

## Runnymede Borough Council

### CORPORATE MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE

20 January 2022 at 7.30 p.m.

Members of the Committee present: Councillors T Gracey (Vice-Chairman in the Chair), M Adams, A Alderson, D Coen, D Cotty, M Cressey, M Harnden, C Howorth, M Maddox, J Sohi, D Whyte and M Willingale.

Members of the Committee absent: None.

#### 389 Notification Of Changes To Committee Membership

The Groups mentioned below had notified the Chief Executive of their wish that the changes listed below be made to the membership of the Committee. The changes were for a fixed period ending on the day after the meeting and thereafter the Councillors removed would be reappointed.

Group	Remove From Membership	Appoint Instead
Conservative	Councillor J Gracey	Councillor M Adams
Conservative	Councillor M Heath	Councillor D Coen
Conservative	Councillor N Prescott (Chairman)	Councillor J Sohi
Runnymede Independent Residents'	Councillor L Gillham	Councillor M Harnden

The Chief Executive had given effect to this request in accordance with Section 16(2) of the Local Government and Housing Act 1989.

#### 390 Minutes

The Minutes of the meetings held on 25 November 2021 and 16 December 2021 were confirmed and signed as correct records.

#### 391 Apologies for Absence

None received.

#### 392 Declarations Of Interest

None declared.

#### 393 2022/23 Treasury Management Strategy, Annual Investment Strategy, Prudential and Treasury Management Indicators and Minimum Revenue Provision Statement

The Committee considered a report on the 2022/23 Treasury Management Strategy, Annual Investment Strategy, Prudential and Treasury Management Indicators and Minimum Revenue Provision Statement.

The Treasury Management (TM) Strategy was one of the ways in which the Council managed its financial planning, risk management, and governance processes. The TM Strategy placed controls over where, and in what, the Council could invest and borrow and ensured adequate planning for the cash flow requirements of the capital and revenue plans agreed by Members. The TM Strategy set out the framework each year for the Council's

treasury operations and had to cover capital issues and treasury management issues. The Committee agreed to recommend the Council's Treasury Management Strategy as set out in the report and the Annual Investment Strategy at Appendix 'C' to the agenda which maintained the principle of prudent investment with regard to protecting security and liquidity before making returns or yield.

The Council had adopted both the CIPFA Treasury Management and Prudential Codes and new versions of these Codes had been published just before Christmas 2021 and the Committee noted the implications for the Council of those Codes. The key objectives of the Prudential Code were to ensure, within a clear framework, that the capital investment plans of local authorities were affordable, prudent and sustainable; that treasury management decisions were taken in accordance with good professional practice; and that local strategic planning, asset management planning and proper option appraisal were supported.

The new Prudential Code applied immediately, with the exception of the reporting requirements which did not take effect until the 2023/24 financial year, although early adoption was recommended. Officers had incorporated some of the new requirements in the Council's Capital and Treasury Management Strategies and would look to enhance all future reports with the new reporting requirements once the associated guidance notes had been received.

One area required by the Code that needed addressing was training for Members with responsibility for treasury management. The last Member training on treasury management had been carried out in November 2017. Plans for further training in June 2020 had to be delayed as a result of the pandemic and had been planned to take place in November 2021. However, CIPFA's draft Code amendments proposed a "Treasury Management Knowledge and Skills Framework" for officers and Members, including a learning needs analysis to support it, so this training had been deferred again until later in 2022 in order to ensure that the new requirements were met.

The Council's Treasury advisors had provided a section in the report on the economy and prospects for interest rates. Current projections showed that the Base Rate would climb to 0.75% by the end of the next financial year and the Council's financial plans and MTFs had been based upon these projections. The 2022/23 estimate for investment income and debt interest was noted. There were no proposed changes to the Council's borrowing strategy for next year. In general the Council would borrow for one of two purposes – to finance cash flow in the short term or to fund capital investment over the longer term. It was noted that the large majority of the Council's borrowing was for fixed rates so that it could be sure of its costs and in order to protect itself against any interest rate increases that had not been forecast.

The new Prudential Code stated that an authority must not borrow to invest for the primary purpose of commercial return. In order to gain access to Public Works Loan Board funding, local authority Chief Finance Officers now had to certify that their Council's capital spending plans did not include the acquisition of assets primarily for yield. The Government's current requirement for local authorities holding commercial assets was that local authorities should seek to divest themselves of these assets where appropriate. As a result of responses received to consultations, the Government had moderated its original intention which was to require local authorities to sell commercial assets.

