



01.02.23

Dear Councillor

Summons to a Meeting of the Full COUNCIL

I hereby summon you to attend the meeting of the Full Council to be held on **Thursday, 9 February 2023 at 7.30 pm. The meeting will be held at Council Chamber - Civic Centre.**

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Paul Turrell'. The signature is written in a cursive style with a long horizontal stroke at the end.

PAUL TURRELL
Chief Executive
01932 425500
Email: paul.turrell@runnymede.gov.uk

A G E N D A

1. **Mayor's Announcements**

2. **Minutes**

13 - 20

To confirm and sign, as a correct record, the minutes of the meeting held on 8 December 2022.

3. **Apologies for Absence**

4. **Declarations of Interest**

If Members have an interest in an item, please complete a member interest form and email it to Democratic.Services@runnymede.gov.uk by 5pm on the day of the meeting. Members are advised to contact the Corporate Head of Law and Governance prior to the meeting if they wish to seek advice on a potential interest.

5. **Speaking or Questions from Members of the Public under Standing Order 12**

In pursuance of Standing Order 12.1, public questions or speaking is not permitted at this meeting.

6. **Petitions**

To receive any petitions from members of the Council under Standing Order 19.

7. **Questions from Members of the Council under Standing Order 13**

Question a)

From Councillor Carl Mann to the Leader of the Council:

“Can the Leader of the Council please give us an update on Egham Orbit?”

Question b)

From Councillor Sylvia Whyte to the Leader of the Council:

“Last September I was pleased that Runnymede Borough Council supported the Great Big Green Week, be it at a very low level, promoting the event on social media and encouraging community groups and organisations to get involved.

I note that this year’s event runs between 10th and 18th June. Is Runnymede supporting this event and are we able to raise the profile a bit higher than last year to get more people involved?”

Question c)

From Councillor Robert King to the Leader of the Council:

“Does the Leader agree that NHS workers, from porters to doctors, from nurses to cleaners, are invaluable to the health of the nation and that we should show the best support we can from Runnymede Borough Council to them and particularly those who live and work in our Borough?”

Question d)

From Councillor Abby King to the Leader of the Council:

“Will the Leader join the Labour Party and the Labour and Co-operative group on this Council, and lobby his Conservative friends presently in government to rule out any increases in the government’s energy price cap from April and force energy firms to pass on recent falls in gas prices to households.”

Question e)

From Councillor Rhys Davies to the Leader of the Council:

“How many Improvement Notices have been issued by Runnymede’s private sector housing team in the last year, broken down by housing tenure (housing association or private rental) and Category 1 or 2 hazards and how many resulted in further action?”

8. **Recommendations from Committees**

a) **Housing Revenue Account Estimates for 2022/23 - recommendation from Housing Committee**

The report and appendices associated with this recommendation were circulated to all members with the agenda for the meeting of the Housing

Committee and are available on the website.

The Senior Accountant advised Committee that the setting of the Housing Revenue Account (HRA) estimates was largely based on the assumptions included in the HRA business plan unless specified in the report. The proposed 7% increase in rents was consistent with Government guidance and also ensured that the Council would not be penalised through the loss of Rent Rebates subsidy entitlement.

The large increase in the Housing Repairs budget was the continuation of a multi-year programme reversing many years of low expenditure and includes deferred expense for the current year.

Committee were advised that in the current year's budget a provision was included to enable the transfer of up to £30,000 of HRA funds to help top up the DHP contribution received from the DWP. It was proposed that the Council continued to increase the DHP contribution by a sum of £30,000. Members were advised that any contribution from the HRA could only be used to help HRA tenants who required assistance, and this assistance was granted using the same criteria as set out in the Council's DHP policy.

Although considerable balances remain in the Housing Revenue Account, consideration was needed to cover current and future spending plans plus the need to service the £100m of borrowings over the next 20 years.

The Senior Accountant concluded that whilst the estimates only covered the next financial year, an updated 30-year finance plan would be presented to the March Committee.

The Committee Chair added that despite the backdrop of financial pressures the Council was facing, the Housing service was still making plans for delivery of services having identified risks, along with strategies to manage those risks.

The Committee Vice Chair expressed concern about the provision of £20,000 to help households in financial difficulties not being sufficient, but was reassured by the proposed increase to the Housing discretionary fund. It was added that further means to support tenants would be kept under review and proposals brought back to Committee if necessary.

Resolved that –

- i. the draft revenue estimates for 2023/24 were approved and the Full Council were requested to make provision accordingly; and**
 - ii. the proposed changes in rents and charges (including those for Housing General Fund services) for 2023/24 were approved to be effective either from the first rent week of April 2023, or 1 April 2023 as appropriate.**
- b) Medium Term Financial Strategy - recommendation from the Corporate Management Committee**

The report and appendices associated with this recommendation were circulated to all members with the agenda for the meeting of the Corporate Management Committee and are available on the website.

The strategy covered the financial period up to 2025/26 and would be used to inform the upcoming budget setting process. The committee was reminded of the current economic context, which had had a significant impact on the figures set out in the report. The government's upcoming Levelling Up Bill was also expected to have an impact on the strategy.

The council's longstanding financial prudence had provided some budgetary resilience, however there was a sizeable deficit predicted by 2025/26, which would require some difficult decisions to be made before then. The council's capital programme was likely to require careful scrutiny, particularly with regard to when capital receipts were received. The proposed change to the minimum recommendation for the council's working balance was welcomed.

There was discussion about the upcoming pay award and the increasing cost of living. Discussions were ongoing with the local union branch and a report would be considered by the Corporate Management Committee and Council in due course. The proposed offer was aiming to be both fair and affordable.

The proposed additional Assistant Chief Executive role was debated. Some members considered that more information, particularly around targets for growth and savings, was required before a decision could be made on whether to proceed with the creation of the post. It was however asserted that the role was going to manage various key areas with their own savings, growth and performance targets. It was also the belief of the administration that additional strategic capacity was required in order to deliver a demanding workload in the coming years.

Separate named votes were requested on each part of the officer's recommendation.

Proposed motion (i)

That the Medium Term Financial Strategy be recommended to Council for approval.

For the motion (10)

Councillors T. Gracey, Howorth, Cressy, Gillham, J. Gracey, Prescott, Mullens, Nuti, D. Whyte and Willingale.

Against the motion (1)

Councillor R. King.

