



31.01.24

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, 8 February 2024 at 7.30 pm. The meeting will be held at Council Chamber - Civic Centre.**

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Andrew Pritchard', written over a dotted grid background.

Andrew Pritchard
Chief Executive
01932 425500
Email: andrew.pritchard@runnymede.gov.uk

A G E N D A

1. **Mayor's Announcements**
2. **Minutes** 10 - 18

To confirm and sign, as a correct record, the minutes of the following meetings of the Council:

- 7 December 2023 (special meeting)
- 7 December 2023 (ordinary meeting)

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, speaking or questions from members of the public are 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**

a) Question from Councillor Peter Snow to the Leader of the Council

“My question is with regard to the bad press we recently received from the Surrey Advertiser on the 5 January. The article related to a warning by Suzanne Clarke from the DLUHC which referred to a "Best Value Notice". Can the Leader please confirm whether the article was factual or not and how we have addressed the concerns that are now being raised by all Runnymede residents since the article was published. Specially can the Leader clarify whether the less than ONE percentage is correct or the figure of 4.1 % is the actual figure as recorded?”

8. **Notification of receipt of non-statutory Best Value Notice**

19 - 24

The receipt of the non-statutory Best Value Notice was also reported to the [Corporate Management Committee on 18 January 2024](#) and the [Standards and Audit Committee on 23 January 2024](#).

9. **Recommendations from Committees**

a) **Chertsey Town Centre Street Licensing - recommendation from the Environment and Sustainability Committee**

The report associated with this item was circulated to all members with the [agenda for the 11 January 2024 Environment and Sustainability Committee](#).

The recommendation of the Committee is to follow.

b) **RIPA Policy Annual Review - recommendation from the Corporate Management Committee**

The report associated with this item was circulated to all members with the [agenda for the 18 January 2024 Corporate Management Committee](#).

The use of the Council's RIPA powers now had to be reported on annually. This opportunity had also been taken to refresh the Council's policy to ensure that it was compliant with the most recent guidance.

It was **resolved** that the Council be recommended to:

1. Note that the Council had not used its RIPA powers during the period 1 January 2023 to 31 December 2023 and further note that such powers had not been used since 2011.
2. Adopt the proposed revised policy to govern the use of RIPA powers for the period 9 February 2024 to 7 February 2025.

c) **Housing Revenue Account Estimates - recommendation from the Housing Committee**

The report associated with this item was circulated to all members with the [agenda for the 10 January 2024 Housing Committee](#).

The Corporate Head of Finance outlined the Housing Revenue Account estimates for 2024/25. He explained the variances in the current financial year could be attributed to the Parkside scheme, central heating, the Decent Homes programmes and changes in the contributions into the Major Repairs reserve. This had led to an additional cost of £117,000 in the current year. This meant that the estimated HRA balance at the end of the year was expected to be £35.6 million compared to the £23.6 million originally forecast. This would reduce the following year as the programmes caught up.

The major works programme for the following year would total £9.3 million and would include major upgrades to central heating, kitchens and bathrooms, roofing and various other works that were required to comply with the Decent Homes Standard. There would therefore be insufficient funds in the Major Repairs Reserve the following year, which would require a further transfer from the HRA balances.

The next section on debt charges and depreciation was noted, with the next repayment of HRA loans in 2027 forecast to be met from a combination of set aside receipts and HRA reserve. It was also proposed to transfer £30,000 of HRA funds to top up the Discretionary Housing Payment pot for which Secretary of State permission would be sought.

Proposed fees, charges and rent levels for the following year were discussed. The Regulator for Social Housing has confirmed that the maximum rent increase limit allowable would revert to CPI + 1%. CPI in September was 6.7% meaning the Council can increase rent by up to 7.7%. This would be applied from April 2024, and would also apply to rents for mobile home pitches and the services charges paid by the Council's Independent Retirement tenants. Rents paid for properties bought under the shared ownership scheme would be subject to a 5.8% increase based on the November RPI + 0.5%.

It was **resolved** that the following be recommended to the Full Council:

1. The draft revenue estimates for 2024/25 as set out in Appendix A be approved as submitted, and that the Full Council be requested to make provisions accordingly.

It was further **resolved** that the proposed changes in rents and charges (including those for Housing General Fund services) for 2024/25, as set out in pages 47-49 of the Estimates, be approved to be effective either from the first rent week of April 2024, or 1 April 2024 as appropriate.

d) **Review of Local Council Tax Discounts - recommendation from the Corporate Management Committee**

The report associated with this item was circulated to all members with the [agenda for the 14 December 2023 Corporate Management Committee](#).

The report was welcomed by Committee, some of whom expressed regret that it had not been forthcoming earlier. It was stressed that the approach

would entail a more compassionate and personalised approach to debt recovery, with more leeway for payment and additional support for care leavers, Ukrainian refugees and properties affected by flooding.

It was **resolved** that the following be recommended to the Council:

- 1) That with effect from 1 April 2024, the following discounts continue:
 - Care leavers
 - Ukrainian Refugees
 - Properties affected by flooding
- 2) That the Council Tax Discount for unoccupied and unfurnished dwellings be reduced from 100% for up to 3 months to 100% for up to 28 days (Class C of the Council Tax (Prescribed Classes of Dwellings) (England) (Amendment) Regulations 2012).
- 3) That with effect from 1 April 2025:
 - In accordance with Section 11B of the Local Government Finance Act 1992 and Rating (Property in Common Occupation) and Council Tax (Empty Dwellings) Act 2018, the additional amount payable for Council Tax be increased from 50% to 100% for dwellings that are unoccupied and substantially unfurnished for more than one year.
 - The additional amount of Council Tax to be increased from 50% to 200% for properties that are unoccupied and unfurnished for more than five years.
 - The additional amount of Council Tax be increased from 50% to 300% for properties that are unoccupied and unfurnished for more than ten years.

e) Medium Term Financial Strategy - recommendation from the Corporate Management Committee

The report associated with this item was circulated to all members with the [agenda for the 14 December 2023 Corporate Management Committee](#).

In picking out the salient points in the report, the Chief Executive highlighted that inflation pressures that resulted in a higher pay increase to staff last year were still in existence but revised figures gave confidence that a tapered reduction could now be put in place. However, it was stressed that the figure was the total budgeted figure from which the pay award would be funded and did not predetermine what that award would be. It also included work to change the salary banding in line with the national living wage coming into force in April 2024, however it was noted that this would be part of a broader review to decompress some of the grades and posts affected.

It was felt that the modest number of growth items were considered essential and unavoidable, whilst it was stressed that the c£1m taken out of the staffing budget was a technical accounting piece designed to ensure reconciliation between the HR and finance systems and was not the removal of any existing job posts. This would ensure that the council's resources were appropriately allocated.