The Committee agreed to recommend the Prudential and Treasury Management Indicators for 2022/23 as set out in Appendix 'D' to the agenda. This included a total authorised limit for external borrowing by the Council in 2022/23 of £720,710,000. These indicators were designed to support and record local decision making. They were not performance indicators and were not comparable between authorities. All of the indicators for next year included a provision for the effects of the introduction of a new Reporting Standard on Leases (IFRS 16). This standard would come into effect on 1 April 2022 and brought all leases onto the Council's Balance Sheet as a debt liability for the first time.

The Council was required to pay off an element of the accumulated General Fund capital spend each year (the Capital Financing Requirement – CFR) through Minimum Revenue Provision (MRP) which was a charge to revenue in order to have sufficient monies set aside to meet the future repayment of principal on any borrowing undertaken. The Council was required to approve an MRP statement in advance of each year. In November 2021, the Government had begun a consultation exercise on proposed amendments to the MRP regulations to take effect from 1 April 2023. Whilst it was not something that the Council had ever done, there was a sentence in the Council’s current MRP Policy which stated that “*Where schemes require interim financing by loan, pending receipt of an alternative source of finance (for example capital receipts) no MRP charge will be applied*”. This course of action appeared to be contrary to the amendments which were the subject of the consultation exercise. As it would have no effect on the Council’s current operations or plans, therefore the Committee agreed to recommend the MRP Policy for 2022/23 as set out in recommendation iv) below which did not include this sentence.

**Recommend to Full Council on 10 February 2022 that -**

- i) the proposed Treasury Management Strategy as set out in the report encompassing the Annual Investment Strategy, as reported, be approved;**
- ii) the Prudential and Treasury Management Indicators for 2022/23, as reported, be approved;**
- iii) the authorised limit for external borrowing by the Council in 2022/23, be set at £720,710,000 (this being the statutory limit determined under Section 3(1) of the Local Government Act 2003); and**
- iv) the Council’s Minimum Revenue Provision (MRP) Statement for 2022/23 be agreed as follows:**

***The Council will use the asset life method as its main method for calculating MRP.***

***In normal circumstances, MRP will be set aside from the date of acquisition. However, in relation to capital expenditure on property purchases and/or development, we will start setting aside an MRP provision from the date that the asset becomes operational and/or revenue income is generated.***

**393 Capital Strategy and Capital Programme 2022/23 to 2025/26**

The Committee considered a report on a proposed Capital Strategy and General Fund Capital Programme 2022/23 to 2025/26.

The CIPFA Prudential Code together with other guidance and legislation, required the Council to produce a comprehensive capital strategy. The purpose of the capital strategy was to describe how the investment of capital resources would contribute to the achievement of the Council’s key objectives and priorities, and to describe the long-term context in which capital expenditure and investment decisions were made. The Prudential Code required all local authorities to look at capital expenditure and investment plans in light of the overall organisational strategy and resources and make sure that decisions were being made with sufficient regard to the long term financial implications and potential risks to the authority. At Runnymede this was done through the Capital Strategy, Treasury Management Strategy and Medium Term Financial Strategy (MTFS).

Although major changes to the strategy resulting from the new Prudential Code were not envisaged, the Council was still awaiting the guidance associated with the Code. The

Committee agreed to recommend the Capital Strategy 2022/23 to 2025/26 at Appendix 'F' to the agenda which had not changed significantly from the Strategy approved in February 2021. The Strategy aimed to balance the resources available to the Council and leave options open as to future funding over the life of the MTFS whilst remaining affordable, financially prudent and sustainable.

The Committee agreed to recommend the updated Capital Programme set out at Appendix 'G' to the agenda and noted a summary of the costs and financing of the Programme set out at Appendix 'H' to the agenda. It was noted that the Council's Capital Programme expenditure on the A320 road improvement scheme was limited to a maximum of £2 million in 2023/24. There was very little change to the Programme and the main changes related to phasing adjustments due to delays caused by the pandemic.

The Capital Programme was funded in a number of ways. In the Housing Revenue Account, (HRA) tenants' rents funded the works to the Council's housing stock. In the General Fund, revenue contributions funded some assets with a short life, and capital receipts were used from the sale of assets to fund much of the remainder. Some schemes were funded, or part funded, by third party grants and contributions such as section 106 contributions or Government grants.