A named vote was requested, with the voting noted as follows:

For the motion (10)

Councillors T Gracey, Cressy, Cunningham, Gillham, J Gracey, Heath, Nuti, Willingale, Wilson and D Whyte.

Against the motion (1)

Councillor R King.

Abstentions (1)

Councillor Mullens.

Motion (i) was passed.

Proposed motion (ii)

That the following be approved:

(a) the creation of an additional Assistant Chief Executive post, with an annual budget of £150,000 including on-costs, be included in the updated Medium Term Financial Strategy.

(b) a supplementary estimate of £20,000 in 2022/23 for associated recruitment costs for the additional Assistant Chief Executive post.

For the motion (7)

Councillors T. Gracey, Howorth, Cressy, J. Gracey, Prescott, Nuti, and Willingale.

Against the motion (4)

Councillors Gillham, R. King, Mullens and D. Whyte.

Abstentions (0)

Motion (ii) was passed.

c) 2023/24 Treasury Management Strategy - recommendation from the Corporate Management Committee

The report and appendices associated with this recommendation were circulated to all members with the agenda for the meeting of the Corporate Management Committee and are available on the website.

The proposed key changes were highlighted to the committee. Many of the proposed changes had become necessary because of the requirements of the new Treasury Management and Prudential Codes, which included two new Prudential Indicators. It was also necessary to increase the investment counterparty limits as increased balances caused by the setting aside of MRP had made finding homes for the Council's investments difficult. It was noted that the reference to the "Monetary Policy Committee" being a government body in appendix A should be amended to state that it was a "Committee of the Bank of England".

A named vote was requested, with the voting noted as follows:

For the motion (10)

Councillors T Gracey, Cressy, Cunningham, Gillham, J Gracey, Heath, Nuti, Willingale, Wilson and D Whyte.

Against the motion (1)

Councillor R King.

Abstentions (1)

Councillor Mullens.

It was **resolved** that the following be recommended for approval by Council on 9 February 2023:

- 1) The proposed 2023/24 Treasury Management Strategy, encompassing the Annual Investment Strategy as set out in the officer's report;
- 2) the Prudential and Treasury Management Indicators for 2023/24, as set out in the report;
- 3) the revised Treasury Management Policy Statement and Treasury Management Practices, as set out in the appendices to the officer's report;
- 4) the authorised limit for external borrowing by the Council in 2023/24 of £700,613,000 (this being the statutory limit determined under Section 3 (1) of the Local Government Act 2003); and
- 5) the Council's MRP statement for 2023/24 remain 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".

d) Capital and Investment Strategy and Capital Programme 2023/24 to 2026/27 - recommendation from the Corporate Management Committee

The report and appendices associated with this recommendation were circulated to all members with the agenda for the meeting of the Corporate Management Committee and are available on the website.

The challenging financial circumstances under which the Capital and Investment Strategy and Capital Programme 2023/24 to 2026/27 had been prepared were highlighted. The strategy and proposed capital projects would potentially require further consideration in light of the potential of delays in capital receipt generation and any changes resulting from the upcoming levelling up bill. The revenue impact of capital projects also required careful consideration.

It was stated that the administration wished to continue its aspirational capital programmes, but could only do so after careful consideration of each proposal. Consequently, it was felt that some discretionary projects, such as the streaming of committee meetings, had to be postponed until it was affordable to pursue them, or affordable alternatives had been identified by the Communications Working Group.

A named vote was requested, with the voting noted as follows:

For the motion (8)

Councillors T Gracey, Cressy, Cunningham, J Gracey, Heath, Nuti, Willingale and Wilson.

Against the motion (4)

Councillors Gillham, R King, Mullens and D Whyte.

Abstentions (0)

It was **resolved** that the following be recommended for approval at Council on 9 February 2023:

- 1) the Capital Strategy at Appendix 'A' and the Capital Programme at Exempt Appendix 'B'; and
- 2) that useable capital receipts be maintained at a level of £2 million.

e) **2023/24 Budget and Council Tax - recommendation from the Corporate Management Committee**

In accordance with The Local Authorities Standing Orders (England) (Amendment) Regulations 2014, a named vote must be taken on this item.

The report and appendices associated with this recommendation were circulated to all members with the agenda for the meeting of the Corporate Management Committee and are available on the website.

The proposed budget had been prepared following consideration of various documents at previous meetings of the committee, such as the Medium Term Financial Strategy. Some of the proposed expenditure, such as various surveys, would dictate the potential need for further expenditure (both revenue and capital) but would also enable project phasing to be undertaken in a managed way.

A significant budget deficit had been forecasted in the medium term. The projected deficit did not include unforeseen expenditure that would be considered as in-year supplementary estimates, nor any growth in future years. Due to the challenging financial circumstances expected in the coming years, an increase to the General Fund working balance (from £3 million to £5 million) was proposed.

The committee noted the comprehensive nature of the statutory Section 151 Officer's statement.

It was felt by some that there were omissions in the budget, in particular for the most deprived residents impacted by the cost of housing in the borough, and those with long term health needs. It was also suggested that more needed to be done to generate income from trade waste.

The outcome of discussions with staff representatives about the annual pay settlement was awaited. There were further discussions about the utilisation of officer expertise and available bandwidth to delivery projects.

Questions were asked about the progress being made on the Council's climate change strategy. A revised action plan, for future review by members, was being developed by officers. Due to the comprehensiveness of the action plan, significant engagement across council departments was required before the review could be completed.

A named vote was requested, with the voting noted as follows:

For the motion (8)

Councillors T Gracey, Cressy, Cunningham, J Gracey, Heath, Nuti, Willingale and Wilson.

Against the motion (4)

Councillors Gillham, R King, Mullens and D Whyte.

Abstentions (0)

It was **resolved** that:

1) The following be recommended for approval by Council on 9 February 2023:

- a) the Revised Budget for 2022/23 and Budget Estimates for 2023/24, including growth items, as set out in the report and at Appendices B, C and E;
- b) an increase to the Band D Council Tax level of 2.99% (£5.37) from £179.55 to £185.92;
- c) the revised minimum threshold for the General Fund Working Balance of £5m; and
- d) transfers to and from Reserves as set out in the report.

2) The following be noted:

- a) The updated Medium-Term Financial Forecast at Appendix A.
- b) The statement of the Chief Financial Officer at Appendix F.

f) Englefield Green Committee - position of Chairman - recommendation from the Englefield Green Committee

The report and appendices associated with this recommendation were circulated to all members with the agenda for the meeting of the Corporate Management Committee and are available on the website.