A cautious approach had been taken to the savings identified, with only savings included that had a defined savings plan and were not subject to outside factors such as a democratic vote or contractual agreement.

The Leader confirmed to a member that webstreaming council meetings remained an aspirational growth item, but would be brought forward at the appropriate time to ensure it synchronises with work to the council chamber and ensures the best value for money.

A member highlighted that the report should be viewed in the wider context of the risk appetite recently agreed by full council, whilst another member felt that they could not support the MTFs, partly based on previous decisions on the Council's asset base, along with the perceived lack of security central government provides local government around rate reviews and funding settlements making it impossible for the council to provide the full range of services that residents require.

It was **resolved** that the Full Council be recommended to approve the Medium-Term Financial Strategy.

The Corporate Management Committee also **resolved** that:

1. The growth items as set out in Appendix 4 for approval and inclusion in the budget for 2024/25 be presented to the January Corporate Management Committee.
2. The Head of Paid Service (Chief Executive) be authorised to enter into pay negotiations with staff and Union representatives within the total provision set out in the report.

f) 24/25 Budget - recommendation from the Corporate Management Committee

25 - 28

The report associated with this item was circulated to all members with the [agenda for the 18 January 2024 Corporate Management Committee](#).

Following the meeting of the Corporate Management Committee, where clarification was sought on car parking income, further information is attached.

The draft budget for 2024/25 had been developed, following the agreement of the Medium Term Financial Strategy and Medium Term Financial Forecast at the previous Corporate Management Committee. The proposed budget also acknowledged other factors such as the Capital Strategy (considered as part of another agenda item at this meeting). The budget report sought to convey the scale of the financial challenges facing Runnymede Borough Council over the coming years, which could if left unaddressed, result in the expiration of the Council's balances during the 2028/29 financial year.

The main features of the budget were presented to the Committee. These features included the proposal to increase Council Tax by the maximum amount possible without needing to undertake a referendum, and the maintenance of a minimum level of reserves. Members' attention was drawn to the statutory statement of the Council's Chief Financial (s151) Officer, which provided commentary on the risks associated with the proposed budget.

The Committee discussed the proposals.

Some members felt that the proposed budget was pragmatic and made good progress towards addressing the budget deficit. It also maintained the Council's commitment to responding to climate change.

Some concern was expressed about the level of remuneration for staff, with particular reference to the recruitment and retention challenges being experienced by the Council. It was noted that the upcoming pay award would be subject to negotiations with the staff union.

It was stated that the car parking income discussed by the Environment and Sustainability Committee was not accurately reflected in the budget before the Committee. Officers agreed that the presentation of this element could be reviewed.

The inclusion of two years of growth for tree works was queried. It was noted that the growth covered additional works required while a full condition survey was being carried out, which would then inform the level of budget required in future years.

A query was raised about the report's commentary around the Council's assets, in particular the undesirability of disposing of them at a loss and the resultant impact on the Council's revenue budget in servicing the outstanding debt. The level of optimism around the performance of the Council in obtaining tenants for its assets was also questioned. It was noted that the Property and Assets Member Task Force was keeping the performance of the Council's assets under close review.

Clarification was provided around limiting the number of future growth items. Such items would only be considered if they were needed to support the delivery of an essential service or to fulfil the Council's strategic aims. The initial expectation was that internal savings would need to be identified and then transferred via a virement.

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

For the resolution (7)

Councillors Gracey, Howorth, Coen, Cressey, Nuti, Snow and Willingale.

Against the resolution (2)

Councillors R. King and Ringham.

Abstentions (3)

Councillors Gates, Gillham and D. Whyte.

It was **resolved** that the Council be recommended to agree:

1. The Revised Budget for 2023/24 and Budget Estimates for 2024/25, as set out in the officer's report and at Appendix D.
2. An increase to the Band D Council Tax level of 2.99% (£5.53) from £184.92 to £190.45.

3. The maintenance of the minimum threshold for the General Fund Working Balance at £5m.
4. The transfers to and from reserves as set out in the officer's report.

The following was **noted** by the Committee:

1. The updated Medium-Term Financial Forecast at Appendix A.
2. The statement of the Chief Financial Officer at Appendix E.

Note: An alternative budget proposal (attached) has been received in accordance with Standing Order 17.9. Please note that alternative budget proposals must be proposed, seconded and debated in accordance with Standing Order 17 (Rules Of Debate For Council Meetings).

g) Council Tax Resolution

To follow.

h) Treasury Management Strategy 2024/25 - recommendation from the Corporate Management Committee

The report associated with this item was circulated to all members with the [agenda for the 18 January 2024 Corporate Management Committee](#).

The proposed Strategy had been prepared with consideration given to a number of recent regulatory changes, as set out in the officer's report. These included the requirements of various codes of practice, and the implications of the Levelling Up and Regeneration Act 2023. Additionally, changes to the Minimum Revenue Provision guidance were anticipated in April 2024, following a lengthy series of consultations. There were also changes to the accounting treatment of lease arrangements arising from the transition to International Financial Reporting Standard 16 (IFRS16).

It was **resolved** that the Council be recommended to agree:

1. The proposed 2024/25 Treasury Management Strategy which also encompassed the Annual Investment Strategy.
2. The Prudential and Treasury Management Indicators for 2024/25.
3. That the Authorised Limit for external borrowing by the Council in 2024/25, be set at £723,443,000 (this being the statutory limit determined under Section 3 (1) of the Local Government Act 2003).
4. The MRP Policy for 2024/25 as set out in paragraph 7.15 of the officer's report.

i) Capital and Investment Strategy 2024/25 to 2027/28 - recommendation from the Corporate Management Committee

The report associated with this item was circulated to all members with the [agenda for the 18 January 2024 Corporate Management Committee](#). Members are reminded that Appendix B to the officer's report contains exempt information.

The key proposed changes to the policy were presented to the Committee. There was uncertainty around the level of government funding in future years, the recent receipt of a non-statutory Best Value Notice and the associated CIPFA report. These dictated the need for a moratorium on investment in new debt-funded assets.

It was reported that the availability of capital receipts was expected to become an issue in 2027. The Council would therefore need to identify new capital receipts around this time.

The new requirements in relation to leases were described to the committee.

Some members felt that the proposed strategy represented a prudent yet pragmatic approach. It was however hoped that some aspirational schemes would still be possible in the future, where funding permitted this.

Questions were asked about some elements of the strategy – it was reported that the proposed Addlestone One internet upgrade was only ever a provisional scheme in the previous strategy; and the sum allocated for replacement vehicles was for the lifespan of the strategy and not a single block purchase.

Disappointment was expressed over the removal of the borough's contribution to the Surrey traveller scheme.

