeting. Whilst supporting the Brooklands Business Park Accessibility Project, Councillor Selleck queried why the resurfacing of the carriageway on St. George’s Avenue had been included as part of the project. He reminded Members that Surrey County Council had applied to the Strategic Spending Board for £163,000 of CIL funding during 2018 and this had been rejected on the basis that it did not meet the criteria for strategic CIL monies. Having noted that Surrey County Council had agreed to contribute £99,000 to the Brooklands Business Park Accessibility Project, Councillor Selleck felt that the County Council was trying to circumnavigate the process and that they would be getting the area resurfaced at half the original cost.

The Acting Leader noted the comments made by Councillor Selleck and advised that the resurfacing of St. George’s Avenue had been included as part of the project. In addition, whilst all the monies for the project would be in a central pot, it would be difficult to identify which of the three partners had paid for which element of the project.

The Acting Leader then invited Councillor A. Davis, Group Leader of the Liberal Democrats Political Group, to address the meeting. Councillor Davis welcomed this project which would be an excellent boost for the area and advised that the resurfacing of St. George’s Avenue was also required for the cyclists who used that area. He further commented that he was under the impression that half of St. George’s Avenue had already been resurfaced and therefore it was possible that the element that had been included within this project was for only half of St. George’s Avenue.

The Acting Leader then invited Councillor C.R. Sadler, a Walton Central Ward Councillor, to address the meeting. Whilst supporting the project, Councillor Sadler agreed with the comments made by Councillor Selleck and further queried why the map on page 303 of the agenda did not show that St. George’s Avenue (the B372) was part of the project.
The Chief Executive took the opportunity to comment and having noted the comments made by Councillors Sadler and Selleck, he agreed to provide, outside of the meeting, a breakdown of which partner would be contributing to which element(s) of the project.

Resolved that £625,000 be allocated from the Community Infrastructure Levy Strategic Infrastructure Project Programme fund to the Brooklands Business Park Accessibility Project.

95/18 Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) Local Spending Boards Scheduling

(Link to Council Priorities: P3)

The Portfolio Holder for Planning Services introduced the report that sought approval to amend the scheduling of the Local Spending Board meetings.

The Cabinet noted that for the applications for Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) funds, local organisations, institutions and Government Agencies were asked to submit with their applications details of additional funding being sought and the viability of their project.

Applicants from the Council, Surrey County Council and other organisations had made officers aware that the timing of the Board meetings in February / March each year made the submission of this information difficult.

Accordingly, the Portfolio Holder advised that it was proposed to move the meetings of the Local Spending Boards from February / March to June / July each year. By moving these meetings would allow capital projects and other funding decisions to be made prior to the CIL funding applications opening in March.

The Cabinet was pleased to note that in order to facilitate the move of the Local Spending Board meetings and to ensure that the Boards met during the Municipal Year 2019/20, a round of Local Spending Board meetings would be held in the summer 2019. In this regard, it was proposed that these meetings be held in September 2019 which would allow time for the CIL pots to replenish.

Resolved that, with effect from the Municipal Year 2020/21, the Local Spending Board meetings take place annually in June / July.

The meeting commenced at 7.00 pm and concluded at 8.17 pm
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