In accordance with the Council's Constitution, under Standing Orders provisions a Special meeting was convened.

The Committee discussed recent agreed actions relating to Englefield Green and the role of the Chairman in progressing these actions.

After a comprehensive debate a vote was made in relation to the proposed motions.

Resolved that:

The Membership of Englefield Green Committee did not have confidence in the Chairman and a recommendation should be made to Full Council that the Chairman should be removed from his role and replaced by a new Member of the current Englefield Green Committee for the remainder of this municipal year

10. Notices of Motion from Members of the Council under Standing Order 15

Motion a)

From Councillor Robert King.

This motion is being proposed and seconded by the Labour and Co-operative parties because we still believe that tax enables the country to provide services from education, health and social care, to flood defences, roads, policing and defence. It also continues to help to counter financial inequalities and rebalance distorted economies. It is something we should all be proud to pay. The Fair Tax Mark is a great initiative to support those organisations that want to do the right thing and ensure we have an ethically sound economy.

It is also important that in all aspects of public life taxes are paid fairly, justly and the penalties for non-payment are enforced equally. No matter how powerful an individual or company, everyone should be equal before the law. Where they break the law they should be punished equally as any other citizen for breaking the same laws and that this even applies to members of HM government.

This council notes that:

- Corporate tax evasion and avoidance continue to have a damaging impact on the world's poorest countries, to such a level that it is costing them far more than they receive in aid.
- Even for wealthy countries it is a significant concern, for example it is costing the UK as much as £32bn a year HMRC estimated in 2021
- This practice also has a negative effect on small and medium-sized companies who pay more tax proportionately, and consequentially impacts our local high streets
- The UK Government has taken some steps to tackle the issue of tax avoidance and evasion by issuing Procurement Policy Note 03/14, which applies to all central government contracts worth more than £5m
- RBC has implemented procurement processes that align to PPN 03/14
- Polling from the Institute for Business Ethics finds that "corporate tax avoidance" has, since 2013, been the clear number one concern of the British public when it comes to business conduct.
- Almost two-thirds (63%) of the public agree that the Government and local councils should consider a company's ethics and how they pay their tax as well as value for money and quality of service provided, when undertaking procurement.
- Between 2017-19 Around 17.5% of public contracts in the UK have been won by companies with links to tax havens. with a combined value of £37.5bn
- The Fair Tax Mark certification scheme was launched in February 2014 and seeks to encourage and recognise organisations that pay the right amount of corporation tax at the right time and in the right place. It's the only scheme of its kind in the UK bridging the gap between corporate responsibility and the wider tax justice movement.
- The Fair Tax Mark offers a means for business to demonstrate good tax conduct, and has been secured by organisations with a combined annual income of £50bn and more than 6,500 outlets and premises, including many social enterprises and co-operatives.

This council believes that:

- Paying tax is often presented as a burden, but it shouldn't be.
- Tax enables us to provide services from education, health and social care, to flood defence, roads, policing and defence. It also helps to counter financial

- inequalities and rebalance distorted economies.
- As recipients of public funding, local authorities should take the lead in the promotion of exemplary tax conduct; be that by ensuring contractors are paying their proper share of tax, or by refusing to go along with offshore tax dodging when buying land and property.
- Where substantive stakes are held in private enterprises, then influence should be wielded to ensure that such businesses are exemplars of tax transparency and tax avoidance is shunned - e.g., no use of marketed schemes requiring disclosure under DOTAS regulations (Disclosure Of Tax Avoidance Schemes) or arrangements that might fall foul of the General Anti-Abuse Rule.
- UK cities, counties, Boroughs and Districts can and should stand up for responsible tax conduct - doing what they can within existing frameworks and pledging to do more given the opportunity, as active supporters of international tax justice.

Therefore this council resolves:

That the Corporate Management Committee form a report and recommendation for Full Council before the end of the municipal year which considers the following plan of action as recommended by the Fair Tax Mark organisation:

1. Approve the [Councils for Fair Tax Declaration](#):
 - 1.1. Lead by example and demonstrate good practice in our tax conduct, right across our activities.
 - 1.1.1. Not use offshore vehicles for the purchase of land and property, especially where this leads to reduced payments of stamp duty.
 - 1.1.2. Undertake due diligence to ensure that not-for-profit structures are not being used inappropriately as an artificial device to reduce the payment of tax and business rates.
 - 1.1.3. Demand clarity on the ultimate beneficial ownership of suppliers and their consolidated profit & loss position.
 - 1.2. Promote Fair Tax Mark certification for any business in which we have a significant stake and where corporation tax is due.
 - 1.3. Support Fair Tax Week events in the area, and celebrate the tax contribution made by responsible businesses who say what they pay with pride.
 - 1.4. Support calls for urgent reform of UK law to enable local authorities to better penalise poor tax conduct and reward good tax conduct through their procurement policies.
2. In addition to the actions recommended by the Fair Tax Mark the report should also explore the following:
 - 2.1. Use the Social Value Act to integrate tax status further into our procurement process.
 - 2.1.1. The Fair Tax Mark would be used as positive evidence of social value above the PPN 03/14 standard.
 - 2.2. Work with Runnymede businesses to encourage the use of the Fair Tax Mark
 - 2.3. Go further than the declaration to ensure all council owned businesses are Fair Tax accredited and the council itself is as close to accreditation as is possible as a public sector organisation.
 - 2.4. Encourage other public sector bodies to adopt a similar approach.
 - 2.5. Council asks the officers to publicise this policy and to report on its implementation annually as part of the budget.

Motion b)

From Councillor Rhys Davies.

This Council notes:

1. The unilateral decision by Surrey County Council to return devolved on-street parking enforcement back to County control.
2. That these services were previously provided by Runnymede Borough Council, along with other districts and boroughs, and could be highly responsive to the needs of residents and the concerns of Councillors, where they were fully resourced.
3. Where streets faced parking overspill or parking stress, Councillors and residents are able to apply for a resident parking permit (RPP) scheme to ensure a level of specific control over the area or street considered.
4. That in Runnymede 7 such schemes are presently in place in the following streets:
 - Burn Close
 - The Hythe
 - Hythe Road
 - Cumberland Street
 - Railway Terrace
 - Thorpe Road
 - Wick Road
5. That the current permit charge is £80 for first permit issued to a household, £100 for second permit issued to a household and £130 for three or more permits issued to a household.
6. That the revenue derived by these permits had previously gone into expanding the enforcement team in Runnymede and ensured residents had a better opportunity to park outside their own home and that parking safety was enhanced.
7. That the unilateral decision by Surrey County Council has had a detrimental impact to this Borough's ability to enforce these permits and generally maintain the same level of staffing in our parking team.
8. That residents in Egham Hythe, Englefield Green West and Addlestone North where RPPs are in force are now paying the same price for a permit and a service which is less valuable than it was last year, with lower enforcement ability.