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

For the resolution (7)

Councillors Gracey, Howorth, Coen, Cressey, Nuti, Snow and Willingale.

Against the resolution (2)

Councillors R. King and Ringham.

Abstentions (3)

Councillors Gates, Gillham and D. Whyte.

It was **resolved** that the Council be recommended to agree, subject to the typographical error at paragraph 3.6 of the officer's report being corrected:

1. The Capital and Investment Strategy at Appendix 'A' and the Capital Programme at Exempt Appendix 'B'.
2. A moratorium on any new debt-funded asset investment in light of the requirements of the Levelling Up and Regeneration Act 2023.
3. The "low value" limit for IFRS16 reporting purposes be set at £10,000, subject to the agreement of the external auditor.

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

To receive and consider any notices of motion from members of the Council under Standing Order 15.

No proposed motions have been received.

11. **Minority Group Priority Business**

To consider any item of minority group priority business registered under Standing Order 23. Any item of such business will be circulated separately with this summons.

No minority group priority business has been received.

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

To consider any items so resolved at the meeting.

Runnymede Borough Council

Full Council

Thursday, 7 December 2023 at 7.30 pm

Members of the Council present: Councillors S Saise-Marshall (Mayor), R Bromley (Deputy Mayor), A Balkan, T Burton, D Clarke, D Coen, MK Cressey, M Darby, R Davies, S Dennett, T Gates, E Gill, T Gracey, C Howorth, J Hulley, S Jenkins, A King, S Lewis, C Mann, J Mavi, M Nuti, N Prescott, S Ringham, M Singh, M Smith, P Snow, S Walsh, D Whyte, S Whyte, S Williams and M Willingale.

Members of the Council absent: Councillors A Berardi, MD Cressey, V Cunningham, J Furey, L Gillham, M Harnden, E Kettle, R King, I Mullens and J Wilson.

57 Apologies for Absence

Apologies were received from councillors Berardi, MD Cressey, Cunningham, Furey, Gillham, Harnden, Kettle, R King, Mullens and Wilson.

58 Declarations of Interest

No declarations of interest were made.

59 Proposal to confer honorary titles

The proposal to confer honorary titles to the North West Surrey Alliance and former councillor Derek Cotty was moved and seconded. The Leader of the Council explained that the proposal was intended to coincide with the 50th anniversary of the formation of Runnymede Borough Council on 1 April 2024, and it was hoped to recognise those who had made a significant contribution to the borough in that time.

The North West Surrey Alliance had been suggested for an honorary title primarily due to its health workers' efforts during the Covid-19 pandemic to put themselves in harms way by going into people's homes to deliver much-needed care, and doing so before the Covid vaccine became available.

Former councillor Cotty stood down from being a councillor in May 2023, and his work in Chertsey Meads, the Rotary Club and local church was highlighted, along with his efforts during the Magna Carta anniversary celebrations helping to ensure that a local authority event received international recognition.

Councillors across the chamber were generous in their praise for the character and achievements of former councillor Cotty, however some considered it wholly inappropriate to be focussing on awards of this nature given the cost of living crisis and a growing dependency of residents to rely on foodbanks, and nominations for Runnymede civic awards would be a more appropriate mechanism to recognise the efforts of those put forward.

A Member highlighted that the Runnymede Medical Practice in Englefield Green belonged to a different NHS Trust, and it would be distasteful to exclude them based on the quirks of a boundary, whilst the process to get to this stage was also noted by some members, with more cross-council discussion required on how to mark the 50th anniversary.

The Leader advised that the cost of the overall scheme had reduced significantly since the

matter was discussed by Corporate Management Committee, and whilst unaware that the Runnymede Medical Practice was outside of the North West Surrey Alliance, acknowledged that the vast majority of Runnymede residents would have been treated by the North West Surrey Alliance. Furthermore, the Leader would be fully supportive of any motion put forward to neighbouring authorities to recognise the efforts of the Runnymede Medical Practice.

When queried about why the proposed title for former councillor Cotty was an alderman rather than the more regularly utilised freedom of the borough, the Leader had considered it more appropriate to propose a former councillor as an Alderman, but moved a motion to amend the recommendation to:

*To consider a proposal from the Corporate Management Committee to award the honorary title of ~~Honorary Alderman~~ **Freedom of the Borough** to Mr Derek Cotty*

The Mayor explained that on the basis the council had been specially convened for the purpose of the object in the resolution, it must be passed by not less than two-thirds of the members present.

Following the conclusion of the debate, the amended motion was put to the vote. A named vote was requested for each item and the voting was as follows:

To award the honorary title of Freedom of the Borough to the North West Surrey Alliance:

For (19)

Councillors Saise-Marshall, Bromley, Balkan, Clarke, Coen, MK Cressey, Darby, Dennett, Gracey, Howorth, Hulley, Lewis, Mann, Mavi, Nuti, Prescott, Snow, Walsh, Willingale

Against (12)

Councillors Burton, Davies, Gates, Gill, Jenkins, A King, Ringham, Singh, Smith, D Whyte, S Whyte, Williams

Abstain (0)

-

The proposed resolution fell.

To award the honorary title of Freedom of the Borough to former councillor Derek Cotty:

For (20)

Councillors Saise-Marshall, Bromley, Balkan, Clarke, Coen, MK Cressey, Darby, Dennett, Gill, Gracey, Howorth, Hulley, Lewis, Mann, Mavi, Nuti, Prescott, Snow, Walsh, Willingale

Against (10)

Councillors Burton, Davies, Gates, Jenkins, A King, Ringham, Singh, Smith, D Whyte, S Whyte

Abstain (1)

Councillor Williams

The proposed resolution fell.

(The meeting ended at 7.59 pm.)

Mayor

Runnymede Borough CouncilFull CouncilThursday, 7 December 2023 at 8.00 pm

Members of the Council present: Councillors S Saise-Marshall (Mayor), R Bromley (Deputy Mayor), A Balkan, T Burton, D Clarke, D Coen, MK Cressey, M Darby, R Davies, S Dennett, T Gates, E Gill, T Gracey, C Howorth, J Hulley, S Jenkins, A King, S Lewis, C Mann, J Mavi, M Nuti, N Prescott, S Ringham, M Singh, M Smith, P Snow, S Walsh, D Whyte, S Whyte, S Williams and M Willingale.

Members of the Council absent: Councillors A Berardi, MD Cressey, V Cunningham, J Furey, L Gillham, M Harnden, E Kettle, R King, I Mullens and J Wilson.

60 Mayor's Announcements

The Mayor provided an update on the events and engagements that she had attended since the last Council, as well as upcoming events, encouraging nominations for the Runnymede Civic Awards.

61 Minutes

The minutes of the 19 October 2023 special meeting and 19 October 2023 ordinary meeting were confirmed and signed as a correct record.