The Council's usable capital receipts were declining as predicted. Most short life assets were funded from capital receipts with some being funded from the revenue budget. The Council's financial strategy aimed to fund all short life assets from revenue when the resources became available. However, with an ongoing revenue reductions target, this aim currently remained an aspiration.

All capital receipts generated from sales of Council dwellings were subject to special rules. A proportion of these receipts were set aside for repayment of the HRA debt, some was set aside for purchasing further HRA properties, with the remainder paid over to central Government according to a set of complex criteria. The current forecast for capital receipts, both general and set aside for housing purposes, was noted. This was based on existing plans for the sale of flats in the Council's redevelopment schemes. It was noted that the letting by the Council of student accommodation in Egham was progressing well.

The Capital Strategy and Capital Programme met all the relevant legislative and statutory guidance and ensured that the Council's assets were used to support the delivery of its priorities. Should the requirements of the new Prudential and Treasury Management Codes dictate any material changes, these would be incorporated into the Strategy and brought back to Members for approval.

**Recommend to Full Council on 10 February 2022 that –**

**the Capital Strategy and the Capital Programme, as reported, be approved.**

### **394 Budget and Council Tax 2022/23**

The Committee considered a report on the Council's Budget and Council Tax for 2022/23.

At its meeting on 16 December 2021, the Committee had approved the Council Tax Base and Collection Fund surplus to be split among the precepting authorities which were the Council, Surrey County Council and Surrey Police. At the same meeting the Council had considered a report containing detailed risk analysis on the budget, the draft budget for 2022/23, the Medium Term Financial Strategy (MTFS) and the Section 25 report on the robustness of the estimates included in the budget and the adequacy of reserves. The Committee had recommended that the Band D Council Tax rate be increased by £5 subject to Government referendum limits and that the MTFS and the revised budget for 2021/22 and 2022/23 be approved.

Since that meeting, the Government had now provided details of the provisional Local Government Finance Settlement. As part of the Settlement, the limit by which Runnymede could increase its Band D Council Tax rate for 2022/23 without holding a referendum had been approved at £5 a year, so no change was required to the recommendation made by the Committee on 16 December 2021 on the Council Tax.

In the provisional Finance Settlement, in 2022/23 the Council would receive extra money from three Government grants consisting of New Homes Bonus for one year, the continuation of the Lower Tier Services Grant and a new Services Grant which included funding to partially offset the 1.25% increase in employer National Insurance contributions. These three grants totalled £633,000 and this meant that, along with some other very minor adjustments to previously estimated figures, in 2022/23 the Council would be making a contribution to working balances of £393,000 rather than the use of £212,000 reported in December 2021.

The Council's earmarked reserves were part of its risk management strategy. In particular the Commercial Income Equalisation and Property Repairs and Renewals reserves protected the Council's income stream from its commercial activities, which were the main reason why the Council's use of General Fund working balances were so low. The Committee noted that officers considered that those earmarked reserves were much more, not less, likely to be called upon for the purpose intended over the next year as the after effects of the remaining coronavirus measures were removed.

The Council currently managed £541 million of investment property which generated approximately £25 million for the General Fund. The Committee was advised that ideally, as a minimum, the Council would wish to set aside 10% of this income to put into the two reserves referred to above in order to pay for future known and unknown events. At present only 6% of this income was set aside annually which was split evenly between the two reserves.

Therefore the Committee agreed to recommend that, with further savings still to be made to balance future years budgets in the MTFs, a further £595,000 be transferred into the Property Repairs and Renewals earmarked reserve in 2022/23 to help protect the crucial investment income stream from any serious future unknown events. This would bring the General Fund bottom line back to the deficit figure reported to, and agreed by, the Committee in December 2021. The Committee noted the anticipated movement in reserves which would result from this transfer.

These budgetary changes meant that the recommendations made by the Committee on 16 December 2021 on the budget for 2021/22 and 2022/23 and on the MTFs had been superceded. Therefore the Committee agreed to recommend the amended General Fund Summary Revenue Account budget for 2021/22 and 2022/23 as set out in Appendix 'I' to the agenda which included the transfer referred to above and the amended MTFs for 2021/22 to 2024/25 as set out in Appendix 'J' to the agenda. As it was a large sum, it was agreed that the Committee would be advised of the composition of the 2020/21 Actual Other accounting adjustments totalling £1,051,409 as set out in the General Fund Summary Revenue Account at Appendix 'I' to the agenda.