The Council resolves:

That the Leader write a letter to the Leader of Surrey County Council to make the following points, with group leaders who are agreement with the sentiments raised, invited to co-sign it:

1. That this Council once again reiterates that it believes it is the wrong decision to return those devolved on street enforcement powers back to the County Council.
2. That we request a revised and published timetable for completion and role out of the new service provided by Surrey County Council and that it be shared with this Council and our residents.
3. That we reiterate this Council's wish for all new and transferred staff to be employed with a local remit and base, to ensure their local knowledge is not lost in the new service.
4. That Borough and District Councils in Surrey should be provided with a compensation fund from Surrey County Council, so funds can be distributed equally to all permit holders, given they have been receiving a worse service than they applied for because of the actions by Surrey County Council.
5. That the Leader of Surrey County Council is asked to confirm that in future, in the spirit of providing good and efficient public services regardless of who

provides them, no future unilateral decisions will be taken without consulting districts and boroughs where their services or roles will be directly affected.

11. **Minority Group Priority Business**

No minority group priority business has been registered under Standing Order 23.

12. **Press and Public to be Excluded by Resolution**

To consider any items so resolved at the meeting.

Runnymede Borough Council**Full Council****Thursday, 8 December 2022 at 7.30 pm**

Members of the Council present: Councillors M Harnden (Mayor), S Saise-Marshall (Deputy Mayor), A Balkan, A Berardi, R Bromley, T Burton, D Cotty, V Cunningham, M Darby, R Davies, S Dennett, E Gill, L Gillham, J Gracey, T Gracey, M Heath, C Howorth, J Hulley, S Jenkins, A King, R King, S Lewis, C Mann, I Mullens, M Nuti, J Olorenshaw, N Prescott, S Ringham, S Walsh, S Whyte, S Williams and M Willingale.

Members of the Council absent: Councillors J Broadhead, D Clarke, D Coen, M Cressey, J Furey, N King, P Snow, D Whyte and J Wilson.

382 Mayor's Announcements

The Mayor provided an update on the events and engagements that she had attended since the last Council. Councillors were wished a happy and restful Christmas and New Year.

383 Minutes

The Minutes of the meeting of the Council held on 20 October 2022 were confirmed and signed as a correct record, subject to amending motion 4 on item 298 (keeping Runnymede and Surrey frack free) to include the outcome of the vote i.e. "The motion was lost".

384 Apologies for Absence

Apologies were received from Councillors J. Broadhead, D. Clarke, D. Coen, M. Cressy, J. Furey, N. King, D. Whyte and J. Wilson.

385 Declarations of Interest

There were none.

386 Speaking or Questions from Members of the Public under Standing Order 12

a) Aileen Owen Davies, a local resident, asked the following question:

"Tree planting and increasing vegetation is now being undertaken around the country. Surrey has just committed to 57,500 new trees this year.

What policies and targets has Runnymede committed to?"

The Leader of the Council replied in the following terms:

"Runnymede Borough Council has now approved its Corporate Plan. A central element of that is our Climate Change Strategy. In line with that strategy, our Environment and Sustainability Committee has now approved our Sustainable Planting Policy, with all future planting to be in line with the principles set out within that policy.

These principles include amongst others:

1. Planting to be planned to encourage biodiversity and support for native wildlife;
2. Maximising the use of native species with near native species being used to lengthen the flowering season, and;
3. The re-naturalisation and development of wildflower meadows where appropriate.

In respect of targets for planting, we have not yet adopted any target and that is deliberate. I believe that centrally imposed targets are an inefficient mechanism for delivering the outcomes we need and want locally. Look at central targets for Housing to see how well they work.

Instead, as a stated part of our policy, we look to encourage and support local community initiatives, including those of residents' groups and businesses who wish to participate within their local communities. As an example, I have supported residents with tree planting on public land at two locations within Woodham and Row Town over this last planting season. I am aware of similar work by numerous other councillors as well.

To help local initiatives we will, subject to approval of the budget, be undertaking a survey of all our trees starting in 2023. We estimate that there are 35,000 trees in Runnymede, many of which are in good condition. Some will however need support or removal to ensure the safety of residents and visitors to the borough. Where trees have to be removed we plan to reinstate at alternative suitable locations. Once this work is completed we will know how many trees we have and how much land we have available for further planting and we will look to develop a separate tree strategy in line with the planting principles I mentioned earlier."

Aileen Owen Davies asked, as a supplementary question, whether there would be targets for replacing lost trees. The Leader reiterated his earlier comments about target setting, adding that a tree survey needed to be carried out before policy development on the replacement of lost trees took place.

b) Deb Long, a local resident, asked the following question:

"An integral part of the Council's Climate Change strategy is to convene a Citizens Panel to regularly consult with stakeholders to exchange updates on the community and councils actions and initiatives also to track the Council's progress to its Net Zero 2030 target and Runnymede's progress towards the national target of Net Zero 2050. When will this Citizen Panel be established and what is the process for participant selection?"

The Leader of the Council replied in the following terms:

"The Citizens' Panel is referenced in the Climate Change Strategy but it falls under our broader strategy to empower communities and support the work of the Council across all of our operating areas, including Climate Change.

Our intent is to recruit up to 900 residents who will be representative of the population as a whole by age, gender, ethnicity and location so that all parts of the borough (and all communities) are represented.

I would note that it is not a forum for exchanging information and views on climate change issues.

Other local authorities already operate such panels but this is a new initiative for Runnymede. To get it off the ground we need two things. Seed funding to begin to recruit and develop the panel and clear terms of reference to set out how the panel will be established and manage its work going forward.

In respect of the former we, submitted a bid for funding to the UK Shared Prosperity Fund which included funding to initiate the Citizens Panel and in respect of the latter, officers are currently developing a report which will be coming forward in the New Year.”

Aileen Owen Davies asked, as a supplementary question, why constituting the Citizens’ Panel had taken a long time. The Leader said that developing such proposals rightly took time to do successfully and that the proposals had been agreed by Council on 20 October 2022.