62 Apologies for Absence

Apologies were received from councillors Berardi, MD Cressey, Cunningham, Furey, Gillham, Harnden, Kettle, R King, Mullens and Wilson.

63 Declarations of Interest

No declarations of interest were made.

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

There were no public questions or speaking.

65 Petitions

There were no petitions.

66 Questions from Members of the Council under Standing Order 13

a) Councillor Don Whyte asked the Leader of the Council the following question:

“A year ago at the 2022 December Corporate Management Committee it was identified that RBC needed to make savings of £5.2m by the end of March 2026 in order to deliver a balanced budget for the municipal year 2026/2027. Can I ask the Leader, why no progress been made by his Administration in identifying any of the required £5.2m savings?”

The Leader replied that a significant amount of work had been done to help inform the decisions over the next few years, and in preparing for budgets for 2024/25 focus had been

on allocating resource where it was needed.

Year on year underspend and earmarked reserves had been reviewed to ensure the Council was holding reserves in the most efficient way, whilst progress had been made in reviewing the establishment, ICT infrastructure, fleet, and the commissioning of contracts across professional services.

The Leader concluded that the revised Medium Term Financial Forecast would be presented to the following week's Corporate Management Committee, which would set out a plan to deliver a balanced budget over multiple years through a mixed package of savings, efficiencies and cost avoidance.

Councillor D. Whyte added that nothing had been received through committees or member working parties to crystallise any of those savings, and felt there was nervousness around the chamber, particularly in the context of the financial struggles of other authorities. Councillor D. Whyte went on to ask if there was a target date to identify the full £5.2m savings.

The Leader replied that no date had been set, but it would be identified as soon as possible and emphasised the positive financial position Runnymede was in compared to other local authorities, which was evident during a recent county-wide financial resilience review where Runnymede were close to leading the way in some areas, largely due to decisions taken over a prolonged period in relation to the investment strategy and decisions to regenerate and place shape in Addlestone and Egham town centres, which both provide income streams to help address current financial challenges.

Councillor S. Whyte emphasised the need to know about the overall financial position of the Council when needing to make any kind of financial decision, and sought reassurance that the Leader would brief all councillors on the financial position as soon as possible.

The Leader reiterated that the Medium Term Financial Forecast would be available as a part one item and encouraged all members to attend the meeting to understand the issues. The Leader encouraged the avoidance of alternative budgets requesting spend on additional uncoded items that had not gone through the appropriate budgetary process.

67 **Recommendations from Committees**

67a **Risk Appetite Statement 2024 - 2025 - recommendation from the Standards and Audit Committee**

At the November Standards & Audit Committee a thorough debate had resulted in consensus across the committee for the status of all but one of the thirteen risk categories, with 'commercial risk' the only category that remained outstanding and subject to Full Council agreement.

Whilst the full range of options was debated at Standards & Audit Committee, opting for minimal commercial risk had been ruled out due to the committee believing in the need for member input.

During the debate several members commented that an open approach and therefore embracing innovation being appealing, however in the context of inflation and the cost of living crisis innovation in this context should currently be avoided unless necessary.

Members voted on whether to adopt cautious or open for the commercial risk category, and voted by majority in favour of cautious.

Resolved that –

The overarching Risk Appetite Statement for 2024/25 and supporting risk appetite statements for each risk category was agreed.

67b Implications of Climate Change for Runnymede Borough Council - Corporate Management Committee

In moving the recommendation the Leader acknowledged that the report had been a long time coming, with the initial motion on the subject tabled in 2019, adding that delays were largely down to the pandemic absorbing officer time and resources, as well as the focus of the climate change member working party being on the delivery of the climate change strategy that formed an integral part of the corporate business plan.

The Leader added the development of the climate change strategy and objective of bring a net zero council by 2030 and net zero borough by 2050 meant that confidence could be placed in the plans developed and Runnymede was in a position to declare a climate emergency as per wording in the report.

Several members commented on the time taken to bring about the report, and sought reassurance that sufficient funding and resources would be in place in next year's budget to further the claims of the climate change strategy. The Leader reiterated how critical the climate change strategy was to the overall corporate business plan and confirmed measures would be in place to ensure it was suitably funded and resourced in future years.

Resolved that –

A Climate Emergency was declared in Runnymede in line with the wording recommended at paragraphs 5.16 to 5.18 of the report

67c Council Tax Support Scheme 2024/25 - recommendation from the Corporate Management Committee

The Leader welcomed the fact that the council delivered on everything from the previous Council Tax Support Scheme, with a reduction in processing time enabling the creation of the administration of the Household Support Fund. The recommendation sought to continue with the current scheme whilst building up data to allow for further recommendations or amendments for 2025/26.

The scheme received unanimous backing, however there was a claim that the scheme did not go far enough, with many residents believed not to be claiming for what they were entitled to, whilst praise was given to Cllr Mullens for her efforts to reduce the minimum weekly entitlement from £10 to £5 for all working age groups.

Resolved that –

The Council Tax Support Scheme to be continued for the 2024/25 financial year, including the provision to automatically apply legislative changes for the annual uprating of the prescribed applicable amounts for 2024/25 financial year as set by the Department of Work and Pensions (DWP).

67d Electric Vehicle Strategy - recommendation from the Corporate Management Committee

The Electric Vehicle strategy formed an important component of the climate change strategy and the Leader praised the cross-party collaboration of the climate change member working party, as well as the insight of Cllr Berardi into the EV market.

Resolved that –

The Electric Vehicle Strategy was adopted with an implementation date of 14 December 2023.

67e **Reserve Forces Policy - recommendation from the Corporate Management Committee**

The recommendation sought to advance the Council beyond gold standard accreditation as a high quality defence veteran employer, providing paid leave for staff who choose to be adult cadet volunteers, providing important opportunities for young people.

Council welcomed the recommendation, with several members speaking of their own positive personal experiences with uniformed youth organisations in their younger days.

Resolved that –

The Reserve Forces Policy was adopted.

67f **Minor Amendment to the Constitution - recommendation from the Corporate Management Committee**

The proposed amendment was a minor technical modification that would enable the convening of a special council tax setting committee in the event that the relevant precept authority had not provided the figures required to set the Council Tax by the date when Runnymede Borough Council holds its Council Tax setting meeting.

Resolved that –

A Standing Council Tax Committee was approved.

68 **Notices of Motion from Members of the Council under Standing Order 15**

On introducing the published motion Cllr Jenkins sought to make a small alteration to one of the proposed resolutions, which received the consent of both the Mayor and Cllr Gates as seconder.

Adopting a Net Zero Carbon Toolkit in Runnymede

Motivation:

This motion is being brought forward to encourage local developers to go above and beyond towards building energy efficient, zero carbon homes that will reduce overall Borough emissions and contribute towards tackling the climate crisis.