**Recommend to Full Council on 10 February 2022 that -**

- i) £595,000 of the additional grant money received from the provisional Finance Settlement be transferred to the Property Repairs and Renewals Reserve;**
- ii) the amended budget for 2021/22 and 2022/23, as reported, be approved; and**

- iii) **the amended Medium Term Financial Strategy 2021/22 to 2024/25, as reported, be approved.**

### **395 Help to Buy Scheme – Magna Square and Addlestone One**

The Committee was recommended to authorise officers to enter into an agreement with Homes England so that the Government's 2021-23 Help to Buy (HTB) Equity Loan Funding Scheme could be offered to eligible purchasers of the residential dwellings in the Magna Square and Addlestone One developments.

The Committee supported the signing of this agreement as it would enable first time buyers with more limited resources to obtain a foot on the property ladder. The Planning Committee had approved the Runnymede Interim Policy Statement on First Homes at its meeting on 19 January 2022. However, it was noted that HTB was a different scheme with different objectives to First Homes.

**Resolved that –**

**the Assistant Chief Executive be authorised in conjunction with the Corporate Head of Law and Governance to enter into an agreement with Homes England in order that the Government's Help to Buy Scheme can be offered to eligible purchasers of residential dwellings on the Magna Square and Addlestone One Developments.**

### **396 Update for Shareholders In Respect of RBC Companies**

The Committee received a report containing an update on the Council's Special Purpose Vehicles (SPV)s, RBC Investments (Surrey) Ltd, RBC Services (Addlestone One) Limited and RBC Heat Company Limited. The report was presented to the Committee in its role as shareholder of the Council's companies.

It was noted that the liability for the remedial work that was required in respect of external wall cladding for Addlestone One was for the Council and not for the SPVs. The purposes of each of the SPVs and the draft financial accounts of the SPVs were noted. It was anticipated that the costs incurred by RBC Heat Company Limited would increase as a result of the rise in gas and electricity prices. The Committee welcomed the report and looked forward to receiving similar updates in the future.

**Resolved that –**

**the update be noted along with the financial information contained within the reports.**

### **397 Process for Appointments to Outside Bodies**

The Committee considered a revised process for appointments to outside bodies as recommended by the Constitution Member Working Party (MWP). At its meeting on 22 July 2021, the Committee had considered matters raised by the Overview and Scrutiny Select Committee concerning the call-in of a decision made by the Committee on appointments to outside bodies. As a result, the MWP had been asked to review the process for appointments to outside bodies in order to make the process more transparent, to give equal access to nominate and to appoint the most appropriate person to these bodies. A majority of Members of the MWP had agreed that the proposed process should be reported to this meeting of the Corporate Management Committee so that, if approved, it could be in place for the outside body appointments for this year.

The Committee supported the revised process as set out in the report. Under the revised process, nomination forms would have to be completed which would be circulated to all

Councillors and people putting themselves forward to be appointed would be required to justify in writing why they considered that they were the best person for that appointment.

**Resolved that –**

**the revised process set out in the report be implemented for this year's appointments to outside bodies.**

### **398 Preliminary Consideration of Mayoral Selection**

The Committee considered candidates for the office of Mayor for the Municipal Year 2022/23 in accordance with Standing Order 7 of the Council's Constitution.

The Government in April 2020 had enacted regulations which allowed the continuation in office of any Mayor who had been appointed to office in May 2019. Former Councillor P Sohi, who had been appointed as Mayor in May 2019 and was scheduled to leave office in May 2020 had agreed to remain in office to assist the Council and avoid the need to hold an Annual Meeting to appoint a new Mayor at a time when the country was in lockdown. In October 2020, when the use of remote meeting technology had been developed, former Councillor Sohi had resigned from office of Mayor. Councillor Elaine Gill had been appointed by Full Council as Mayor until May 2021 and Councillor Margaret Harnden had been appointed to the office of Deputy Mayor for the same period.

Councillors Gill and Harnden had been nominated as Mayor and Deputy Mayor in May 2020 but due to the Covid pandemic had been unable to take up those offices. Members had indicated prior to the Full Council meeting in October 2020 that they would support the nomination of Councillors Gill and Harnden for the offices of Mayor and Deputy Mayor for the Municipal Year 2021/22 in acknowledgement of the fact that due to the impact of coronavirus they were unable to be appointed to those roles in May 2020.

At the Annual Meeting of the Council on 19 May 2021, Councillor Gill had been elected Mayor of Runnymede for the Municipal Year 2021/22 and Councillor Harnden had been appointed Deputy Mayor for the Municipal Year 2021/22. The Committee noted that it was the normal custom of the Council for the Deputy Mayor in one Municipal Year to become the Mayor in the next Municipal Year. Accordingly, the Committee nominated Councillor Margaret Harnden for the office of Mayor for the Municipal Year 2022/23.