387 **Petitions**

There were none.

388 **Questions from Members of the Council under Standing Order 13**

a) Councillor Carl Mann asked the Leader of the Council the following question:

“Can we please have an update on the A320 Ottershaw roundabout and whether the HIF money is protected?”

The Leader responded in the following terms:

“With regard to the planning application for the A320 (RU.21/2018), reviewed on Wednesday 27 July 2022, Surrey County Council’s Planning and Regulatory Committee resolved:

That, subject to referral to the Secretary of State under paragraph 10 of the Town and Country Planning (Consultation) (England) Direction 2021, and in the absence of any direction by the Secretary of State, to PERMIT subject to amended conditions and informatives agreed by the Chairman and Vice-Chairman and within these minutes, and the remaining unamended conditions and informatives set out within the report and update sheet.

I can confirm that, on 7 December 2022, we received an update stating that the Secretary of State will not be calling in the decision. This means that the scheme can go ahead in the New Year.

There will be a further round of public consultation held looking at landscaping, hardstanding and traffic management plans, with the outcome of this consultation informing the final conditions.

With regard to the Housing Infrastructure Fund, a general development agreement was signed by Surrey County Council and Homes England, with a side agreement signed by Surrey County Council and Runnymede Borough Council. The contents of the general development agreement are subject to a non-disclosure agreement.”

Councillor Hulley asked whether members for Ottershaw should be thanked for their work on this matter? The Leader agreed that they should.

b) Councillor Sylvia Whyte asked the Leader of the Council the following question:

“Following the death of 2 year old Awaab Ishak, caused by mould in the family’s flat in Rochdale, the social housing regulator has ordered all landlords with more than 1,000 homes to report their most recent assessment of the extent of damp and mould hazards, the action they are taking to remedy them and to detail the process they have to identify

and deal promptly with damp and mould cases, when they are raised by tenants. Can the leader of the Council assure me that Runnymede Borough Council's housing stock is inspected regularly to ensure that tragedies like this will never happen in Runnymede?"

The Leader responded in the following terms:

"The death of Awaab Ishak is a tragedy.

As a landlord we take our responsibilities very seriously, and I wish to assure members and residents that we do have robust processes in place to address issues that arise within our properties, including problems with mould or damp.

In 2019 we commissioned a full stock condition survey on all our housing to ensure that we have comprehensive data on the condition of our properties. This is kept up to date by visiting at least 10% of our properties annually.

We also have contracts in place to ensure that resource is available to address issues if and when they arise. It is of course not possible to prevent issues occurring all of the time. As many property owners will attest to, leaks do happen and are not always immediately identifiable. However once a problem is identified we will work with tenants to resolve them quickly.

Close co-operation with our tenants is vital to achieve resolutions to issues. Runnymede's housing department is therefore investing in better systems and processes to further improve tenant engagement. Our new integrated systems mean residents will be able to report issues directly via the housing portal and see all information regarding their property and tenancy, including issues of repair and maintenance. This will avoid the need to raise issues with a third party, making the process for reporting issues quicker and easier for tenants.

To support this process Runnymede Borough Council visit or engage with all our properties annually in the course of our housing management functions and seek to proactively identify any concerns within our properties. We also undertake targeted tenancy audits focused on tenants who engage with us less proactively.

Our tenancy agreement places some obligations on our tenants. They "must tell us when a repair that is our responsibility needs to be done as soon as possible". In relation to mould and damp, tenants must also adequately ventilate properties – bathrooms in particular can develop mould and mildew if this does not happen.

Where incidents of mould or damp are reported we take an active approach by visiting the property to inspect the issue, provide advice and carry out remedial works where required. In serious cases tenants can be moved to temporary accommodation while this work is carried out.

The housing department is also committed to continuous development. Processes are regularly reviewed to ensure that they are enabling the best possible service, with updates to processes made when needed. Following the tragic death of Awaab Ishak the Chair of Housing Committee raised this issue with the Corporate Head of Housing, and officers have already been reviewing our processes. Officers have identified areas of possible improvement to enable swifter access to properties when an issue arises, and this will be taken through Housing Committee in line with due process."

Councillor Whyte asked whether the Council had any authority over housing associations operating within the borough. The Leader stated that whilst there was no authority over other housing providers, the Council was happy to share good practice with them.

Councillor Mullens asked whether private sector landlords could also benefit from the Council's willingness to share good practice. The Leader said that the Council was able to share good practice with private sector landlords.

Councillor J. Gracey sought to confirm whether there were any other arrangements in place to govern large scale landlords. It was reported that this was the responsibility of the Regulator of Social Housing.

c) Councillor Isabel Mullens asked the Leader of the Council the following question:

"Given that the original Climate Change Strategy approved by the Corporate Management Committee in April of this year included an Action Plan, and in order to give transparency to the council's actions and plans for carbon emission reductions, could the Leader of the Council ensure that this Climate Change Action Plan, or an up to date version of it, be published on the RBC website with high visibility alongside the council's Climate Change Strategy, as a matter of urgency?"

The Leader responded in the following terms:

"Further to the discussion in relation to the Corporate Plan at our last Council the climate change action plan, alongside the action plans for the other strategies within the Corporate Plan is currently being reviewed and refreshed to establish the prioritisation of actions which we will be delivering. In respect of the climate change action plan, a report setting out the recommended prioritisation will be prepared for the Corporate Management Committee in the New Year and published once agreed.

I would add that I intend for periodic reporting against our Corporate Plan actions to be a feature of the committee work plans going forward, in order to support the monitoring and scrutiny of our progress. This reporting, subject to any exemptions applying, will be made publicly available"

Councillor Mullens asked whether the Leader was aware that only Runnymede and one other Surrey district/borough did not currently publish their climate change action plans? The Leader stated that he was not aware of this.

Councillor Jenkins asked whether thought should be given to how the Council promoted the efforts it was making in tackling climate change. The Leader agreed with this suggestion.

d) Councillor Rhys Davies asked the Leader of the Council the following question:

"Is the Leader aware of the chronic delays this Council's housing department is facing in assessing medical and disability submissions forms from residents applying to our housing register, does he think waiting months for these forms to be reviewed and a decision taken is acceptable?"

The Leader replied in the following terms:

"It is unusual for an assessment not to be carried out within the 28 day target. These are submitted to an external organisation and require submission of a form and relevant supporting information.