This council notes:

Due to uncertainty around the Government's policy direction, the decision was made at Planning Committee in June 2023 to pause the review of the Runnymede Local Plan until the new plan making regime is introduced. This is not expected to take place until late 2024 at the earliest and it could take a further 30 months from there to introduce a new Local Plan.

In May 2023, it was reported that the Earth is likely to break the key temperature limit of 1.5C between now and 2027 as a result of human activity (see note 1).

Therefore an urgent need exists to promote and actively encourage sustainable development that supersedes the speed at which any new Local Plan can be implemented.

Adopting a Net Zero Carbon Toolkit enables interim measures to be put in place to encourage energy efficient, zero carbon developments whilst underpinning the core principles of the existing Local Plan until it can be reviewed. It also provides Councillors with an opportunity to put the knowledge gained from recent Carbon Literacy training into action, by encouraging developers to build zero carbon homes and to retrofit existing properties, thereby reducing overall Borough emissions.

Cotswold District Council, in collaboration with West Oxfordshire District Council and Forest of Dean District Council worked with leading technical experts from Etude, the Passivhaus Trust, Levitt Bernstein and Elementa Consulting to produce a Net Zero Carbon Toolkit template (see note 2). The template provides best practice guidance for small-to-medium sized builders, architects and developers to deliver new-build net zero homes or retrofits of existing homes.

The template is available under Creative Commons for any authority to adapt as they wish, to make it specific to the needs of their local area. One example of a local authority who has adapted the toolkit in this way includes Somerset Council (see note 3).

There are a number of ways that Runnymede Borough Council could adapt this template to suit the needs of our local area, such as by:

- Adding RBC branding and relevant images.
- Amending the introduction – setting out Runnymede’s climate goals, referring to existing planning policies and relevant planning guidance (e.g. Design SPD / Green and Blue Infrastructure SPD).
- Making minor changes throughout the document to reference Runnymede’s Climate Change Strategy / Action Plan / Local Plan.
- Introducing a couple of pages on ‘beyond energy’ issues – to consider wider sustainability issues such as sustainable transport and drainage, and gigabit capable connectivity (e.g. refer to Surrey County Council’s Healthy Streets guidance and Sustainable Drainage Systems guidance).

It is important to note that a Net Zero Carbon Toolkit does not constitute a Supplementary Planning Document and should be considered as a separate entity. However, if a developer can demonstrate that they have used the Toolkit to meet or exceed Local Plan energy policy requirements in a sustainable manner, and that their proposal therefore brings about climate change benefits, this would be a material consideration which would be weighed in the balance in deciding whether to grant planning permission.

The Council Believes that:

- Adopting a Net Zero Carbon Toolkit gives Runnymede Borough Council an opportunity to proactively encourage greater sustainability within the Borough, providing a framework which inspires developers to go beyond the bare minimum and to actively reduce emissions within their work.
- Adopting a Net Zero Carbon Toolkit will strongly encourage the introduction of

zero carbon new-build homes as well as increased retrofitting of existing properties.

- Adopting a Net Zero Carbon Toolkit provides the Council with a means of encouraging sustainable development across the Borough between now and the next Local Plan review.
- Adopting a Net Zero Carbon Toolkit will help to reduce a significant portion of overall Borough emissions by promoting greater energy efficiency.
- Adopting a Net Zero Carbon Toolkit falls into line with recommendations which arose from a recent study commissioned by officers on Climate Change policy options which could be pursued as part of a revised Local Plan.
- Adopting a Net Zero Carbon Toolkit will help Runnymede Borough Council to get a head start on implementing its upcoming Climate Change Action Plan, as the adoption of a toolkit is one of the goals listed on this plan (sub action 1.1.4).
- Adopting a Net Zero Carbon Toolkit could potentially be used to incentivise developers to meet the initial capital cost of providing heat pumps and improving cooling systems.

The Council resolves to ask the Corporate Management Committee to consider:

1. Asking officers in the Climate Change team to adapt the template [published under Creative Commons by Cotswold, West Oxfordshire and Forest of Dean Councils](#) to create a Net Zero Carbon Toolkit for the Borough of Runnymede, [and to continue considering other measures and tools that can be deployed alongside this to reduce carbon emissions between now and the next Local Plan review.](#)
2. Adopting the Net Zero Carbon Toolkit once a working draft has been scrutinised by the Climate Change Members Working Party.
3. Including the Net Zero Carbon Toolkit into the 2024/25 Climate Change Delivery Plan to ensure that the adopted document is promoted in a timely and effective manner to the local development community.

Note 1 - <https://www.bbc.co.uk/news/science-environment-65602293>

Note 2 - [How to achieve net zero carbon homes - Cotswold District Council](#)

Note 3 - <https://www.somerset.gov.uk/planning-buildings-and-land/other-design-and-technical-guidance/net-zero-carbon-toolkit-in-somerset-west-and-taunton/>

The proposed amended motion was debated by the Council.

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

For (31):

Councillors Saise-Marshall, Bromley, Balkan, Burton, Clarke, Coen, MK Cressey, Darby, Davies, Dennett, Gates, E Gill, Gracey, Howorth, Hulley, Jenkins, A King, Lewis, Mann, Mavi, Nuti, Prescott, Ringham, Singh, Smith, Snow, Walsh, D Whyte, S Whyte, Williams, Willingale

Against (0):

-

Abstain (0):

-

The motion was carried.

69 Minority Group Priority Business

There was no minority group priority business.

70 Press and Public to be Excluded by Resolution

By resolution of full Council, the press and public were excluded from the remainder of the meeting during the consideration of the remaining matters 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.

71 Recommendations from Committees**71a Housing Revenue Account Development - recommendation from the Housing Committee**

Resolved that –

- 1. The budget and subsequent procurement of the first piece of land and the completed scheme in line with the planning approval (if obtained) and agreed specification was approved.**
- 2. The budget and subsequent procurement of the second piece of land and the completed scheme in line with the planning approval and agreed specification was approved.**
- 3. Funds from the total budget were approved to be utilised within the financial year 2023/24 to commence the legal process for each of the schemes, to be financed from HRA Reserves.**

71b Procurement of Digital Alarms - recommendation from the Corporate Management Committee

Resolved that –

- 1. A supplementary capital estimate in the sum reported to the Community Services Committee for the purchase and installation of digital community alarm equipment be funded from the Better Care Fund over the next year was agreed.**
- 2. Approval was given to enter into a procurement process for the purchase of digital community alarm equipment on behalf of both Runnymede and Surrey Heath Borough Councils up to a potential total value in the sum reported to Community Services Committee.**

(The meeting ended at 9.13 pm.)