**Recommend to Full Council on 3 March 2022 that –**

**Councillor Margaret Harnden be nominated for the office of Mayor for the Municipal Year 2022/23.**

### **399 Urgent Action – Standing Order 42**

The Committee noted proformas 990 and 992 detailing action taken after consultation with the Chairman and Vice-Chairman of the Committee.

### **400 Law and Governance Service Review 2021-22**

By resolution of the Committee, the press and public were excluded from the meeting during the consideration of this matter under Section 100A (4) of the Local Government Act 1972 on the grounds that the discussion would be likely to involve the disclosure of exempt information of the description specified in paragraphs 1 and 3 of Schedule 12A to Part 1 of the Act.

The Committee considered a service review of the Council's Law and Governance Business Centre. The review contained proposals in respect of three of the Teams within Law and

Governance – Democratic Services, Elections Services and Legal Services. The Committee noted the environmental/sustainability/biodiversity implications of the proposals.

A series of options for the Democratic Services Team going forward had been considered in view of the voluntary early retirements of the Democratic Services Manager and one of the Democratic Services Officers. It had been concluded that the best option was to directly replace the departing officers. It was proposed to delete the Democratic Services Manager post and replace it with a new Head of Democratic Services post and to delete the Democratic Services Officer post and replace it with a new Deputy Head of Democratic Services post to provide increased resilience. The Committee noted that there were no additional financial implications associated with these changes and approved these proposals for the Democratic Services Team and the recruitment exercises for these new posts.

The continuation of a Market Factor Supplement (MFS) for the Electoral Services Manager had been recently extended for a further two years to assist with retention in view of a shortage of experienced senior elections staff across the country. As this shortage continued, it was agreed that this MFS should extend for a further five years and then be reviewed. Budgetary provision for this extension was included in the total additional spend set out in paragraph 4.9 of the report.

The Elections Team currently consisted of a Manager, a Deputy Manager and an Elections Assistant. The Elections Assistant would be departing at the end of May 2022. The Committee approved the funding required to retain the Elections Assistant until the end of May 2022 and agreed the funding required for a new Elections Assistant post to be added to the establishment to add resilience to the Team and the recruitment exercise required for this new post. Officers advised the Committee that these arrangements would provide sufficient experienced cover as the Team would be further supplemented by casual staff at critical times such as annual canvass and elections.

The case management software used by Legal Services which was IKEN required updating and the Committee agreed that as the existing system worked well it would be more cost effective to upgrade it rather than conduct a procurement exercise. Accordingly, the Committee approved the funding required to pay for the purchase of the IKEN Cloud system upgrade and the increased annual licence fee for the use of the IKEN Cloud database.

The Committee approved a series of new Legal posts which were required to support the Council's property management and procurement activities which were core Legal services fundamental to the delivery of the Council's functions and financial well-being. The Committee approved the changes to the establishment along with the required recruitment exercises for these posts and the funding required to bring these posts into effect and to cover 2022/23 interim Legal staffing costs.

The Committee agreed that a staff consultation be commenced within Democratic Services and Legal Services regarding the changes within both Teams and that UNISON be consulted on the changes. A further report would be submitted to the Committee in 2022 to reflect the outcome of that staff consultation and any views provided by UNISON. An Equality Screening Assessment or an Equality Impact Assessment (should a Screening Assessment determine that this was necessary) would be attached to this further report.

**Resolved that –**



- i) a supplementary revenue estimate be approved in the sum reported to fund the retention of the Elections Assistant until the end of May 2022 (in the sum reported in Financial Year [FY] 2021/22 and in the sum reported in FY 2022/23);**
- ii) a supplementary capital estimate be approved in the sum reported for the purchase and installation of the IKEN Cloud system upgrade to be taken from the provision for upgrades in the Capital Programme;**
- iii) a supplementary revenue estimate be approved in the sum reported to fund the increased annual license fee payable for the use of the IKEN Cloud database;**
- iv) the changes to the establishment be approved as set out in the report at a cost in the sum reported in a full year as set out in paragraph 4.9 of the report;**
- v) the external recruitment exercise be commenced to appoint to the following newly created posts:**
  - a. Head of Democratic Services (at grade MMB plus MFS);**
  - b. Elections – Trainee (at grade 3/5);**
  - c. Principal Solicitors (Property) (2 posts) (at grade SMA plus MFS);**
  - d. Principal Solicitor (Contracts) (at grade SMA);**
  - e. Senior Solicitor (Contracts) (at grade MMB); and**
  - f. Legal Support roles (2 posts) (at grade 8/9).**
- vi) Posts [redacted] and [redacted] be deleted from the current establishment list;**
- vii) the recruitment exercise be commenced to appoint to the newly created Deputy Head of Democratic Services post;**
- viii) a staff consultation be commenced within Democratic Services and Legal Services regarding the proposed changes within both teams;**
- ix) discussions be commenced with potential partners with whom the Council would look to outsource Legal work; and**
- v) a supplementary revenue estimate be approved in the sum reported for the financial year 2022/23 to cover interim Legal Services staffing costs.**