Unfortunately it can take weeks or months between applicants raising issues of medical need to the submission of relevant data. This can be due to residents not knowing the right information to provide, or delays in obtaining relevant evidence from medical providers. The housing department are available to provide advice to tenants throughout this process.

Once a medical assessment is completed and an applicant is awarded priority, this is dated at the point that their medical information was submitted, so any delay in the assessment by the Council, or its third party assessors, is not reflected in their priority date.

All applications are screened and priority is always given to those that are urgent to ensure that no applicant will miss a rehousing opportunity due to a delay in the assessment.

While to date no concerns have been raised with myself or the Chair of the Housing Committee regarding systemic issues or delays in this service, if Councillors have evidence or concerns over this or any other aspect of the services we run, I would urge them to raise this with myself or the relevant committee chair.”

Councillor Davies asked whether it was possible to shorten the process? The Leader said that there were unavoidable constraints when information was required from third parties. The housing team would however continue to work as efficiently as possible.

Councillor R. King asked whether the Leader was aware of a particular case that was ongoing? The Leader stated that it was not appropriate to discuss specific cases in an open forum and offered to speak with Councillor King separately.

Councillor J. Gracey asked whether the Leader would be happy to involve the Chair of the Housing Committee in these discussions. The Leader confirmed that this should happen.

e) Councillor Robert King asked the Leader of the Council the following question:

“Is the Leader aware that hundreds of residents, already struggling to get a GP appointment, have had a further blow with numerous GP practices in recent months withdrawing online app services, such as Livi, making it nearly impossible to get even a telephone or online appointment. What is Runnymede doing to lobby GP practices and Surrey Heartlands to reintroduce such services?”

The Leader replied in the following terms:

“We have sought clarity on this matter with the North West Surrey Health Alliance (NWSHA). Whilst NWSHA was ahead of the curve, before the pandemic when the original Livi contract was agreed, in terms of digital GP appointments etc, the pandemic created a demand for such services, across the Country. This necessitated Livi growing with the market and as a result, impacted their offer and cost. Consequently, NWSHA decided not to renew the contract with Livi, but to invest some of this funding into more face-to-face appointments, as well as in a new digital offer in the future.

Regarding the need to lobby, given that NHS partners already recognise the challenge across the system of meeting the demand for services via digital platforms, lobbying isn’t required. The Council is a partner member of the NWSHA and therefore does have the opportunity to ask questions of partners on matters such as these. Given that this is a workstream already in development, the Council will continue to support the work of the NWSHA, as opposed to directly lobbying for specific services.

I can confirm that the place leader for the NWSHA had agreed to supply a written briefing on the situation surrounding Livi and digital appointments. The initial briefing has now been provided and will be circulated to all members following this meeting.

The key changes being introduced in NWSHA, in response to patient feedback, are:

- Providing more face-to-face appointments in the evenings and at weekends through acute illness hubs, based at Ashford Hospital, St Peter’s Hospital and Woking Community Hospital. These appointments are available now and can be booked

via the patient's GP surgery (there is no walk-in facility for this service).

- Introducing a new service called Rapid Health that allows patients to directly book and manage their own appointments for a range of different practice services. In early 2023 Rapid Health will enable patients to initiate their own care for services such as first contact physiotherapy, immunisations, and cervical smears.

Whilst the Livi contract was due to end in November, its availability has been extended until March 2023 so that patients can continue to benefit from free video GP consultation services while the wider changes to accessing primary care services are embedded."

Councillor R. King asked whether there was more that the administration could do to support residents. The Leader said that Runnymede was not responsible for health services. It was however working with local health providers to develop partnership hubs in various locations, the first of which was intended to be situated in Egham Hythe.

Councillor Darby asked whether the Leader was aware of wider trends in NHS waiting times? The Leader stated that waiting times in all nations of the United Kingdom had gone up, principally due to the pandemic, and that this was not a party political matter.

Councillor Gillham asked whether there was anything that the Council could do to address the significant waiting time differences at various surgeries within the borough. The Leader urged Councillor Gillham to direct her concerns to NWSHA.

f) Councillor Abby King asked the Leader of the Council the following question:

"What is the Council doing to enhance street cleaning in Runnymede and is the Leader exploring a timetabling of streets, in collaboration with Surrey Highways after they carry out gully cleaning?"

The Leader replied in the following terms:

"Many councillors would sympathise with your remarks. As you will be aware, gullies and issues relating to blockages/flooding are the responsibility of Surrey County Council and their contractors. The frequency of these visits is therefore not something that we can adjust as part of our street cleaning operations. Surrey County Council have also taken the decision to bring additional services previously delivered by boroughs and districts back 'in-house'. Verge cutting and highways maintenance are some of the areas affected by this change in approach.

Within what we can control however, we are a learning organisation and our depot team is constantly looking at how it can enhance and optimise its operations. It will therefore continue to do this by working collaboratively for with Surrey County Council to deliver the best outcomes for our residents."

Councillor Gillham asked whether the Leader was aware of the discussions at a recent working group meeting around adjusting the Council's street cleaning rotas, and Runnymede's own services responding accordingly. The Leader said that a collaborative approach between senior managers at Surrey and Runnymede was taking place and would continue to do so.

389 **Recommendations from Committees**

389a Council Tax Support Scheme**Resolved that:**

The preferred option for a revised Runnymede Council Tax Support scheme, as set out in the report considered by the Corporate Management Committee on 24 November 2022, be adopted for implementation from 1 April 2023.

390 Notices of Motion from Members of the Council under Standing Order 15

The motion, as set out in the summons, was moved by Councillor R. King, subject to a referral being made to the Environment and Sustainability Committee.

The motion was seconded by Councillor Berardi.

The motion was debated by the Council.

A named vote was requested on the motion and the voting was as follows:

For the motion (12)

Councillors Berardi, Burton, Davies, Gill, Gillham, Jenkins, A. King, R. King, Mullens, Ringham, S. Whyte and Williams.

Against the motion (18)

Councillors Saise-Marshall, Balkan, Bromley, Cotty, Cunningham, Darby, Dennett, J. Gracey, T. Gracey, Heath, Howorth, Hulley, Lewis, Nuti, Olorenshaw, Prescott, Walsh and Willingale.

Abstentions (2)

Councillors Harnden and Mann.

The motion was lost.

391 Minority Group Priority Business

There was none.

(The meeting ended at 8.39 pm.)