Mayor

Report title	Notification of receipt of non-statutory Best Value Notice
Report author	Andrew Pritchard
Department	Chief Executive
Exempt?	No
Exemption type	Not applicable
Reasons for exemption	Not applicable

Purpose of report:

- **For information**

Synopsis of report:

This is to provide notification to Members that Runnymede Borough Council received a non-statutory Best Value Notice (“Notice”) on Dec 19th 2023 from the Department for Levelling Up, Housing and Communities (DLUHC).

Recommendation(s):

For information

1. Context and background of report

- 1.1 The Best Value Duty relates to the statutory requirement for local authorities and other public bodies defined as best value authorities in Part 1 of the Local Government Act 1999 (the 1999 Act) to “make arrangements to secure continuous improvement in the way in which its functions are exercised, having regard to a combination of economy, efficiency and effectiveness”.
- 1.2 In practice, this covers issues such as how authorities exercise their functions to deliver a balanced budget, provide statutory services and secure value for money in all spending decisions.
- 1.3 Where, over a period of time, continuous improvement is not demonstrated sufficiently, the 1999 Act grants the Government powers to intervene to ensure compliance with the Best Value Duty. These powers include taking action to protect the public purse and ensure significant or long-term failings are corrected and performance is raised to an acceptable and sustainable level.
- 1.4 In addition to the statutory powers available to it, the Government can exercise what are termed as non-statutory measures aimed at ensuring compliance with the Best Value Duty. They do not involve the Government using the powers in the 1999 Act. They are usually appropriate for addressing failure or risk of future failure that does not appear to be systemic in an authority and where that authority has the

willingness, capability and capacity to improve. Authorities that can demonstrate how they are addressing risk, and where the Government is confident that continuous improvement can be sustained without statutory intervention, are most likely to be subject to non-statutory measures.

2. Report

- 2.1 Following engagement with the Department for Levelling Up, Housing and Communities (DLUHC) and the Chartered Institute for Public Finance and Accountancy (CIPFA) during 2023, the Council has now received a non-statutory Best Value Notice (“Notice”) on 19th December 2023 from DLUHC.
- 2.2 CIPFA conducted a Capital Review of Runnymede on behalf of DLUHC due to the fact that:
 - The Council has significant debt relative to its core spending power. As of 31 March 2023 it had borrowing 71 times their core spending power, which has been used predominantly to invest in the Council’s property portfolio to generate commercial income.
 - Commercial income represents a substantial revenue source for the Council and is used to support both core and discretionary services. The Council currently derives £11.2m of net income from its investment property portfolio which is used to fund such services, generating a net return of 2.1%.
 - Both these facts expose the Authority to significant financial risks should anticipated commercial income fail.
- 2.3 Officers are obliged to inform Members of the receipt of the Notice in accordance with the requirement for transparency. The Notice was communicated to all Members via email on 20th December 2023 at 12.03 and has been published to the runnymede.gov.uk website.
- 2.4 The Notice is found at Appendix 1.
- 2.5 Officers are developing the work programme and action plan necessary to respond to the Notice and are continuing the ongoing dialogue with DLUHC officials.
- 2.6 Further details of the work programme will be provided to Members in due course.

3. Policy framework implications

- 3.1 The compliance of the Council’s with its obligation to secure continuous improvement and thereby deliver Best Value is evidenced through various decisions the Council makes under its Policy and Financial Framework. Addressing the issues which have been raised will enable the Council to demonstrate that it is delivering Best Value.

4 Resource implications/Value for Money

- 4.1 The Notice is a formal notification that DLUHC has concerns regarding the risk of future failure of an authority and is a request that the authority engages with the Department to provide assurance of improvement. The Department expects authorities that have been issued with Best Value Notices to continue leading their own improvement.

- 4.2 Responding to the Notice will require resources from across the organisation to support this as a priority. This may impact delivery of other planned activity for 2024/25.
- 4.3 Resource capacity and capability requirements to respond to the Notice will be part of the programme planning for the Best Value Notice response work programme and will be advised as this comes forward.

5. Legal implications

- 5.1 Under the 1999 Act local authorities must legally deliver what is termed 'Best Value' – a council must be able to show that it has arrangements to secure continuous improvement in how it carries out its work. The Government has powers under the 1999 Act to take action where this Best Value Duty is not, or is at risk of not, being met.
- 5.2 The Government has a range of responses open to it, both statutory and non-statutory, as listed below:
- (Non-statutory) Best Value Notice
 - Best Value Notice issued under section 230 of the Local Government Act 1972
 - Improvement board
 - Sector-led intervention
 - Directions to a best value authority
 - Directions for a commissioner-led intervention
- 5.3 The Council has received a (Non-statutory) Best Value Notice which involves a senior civil servant writing formally to an authority to state the Government's concerns on the available evidence and to set out the Government's expectations of the authority in providing assurance of progress. The Notice will request that the authority engages directly with the Government to provide assurance of improvement. The Notice will normally remain in place for 12 months, after which time, should the Government deem it necessary to continue to seek assurance of the authority's improvement progress, it will be reissued. The Notice may be withdrawn or escalated at any point based on the available evidence.
- 5.4 (Non-statutory) Best Value Notices provide an opportunity for early engagement with an authority that is exhibiting indicators of potential best value failure and where there is confidence that the authority may have the capability and capacity to make its own arrangements to secure continuous improvement.

6. Equality implications

- 6.1 Non arising directly from this report

7. Environmental/Sustainability/Biodiversity implications

- 7.1 Non arising directly from this report

8. Risk Implications

8.1 Risks will be identified and recorded in the risk management system for the Best Value Notice Response programme as per the Council's project management methodology.

9. Other implications

9.1 None arising directly from this report

10. Timetable for Implementation

10.1 The Notice states 'This Notice will remain in place for 12 months, after which time, should the Department deem it necessary to continue to seek assurance through such a Notice, the Notice will be reissued. The Notice may be withdrawn or escalated at any point based on the available evidence.'

10.2 The work programme will be developed to accord with the timetable stipulated by DLUHC

11. Conclusions

11.1 This is to provide notification to Members that Runnymede Borough Council have received a non-statutory Best Value Notice on December 19th 2023.