#### **401 Future Management of Property**

By resolution of the Committee, the press and public were excluded from the meeting during the consideration of this matter under Section 100A (4) of the Local Government Act 1972 on the grounds that the discussion would be likely to involve the disclosure of exempt information of the description specified in paragraph 3 of Schedule 12A to Part 1 of the Act.

The Committee considered a report on the future management of two properties within the borough. Both properties were used to run businesses. One property was used to run a larger business than the other property in terms of turnover and the other property was used to run a smaller business than the other property in terms of turnover. For each of the properties, the Council had granted a lease to a Trust in each case to occupy and use the properties which were both owned by the Council.

At its meeting on 25 November 2021, the Committee had considered a report setting out options for future leisure provision in Runnymede. The Committee had resolved that option 2 as set out in paragraph 3.4 of that report be pursued, (hereinafter referred to as option 2 in this Minute), and that the Chief Executive report back on the outcome of negotiations to achieve option 2 and on the options set out in paragraph 4.2 of that report.

Council officers had met with the Chief Executive and Trustees of the Trust which managed both of the two properties at which the implications of the decision to pursue option 2 and concerns about the management of the smaller of the two businesses had been discussed. The outcome of the meeting was that the Council's Chief Executive had sent a letter at Exempt Appendix '1' to the report to the Trust Chief Executive requesting a formal response and the letter received in response from the Trust's Chief Executive at Exempt Appendix '2' to the report was noted by the Committee.

The Committee noted the concerns of officers about the response received from the Trust's Chief Executive. The legal and financial implications of continuing to pursue option 2 were noted as set out in the report. The Committee noted the details of a provisional offer received by a new provider to manage the larger of the two businesses. It was noted that the Council could enter into a two year contract with a new provider to use this property to run this business after which it would be necessary to undertake a full scale competition.

After considering the matter, the Committee was not convinced by the proposals set out in the letter from the Trust Chief Executive and confirmed its stance to pursue Option 2. The Committee agreed that officers would make preparatory arrangements for the forfeiture of the lease of the property where the larger of the two businesses was run and for the installation of a new provider at this property for a limited period.

Having considered officer advice, the Committee was also not convinced that the Trust should continue to manage the smaller of the two businesses. The Committee agreed that officers would make arrangements for the forfeiture of the lease of this property and that officers would continue discussions for the installation of a suitable alternative provider and report back at the earliest opportunity.

The Committee considered a draft letter to the Trust Chief Executive from the Council Chief Executive and Leader of the Council at Exempt Appendix '3' to the report. The Committee agreed that this letter required revision and authorised the Council Chief Executive to agree with the Leader of the Council an amended version of this letter to be sent signed by both of them.

**Resolved that –**

- i) the contents of a letter received from the Chief Executive of the Trust managing two properties owned by the Council where businesses are run in response to a letter from the Chief Executive of the Council be noted;**
- ii) given that the letter from the Trust Chief Executive fails to convince the Council, the Committee confirms its stance as set out in Option 2 in paragraph 3.4 of the report on Options for Leisure Provision in Runnymede submitted to the Committee on 25 November 2021 and the Council Chief Executive be authorised to agree with the Leader of the Council an amended version of the letter at Exempt Appendix '3' to the report and the amended letter then be sent signed by both of them;**
- iii) officers make preparatory arrangements for seeking the forfeiture of the lease of the property where the larger of the two businesses is run and the installation of a new service provider on a two year contract; and**

- iv) officers also make arrangements for the forfeiture of the lease of the property where the smaller of the two businesses is run and continue discussions for the installation of a suitable alternative provider and report back to Members at the earliest opportunity.**

(The meeting ended at 8.56.p.m.)

Chairman