Chairman

**Council Tax Resolution and Council Tax Setting Committee
(Councillor T Gracey, Leader of the Council and Chairman of the Corporate
Management Committee)**

Synopsis of report:

Following consideration of its own budget, the Council is required by statute to formally set the level of Council Tax to be levied in Runnymede Borough on behalf of itself and its preceptors (Surrey County Council and the Police and Crime Commissioner for Surrey). Appendix A sets out the draft Council Tax Resolution subject to confirmation by the precepting bodies following their own tax setting meetings.

If this confirmation is not received ahead of Runnymede's full Council meeting, then the overall level of Council Tax cannot be formally determined. If this situation arises, it is proposed to delegate this function to a special Council Tax Setting Committee, in order to set the Council Tax for the year ahead within the necessary timelines.

Recommendations:

1) To approve the formal Council Tax Resolution as set out at Appendix A, (if the requisite notifications from preceptors have been received)

Or:

2) To approve the formation of a Council Tax Setting Committee as detailed in the report and at Appendix B, delegating final approval of the Council Tax Resolution to that Committee, once all precept notifications have been received

1. Context and background of report

- 1.1 Once the Council has considered and formally set its own budget and Council Tax requirement for the year ahead, it is required under the Local Government Finance Act 1992 to set the Council Tax for its area, including the amounts to be levied on behalf of its local precepting bodies (in Runnymede Borough Council's case, the other precepting bodies are Surrey County Council and the Police and Crime Commissioner for Surrey).
- 1.2 This is delivered via the Council Tax Resolution which provides the formal approval of the figures to be used for the billing of Council Tax for the coming year.
- 1.3 The Resolution simply brings together the Council Tax levels agreed by each body and does not affect the decisions made by each, including the Council, on the amount of tax to be levied.
- 1.4 The Council Tax must be set before 11th March in the financial year preceding the year to which the tax relates and cannot be set before the earlier of:
 - 1st March in the financial year preceding the year to which the tax relates

- The date of issue to the authority of the last precept from its major precepting authorities for the relevant year

2 Report and options considered

- 2.1 Appendix A sets out the Resolution, in its prescribed format, based on the proposed budget requirements of the Council and each preceptor. If the formal precept confirmation is received ahead of the full Council meeting on 9th February, the Resolution may be considered for approval, subject to any amendments to the Borough Council's budget that may be approved earlier in the meeting.
- 2.2 However, there is a risk that confirmation from preceptors will not be received in time. The County Council is considering its budget at a meeting of its Full Council on 7th February, with precept notices expected shortly thereafter. The Surrey Police and Crime Panel will meet to consider its precept on 3rd February, for approval by the PCC on 6th February and precept notices to follow thereafter. However, the Panel has a right of veto, which if exercised, means that the Panel will reconvene on the 17th February to consider a revised precept, for approval by the PCC on 20th February, with precept notice to follow. If such a veto is exercised, it is clear that the precept notice would not be issued in time for the Resolution to be made at Runnymede Borough Council's meeting of its full Council 9th February and therefore alternative arrangements need to be made to allow for this eventuality.
- 2.3 One option would be to defer the Resolution to the next full meeting of the Council, currently scheduled for 2nd March. However, this would not leave sufficient time for the annual billing process, including the printing of Council Tax demands and the provision of sufficient notice to residents ahead of the first direct debit runs for the year.
- 2.4 Bringing the full Council meeting forward is not recommended as an option due to its already close proximity to the Feb Council meeting and the need to allow for recommendations from February committee meetings to be considered, where necessary, in a suitable timescale.
- 2.5 While much of the budget setting process is a function of the full Council and cannot be delegated to a committee, the passing of the Council Tax Resolution is one function that may be exercised by a committee of the authority appointed by it for that purpose. The Council must determine the number of members of the committee, who must be members of the Council and not external appointments, and the term of office.
- 2.6 It is recommended that a special Council Tax Setting committee be set up to undertake this final piece of the tax setting process, should the precept notices not be received in time for the Council meeting on the 9th Feb. It is further proposed that the Membership consist of the members of the current Corporate Management Committee, with the meeting to take place immediately before or after the Corporate Management Committee meeting scheduled for the 23rd February. These members would be appointed to the special committee for a fixed term running to no later than the 11 March, which is the final date for setting of the Council Tax. Draft terms of reference for the special committee are set out at Appendix B.
- 2.7 This proposal relates only to the tax setting for the financial year 2023/24. The necessity for any on-going contingency arrangements could be considered by the Constitution Working Group and presented to Council for consideration ahead of the following year's tax setting process.

3 Policy framework implications

- 3.1 The approval of the Council Tax Resolution is key element of the statutory framework for setting the Council Tax in Runnymede. It flows out of the decisions taken under the budget policy framework of the Council, and that of the other major precepting bodies. While the policy framework, including the Council's budget proposals, are required to be considered by full Council, the passing of the Resolution is allowed, under statute, to be delegated to a committee as set out in the body of the report.

4 Resource implications/Value for Money

- 4.1 The Council's budget sets out the resources required to deliver its objectives for the year ahead, including its Council Tax requirement, which drive the figures in the Resolution relating to Runnymede Borough Council. There are no additional resource implications contained in the report, other than an additional meeting, which is being held on the same evening as a scheduled meeting, to reduce the draw on Member and officer time.

5 Legal Implications

- 5.1 Under the Local Government Finance Act 1992 (the 1992 Act), the Council is required to determine the level of Council Tax for the Borough for 2023/24 by 11 March 2023. The 1992 Act prescribes the calculations to be set out in the Resolution while s67 of the 1992 Act allows for the Resolution to be determined by a committee of the Council following confirmation of the precepts.

6 Equality Implications

- 6.1 There are no equality implications of this report.

7 Environmental, Sustainability, Bio-diversity implications

- 7.1 The proposal that the Council Tax Setting Committee be constituted from the membership of the Corporate Management Committee and meet on the same date as an existing meeting, reduces the potential for additional environmental impacts from holding a separate meeting by reducing travel requirements.

8 Conclusions

- 8.1 Appendix A of this report sets out the draft Council Tax Resolution for 2023/24, including the Council Tax base for the Borough and the gross income and expenditure, Council Tax Requirement and Band D Council Tax level for Runnymede, as set out in the preceding budget report. In addition, it sets out the Council Tax by valuation bands A – H for Runnymede Borough Council, Surrey County Council and Surrey Police and Crime Commissioner along with the total Council Tax due for each band, before any discounts or premiums are awarded. If the Council has received formal notification of the preceptors' Council Tax amounts by the time of the meeting, then the Resolution can be considered, as set out in Recommendation 1.
- 8.2 Recommendation 2 sets out an alternative process to follow should the precept notifications not have been received in time for the meeting. This alternative will ensure that the formal setting of the Council Tax can take place within statutory

timescales and allow sufficient time for the testing and production of Council Tax demands, to meet requirements around notifications for Direct Debits, for example.