12. Background papers

12.1 The CIPFA Capital Review report referenced in the non-statutory Best Value Notice is also published to the website [here](#)

13. Appendices

- Appendix 1: Best Value Notice

Appendix 1: Runnymede Borough Council (RBC) Best Value Notice issued on December 19th 2023



Suzanne Clarke
*Deputy Director, Local Government
Finance*

**Department for Levelling Up,
Housing and Communities**
4th Floor, Fry Building
2 Marsham Street
London SW1P 4DF
www.gov.uk/dluhc

Andrew Pritchard
Chief Executive
Runnymede Borough Council

19 December 2023

Runnymede Borough Council (RBC) Best Value Notice issued on 19 December 2023

The Department expects authorities to identify and implement arrangements to secure continuous improvement and acknowledges the steps you are already taking to address issues in Runnymede Borough Council, including responding to the recommendations identified in the CIPFA capital review. Ministers remain concerned as to Runnymede Borough Council's capacity to comply with its Best Value Duty under the Local Government Act 1999. The Parliamentary Under Secretary of State has therefore made the decision to issue Runnymede Borough Council with this Best Value Notice.

This Best Value Notice ("Notice") is a formal notification that the Department has concerns regarding an authority and is a request that the authority engages with the Department to provide assurance of improvement. The Department expects authorities that have been issued with Best Value Notices to continue leading their own improvement.

This Notice is issued to Runnymede Borough Council ('the Authority') following concerns highlighted by the Capital Review of Runnymede, undertaken by the Chartered Institute for Public Finance and Accountancy (CIPFA), which was shared with the Authority on 25 July 2023. Concerns include that:

- The Authority has significant debt relative to its size, as of 31 March 2023 it had borrowing 71 times their core spending power, which has been used predominantly to invest in the Authority's property portfolio. This level of debt poses the Authority with capacity challenges, particularly in asset management, commercial and regeneration activity.
- Commercial income represents a substantial revenue source for RBC and is used to support both core and discretionary services, which exposes the Authority to significant financial risks should anticipated income fail.

The Authority has engaged constructively and openly with the CIPFA capital review and has indicated it is already taking steps to address the concerns raised in the review. We expect the Authority to continue to improve and, specifically, to commission an external governance review which aims to provide more in-depth assurance on RBC's governance and leadership structures in line with Best Value principles, including a review of:

- The effectiveness and efficiency of internal decision-making and scrutiny processes
- Culture and leadership, including the Authority's sense of strategic vision and direction, effectiveness of leadership, and attitudes and behaviours towards positive and open relationships.
- Capacity and capability, including evidence of continuous improvement.
- Delivery of services.

The Authority should also agree plans to address concerns and deliver all recommendations set out in the CIPFA review, at pace. In particular, the Authority should:

- Outline what steps they plan to take to reduce and manage the overall debt of the Council.
- Develop a risk appetite statement, including specific elements for its commercial and regeneration portfolio and divestment opportunities, and formalise a moratorium on commercial investment.
- Update the MTFP to reflect different scenarios in savings delivery, in the relationship of stock condition findings to MRP, and in commercial income performance.
- The Finance and the Asset Teams should work together to determine the appropriate scale of the sinking fund to the extent that the sinking fund can cover income and repairs risk.
- Develop and monitor capacity and capability to support priority areas.
- Work to elevate the profile of, and focus on, commercial and regeneration priorities in formal decision-making and oversight.
- Improve reporting on investment performance and expected returns.

While the Authority may continue to receive and be awarded government funding whilst under this Notice, we would emphasise that receipt of funding does not indicate the Department's broader view of the performance of the Authority, nor would it indicate any change in the status of this Notice, with individual funding programmes being managed and assured independently by their respective departments.

This Notice will remain in place for 12 months, after which time, should the Department deem it necessary to continue to seek assurance through such a Notice, the Notice will be reissued. The Notice may be withdrawn or escalated at any point based on the available evidence.

This Notice is issued outside the statutory powers held by the Secretary of State under the Local Government Act 1999 to inspect or intervene in local authorities where there is evidence of Best Value failure and, separately, under section 230 of the Local Government Act 1972 to request information from local authorities. However, a failure to demonstrate continuous improvement may be judged to contribute to Best Value failure and the Secretary of State will consider using these powers as appropriate.

It is important to ensure transparency in relation to the challenges faced by local authorities and the Department's engagement on these. A copy of this Notice will therefore be published on gov.uk. I encourage you to make a copy of this Notice available on the Authority's website, and to share it with full council and the audit committee. In line with this, we will notify your external auditor of this action.

Separately to this Notice, I would encourage you to engage with the Local Government Association, making use of the full range of support they have to offer. We also expect the Authority to engage regularly with the Department during the period of the Notice and in determining the scope of the external governance review. A member of my team will be in touch with you to make arrangements. I look forward to receiving updates on your progress.

Yours sincerely,

Suzanne Clarke
Deputy Director, Local Government Finance

MTFS as reported to Corporate Management Committee 18 January 2024

	Probable 2023/24	Forecast 2024/25	Forecast 2025/26	Forecast 2026/27	Forecast 2027/28	Forecast 2028/29	Comments
	£'000	£'000	£'000	£'000	£'000	£'000	
Car Parks - Income - P&D & PCN net increase	(128)	(200)	(200)	(200)	(200)	(200)	Environment & Sustainability November 2023

Comments should have read "Various movements in net income including an increase in fees agreed at E&S in November 2023". Make up of the total set out below.

	Probable 2023/24	Forecast 2024/25	Forecast 2025/26	Forecast 2026/27	Forecast 2027/28	Forecast 2028/29	Comments
	£'000	£'000	£'000	£'000	£'000	£'000	
Car Parks - Environment & Sustainability November 2023:							
Increased permit charged	-	(14)	(14)	(14)	(14)	(14)	
Sunday charging	-	(36)	(36)	(36)	(36)	(36)	
Cost of cash collections	-	(10)	(10)	(10)	(10)	(10)	
10p/20p increase in fees	-	(21)	(21)	(21)	(21)	(21)	
Pooley Green free parking removal	-	(7)	(7)	(7)	(7)	(7)	
Homewood Park reduction in free period	-	(22)	(22)	(22)	(22)	(22)	
5% drop in use	-	19	19	19	19	19	
Revised signage costs	-	8	-	-	-	-	
Car Parks - lease for British Legion car park ceased 30 September 2023	(10)	(20)	(20)	(20)	(20)	(20)	
Car Parks - P&D income - Overestimation of lost income from Hummer Road	(33)	(33)	(33)	(33)	(33)	(33)	
Car Parks - P&D income - greater income from other car parks	(86)	(86)	(86)	(86)	(86)	(86)	
Car Parks - Reduction in cash collection costs	(5)	(5)					
Car Parks - P&D income - Provision of 5 free parking permits for NHS	5	5	5	5	5	5	
Car Parks - PCN income lower than estimated	25	25	25	25	25	25	
Car-Parks - Other general savings	(24)	(3)					
	(128)	(200)	(200)	(200)	(200)	(200)	

REVENUE Budget Amendment Template

Councillor making proposal:	Cllr Robert King
Political Group/(s)	Labour & Co-operative, Green, Liberal Democrat, Independent Residents and Englefield Green Independent Groups
Political Group Leader/(s)	Cllr Robert King, Don Whyte, Steve Ringham & Linda Gillham

Overview of the rationale/purpose of amendment/(s):

Below sets down the proposed budget amendments by the Labour & Co-operative, Green, Liberal Democrat, Independent Residents and Englefield Green Independent Groups.

These are key amendments to a budget which still doesn't work for our residents and does not adequately address the need to get our finances back under control, reduce the Council's debt burden and regear asset investment which at present see a declining real term income, year on year. Runnymede's residents have been hit hard by the Cost-of-Living Crisis, and the removal of the HSF funding by this government will make an already perilous situation for pensioner, those on low income and disabled household even worse. Across the opposition, no matter our political groupings, we agree this cannot be an acceptable position, and we would ringfence an inflationary linked fund every year to support those who will be effected by this cruel and unnecessary cut, launching the Runnymede Citizen Support Fund. Our staff too must be supported, especially those on our lower bandings and whilst it is noted there are one off payments and rebanding in some of the lower grades to compensate for some of the decline in their real term incomes oer the past decade, this is insufficient to continue to make Runnymede an attractive place to work and provide an employment which delivers an acceptable standard of living in one of the most expensive places to live outside London. As the preceptor in setting council tax, Runnymede must support those struggling to pay their bills and avoid the costly processing of taking our residents to court when they simple don't have the means to pay. In a time of rising prices, the best place for the cash that lower income working aged household earn and receive is in their pocket, not Runnymede's and not Surrey's, offering a tax cut of up to 100%, council tax relief, to target our most hard pressed residents is the best support we can offer and will align to a change in supporting banding we would support from the middle of 2024 with new data from June 2024, of our wider Council tax support policy going forward to 2025.

Ensuring resident live in a decent home whether they live in private housing, council housing or housing association properties is essential, offering better support to mitigate the blight caused by noise or unruly neighbours should be essential. As an authority we should be offering a single service as a Council to drive up standards and make sure our resident homes are secure, warm, and affordable. By offering out of hours support 24/7, with a return to a 24/7 duty officer budget in environmental services after over a decade, this will begin to rebuild the support of our residents in their own home which they should have expected all along. It will too ensure those bad landlords in the private sector or poorly forming housing associations, don't impact the sector we need as a borough for our housing strategy.

Our halls must be transformed to be better used, to assist schools and family centres, and enable the provision of new NHS services for communities which have grown, and face pressures from new developments, without the public services those new residents need. Joining up these offerings makes the best use of our resource and ensures a better use of capital assets when resources are scarce. We also need to better use our transport services, continuing to deliver a viable and improved service to older residents, but also expand this offering to younger people, working commuters and help groups such as schools and those with residents with a disability access the Borough's leisure facilities. A move to a section 19 type service not only provides for this but would also support households who were impacted the most from the previous cuts to the yellow school bus services. Democracy and accountability again must be improved, livestreaming in the 21st century is something the free press and our residents should expect, the administration has dragged its feet for too long to avoid wider public scrutiny on this, despite rolling out some of the capital equipment needed in Council meeting rooms.

Final a new executive leadership needs new direction from their political leadership and a new way of doing things. As the budget gap continues to rise under this administration to near £9.3 million in the MTFS in 28/29, choices have to made to both protect

Section 151 statement:

These budget proposals meet the requirement for a balanced budget and adequate level of reserves.

Amanda Fahey 30/01/2024

Financial implications	Enter in £s		
-------------------------------	--------------------	--	--

Please ensure all financial implications of any amendments are included, such as staffing costs (including employers costs), running costs, any implementation costs, financing costs and any changes to income, including council tax level and use of reserves.

Revenue Budget Amendments	Budget year	Future years	
	2024/25	2025/26	2026/27
	£	£	£

Expenditure:				
Data Analysis Apprenticeship/Post (Under Head of Digital Innovation) Internal Functions	25,000	30,000	35,000	
Runnymede Citizen Support Fund (HSF Replacement)	100,000	103,000	106,090	
Improved Pay Offering for Bands (3-6) & Job families work	35,000	40,000	45,000	
Staff Turnover Reduction Pay Offer and Job Families (Training and Expenses)	(10,000)	(10,000)	(10,000)	

Community Bid Writer Budget Move from Chief Exec Budget to Community Services	0	0	0
Out of Hours Environmental Health Budget/Post (Housing and Noise) Band 7	35,000	35,000	35,000
Vacant Post Funded Housing Development Officer (Under Development Manager) Band 8	0	0	0
Reduction in Halls Usage & Budget (Change of Service & Income)	(150,000)	(175,000)	(200,000)
Chief Executive office downsize & restructure	(150,000)	(200,000)	(200,000)
Move to 100% Council Tax Relief for working aged	41,200	42,436	44,982
Income:			
Housing Association Service Cost Recovery	(5,000)	(5,000)	(5,000)
Runnymede - On demand Community Transport (Section 19)		(25,000)	(25,000)
Revenue consequences of Capital			
Expenditure			
Livestream Meetings and Record (Operations)	20,000	20,000	20,000
Livestream Meetings and Record (Cost of Capital)	45,000		
Income			
Change to Council Tax level:			
Use of Reserves:			
Contribution to Reserves	13,800	144,564	153,928
Additional draw on Reserves			
Balanced budget:	Balanced	Balanced	Balanced

Effect on GF Reserve	£000	£000	£000
Current projected reserves at year end	19,596	18,074	12,925
Amended reserves at year end	19,610	18,232	13,237
Above minimum threshold of £5m	Yes	Yes	Yes

CAPITAL Budget Amendment Template

Financial implications				
	Enter in £s			
Please ensure all financial implications of any amendments are included, such as implementation costs, land assembly costs, etc. Include any associated revenue costs such as on-going staffing and running costs, and any borrowing costs in the Revenue budget amendments section.				
	Budget year	Future years		
	2024/25	2025/26	2026/27	2027/28
	£	£	£	£
Capital Budget Amendments				
Expenditure:				
Capital expenditure for Live Stream	45,000			
Total Capital Expenditure	45,000	0	0	0
Funded by:				
Capital Receipts*				
External Grant*				
General Fund working balance	(45,000)			
HRA Working balance				
Other Earmarked Reserve*				
Borrowing				
Total Funding changes	(45,000)	0	0	0
*Please identify specific funding streams here:				
Net Capital position	0	0	0	0

ASSOCIATED REVENUE COSTS				
	2024/25	2025/26	2026/27	2027/28
	£	£	£	£
Cost of Borrowing	0	0	0	0
Ongoing revenue income				
Ongoing Revenue costs - Live streaming	20,000	20000	20000	20000
Total Associated Revenue costs	20,000	20,000	20,000	20,000