(To resolve)

COUNCIL TAX RESOLUTION 2023/24

Following consideration of its budget, the Council is required under Statute to make a formal resolution in respect of the amount of Council Tax to be levied in Runnymede Borough for the financial year commencing 1st April 2023.

The figures below have been calculated in accordance with regulations made under Sections 31B (3) and 34 (4) of the Local Government Finance Act 1992 (as amended) (“the Act”).

1. To note that the Corporate Management Committee at its meeting on 15th December 2022, calculated the Council Tax Base 2023/24 for the Council as 34,864.6 in accordance with Regulation 3 of the Local Authorities (Calculation of Council Tax Base) (England) Regulations 2012.
2. That the following amounts now be calculated for the year 2023/24 in accordance with Sections 31 to 36 of the Act:
 - (a) £99,020,426.00 being the aggregate of the amount which the Council estimates for the items set out in Section 31A (2) (a) to (f) of the Act;
 - (b) £92,573,264.17 being the aggregate of the amount which the Council estimates for the items set out in Section 31A (3) (a) to (d) of the Act;
 - (c) £6,447,161.83 being the amount by which the aggregate at 2(a) above exceeds the aggregate at 2(b) above, calculated by this Council in accordance with Section 31A (4) of the Act as its Council Tax requirement for the year.
 - (d) £184.92 being the amount at 2(c) above, divided by the Council Tax base (item 1 above), calculated by the Council, in accordance with Section 31B (1) of the Act, as the basic amount of its Council Tax for the year (including Parish precepts)
 - (e) £0.00 being the aggregate amount of all special items (Parish precepts) referred to in Section 34(1) of the Act
 - (f) £184.92 being the amount at 2(d) above less the result given by dividing the amount at 2(e) above by the Council Tax base, 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 special item (Parish precept) relates.
 - (g) That the following amounts be calculated for the year 2023/24 in accordance with Sections 31 to 36 of the Act.

Valuation Band	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H
	£	£	£	£	£	£	£	£
Runnymede Borough Council	123.28	143.83	164.37	184.92	226.01	267.11	308.20	369.84

Being the amounts given by multiplying the amount at 2(f) above by the number which, in the proportion set out in Section 5(1) of the Act, is applicable to dwellings listed in a 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.

3. To note for the year 2023/24 Surrey County Council and the Police and Crime Commissioner for Surrey have stated the following amounts in precepts issued to the Council, in accordance with Section 40 of the Act for each of the categories of dwelling in the Council's area as shown below:

Valuation Band	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H
	£	£	£	£	£	£	£	£
County Council	1,116.72	1,302.84	1,488.96	1,675.08	2,047.32	2,419.56	2,791.80	3,350.16
Police & Crime Commissioner	207.05	241.55	276.06	310.57	379.59	448.60	517.62	621.14

4. That, having calculated the aggregate in each case of the amounts in 2(g) and 3 above, the Council, in accordance with Sections 30 to 36 of the Act, hereby sets the amounts of Council Tax for the year 2023/24 for each of the categories of dwellings:

Valuation Band	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H
	£	£	£	£	£	£	£	£
Total Council Tax due	1,447.05	1,688.22	1,929.39	2,170.57	2,652.92	3,135.27	3,617.62	4,341.14

5. The Council has determined that its relevant basic amount of Council Tax for 2023/24 is not excessive in accordance with the principles approved under Section 52ZB of the Act.

As the billing authority, the Council has not been notified by a major precepting authority that its relevant basic amount of council tax for 2023/24 is excessive and therefore the billing authority is not required to hold a referendum in accordance with Section 52ZK of the Act.

6. The payment dates for the statutory ten monthly instalments scheme be set to run from 1 April 2023 to 1 January 2024.

The Council Tax (Administration and Enforcement) Regulations 1992 allow customers to opt out of the ten monthly instalment scheme and request payment over a 12-month period. Where this is requested, the Council authorises that the payment dates are to be on such a day in each month as is most efficient for administrative purposes.

Explanatory Note: The following narrative provides some additional explanation of the figures contained within the formal resolution at section 2.

2(a)	£99,020,426.00	This represents the gross expenditure of the Council
2(b)	£92,573,264.17	This represents the total income to the Council, including Government support and share of any Council Tax surplus from prior years
2(c)	£6,447,161.83	This represents the balance to be raised by Council Tax (including any Parish precepts)
2(d)	£184.92	This represents the average Band D Council Tax for the year (including any Parish precepts)
2(e)	£0.00	This represents the amount reappportioned to specific areas under special expenses or Parish precepts. There are no such charges for Runnymede Borough Council
2(f)	£184.92	This represents the average Band D Council Tax excluding the amounts covered by special expenses or Parish precepts. As there are no such charges in Runnymede, the Band D amount remains the same as in 2(d)

COUNCIL TAX SETTING COMMITTEE 2023/24 – TERMS OF REFERENCE

ROLE AND FUNCTIONS

The Council Tax Setting Committee is established under section 67 of the Local Government Finance Act 1992 (as amended) with the following role and functions:

1. To note the annual budget for 2023/24 for Runnymede Borough Council as approved by full Council,
2. To note the Council Tax base set by Runnymede Borough Council,
3. To note the amounts stated by Surrey County Council and the Police and Crime Commissioner for Surrey in precept notices issued to the Council, and
4. To agree the formal resolution for Runnymede's Council Tax, calculating the amounts required by statute as set out in the Local Government Finance Act 1992 (as amended), and setting the Council Tax for the year 2023/24.

MATTERS RESERVED FOR DECISION

The matters reserved for decision to this Committee are set out in the role and functions above.

TERM OF OFFICE

The term of office for the Committee shall be fixed at no later than 11 March 2023

MEMBERSHIP

Membership will be comprised of the Members of the Corporate Management and will be in accordance with the political balance of the Council.

Councillors: M Cressey, L Gillham, J Gracey, T Gracey (Chairman), M Heath, C Howorth (Vice-Chair), N King, R King, I Mullens, M Nuti, D Whyte and M Willingale