

Council

Venue: Council Chamber - Civic Centre, Doncaster Road, Selby, YO8 9FT

Date: Thursday, 20 February 2020

Time: 6.00 pm

Present: Councillor D Mackay in the Chair

Councillors J Duggan (Vice-Chair), K Arthur, D Brook, D Buckle, J Cattnach, I Chilvers, J Chilvers, M Crane, S Duckett, K Ellis, K Franks, T Grogan, E Jordan, M Jordan, A Lee, C Lunn, J Mackman, J McCartney, M McCartney, R Musgrave, W Nichols, R Packham, C Pearson, N Reader, J Shaw-Wright, Shaw-Wright, R Sweeting, M Topping, P Welburn and P Welch

Officers Present: Janet Waggott (Chief Executive), Dave Caulfield (Director of Economic Regeneration and Place), Karen Iveson (Chief Finance Officer (s151)) and Alison Hartley (Solicitor to the Council and Monitoring Officer)

Press: 2

Public: 9

59 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

There were no apologies for absence.

60 DISCLOSURES OF INTEREST

There were no disclosures of interest.

61 MINUTES

The Council considered the minutes of the meeting held on 17 December 2019.

RESOLVED:

To approve the minutes of the Council meeting held on 17 December 2019 for signing by the Chairman.

62 COMMUNICATIONS

The Leader updated the Council on the flooding situation in the district, particularly at Hirst Courtney and in relation to the closure of the A19 between Chapel Haddlesey and Whitley. The Environment Agency were working closely with Council Officers who had been out assisting residents late into the night. The Leader thanked the Head of Operational Services and her team for all their hard work.

63 ANNOUNCEMENTS

The Chairman reminded Members about his upcoming charity concert in March to be held at Selby Abbey and encouraged them to purchase tickets for the event. He also thanked former Chairman Cllr David Buckle for his assistance in planning and publicising the event.

64 PETITIONS

There were no petitions received.

65 PUBLIC QUESTIONS

A public question had been received from Mr David Bowgett, who put the following question to the Lead Executive Member for Housing, Health and Culture:

“In the past, Selby District Council’s policy with regards to public toilets has been to encourage businesses to make their toilets available, rather than providing purpose-built facilities. Is this still the council’s policy, and if so, do you believe it to be an adequate one, particularly when it comes to meeting the needs of handicapped people?”

Councillor C Pearson responded by explaining that he was not aware of a Council policy on public toilets, but that the Council did provide facilities and also had agreements with local businesses who would make their facilities available to the public if needed.

Mr Bowgett asked a supplementary question regarding the toilets in Tadcaster at the bus station, which were often out of order.

Councillor Pearson confirmed that he would investigate why the toilets at Tadcaster bus station were not currently working.

66 COUNCILLORS' QUESTIONS

It was noted that two questions had been submitted for consideration.

Question One

Councillor J McCartney asked question one which related to the length of

recent sentences given to convicted fly-tippers, and if the Council was raising the issue of longer sentences with Central Government and the judiciary.

The Leader sympathised with Councillor McCartney's frustration, and explained that he had again written to the magistrates on the matter but had received no response. He went on to confirm that he had also raised the issue of fly-tipping with Nigel Adams MP, at the District Councils Network and the Local Government Association and would continue to do so.

Councillor McCartney felt that the imposition of larger fines by local authorities would act as a better deterrent.

Question Two

Councillor J McCartney asked question two, which related to prosecutions and fixed penalty notices for fly-tipping tyres, and what efforts were being made to trace the origin of fly-tipped tyres by Trading Standards and the police forces from West and South Yorkshire and the East Riding of Yorkshire.

The Lead Executive Member for Housing, Health and Culture explained the difficulty in tracing fly-tipped tyres, and unless the actual incident was witnessed, it was almost impossible to find out where they were from. However, the Council was working with the police on the matter.

Councillor McCartney expressed his frustration at the lack of prosecutions and emphasised the impact of the crime on local communities and the countryside.

The Lead Executive Member made the point that the amount of general fly-tipping in the district had reduced, and that several fixed penalty notices had been given out.

67 REPORTS FROM THE EXECUTIVE

Councillor Mark Crane, Leader of the Council

The Leader of the Council presented his update on the work he had recently undertaken, as outlined in his report.

In response to queries regarding the potential creation of a combined authority of York and North Yorkshire, development of a post of a Mayor for the combined authority, and the subsequent relationship between the different tiers of local government, the Leader explained that many ideas had been discussed with other North Yorkshire Leaders and Chief Executives at a recent meeting he had attended.

Members noted that a potential structure was being drafted by North Yorkshire Chief Executives, but were sceptical as to whether a mayoral model would work in North Yorkshire. The Leader explained that he and other Leaders had agreed on the importance of suitable checks and balances on the powers of any future mayor.

Councillor Richard Musgrave, Deputy Leader of the Council and Executive Member for Place Shaping

Councillor Musgrave provided an update on the work he had recently undertaken, as outlined in his report.

A question relating to the design and layout of public spaces within new housing developments was asked, and whether there was potential for involvement of local communities and residents in the design process. Councillor Musgrave agreed that good design was essential, but that it would be difficult to change the design of schemes that had already been approved. However, he explained that Officers had been working on design matters and emphasised the importance of this being fed into the issues and options consultation for the development of the new local plan.

A query was raised relating to the permeability of new driveways, due to the potential effects of this on groundwater flooding. Councillor Musgrave explained that with regards to new developments, matters such as driveways would be controlled by condition, but that if there were issues with the resurfacing of existing driveways these should be reported to the Planning Enforcement Team. Councillor Musgrave resolved to investigate the matter further.

In response to concerns expressed around tackling climate change, Councillor Musgrave agreed that more work needed to be done and at a faster pace, including the progress of the work of the Policy Review Committee's Low Carbon Working Group.

In relation to public open spaces created as part of new developments, some Members expressed frustration on behalf of residents who had concerns around the responsibility for such spaces, where there was sometimes no consistency of approach or transparency of management. Councillor Musgrave acknowledged Members' concerns and confirmed that he was happy to follow these up with local Councillors.

Lastly, Councillor Musgrave assured Members that he would ask Officers to provide a response to a question regarding tree planting on roundabouts in the district.

Councillor Cliff Lunn, Executive Member for Finance and Resources

Councillor Lunn provided an update on the work he had recently undertaken, as outlined in his report.

In response to a question relating to car parking in Tadcaster and the potential impact that not charging for parking was having on the Council's income, Councillor Lunn explained that the financial impacts were negligible and that a report on car parking would be brought forward in the coming months.

Councillor David Buckle, Executive Member for Communities and Economic Development

Councillor Buckle provided an update on the work he had recently undertaken, as outlined in his report.

Members asked questions about the need for more investment and improved infrastructure in Eggborough and Kellington, and about the changes to the Local Enterprise Partnerships (LEPs) in the area.

Councillor Buckle agreed it was important that jobs were being created in the Selby district, but that the infrastructure was also there to support them.

In relation to the LEP question, it was confirmed that from 1 April 2020 Selby would be part of the York and North Yorkshire LEP, and reassured Members that this change would not affect the existing Transforming Cities fund.

The Leader came in at this point and explained that central government had taken the decision that Selby would be part of the York and North Yorkshire LEP. It was acknowledged that the Leeds City Region LEP received more funding, but that as a percentage Selby would be a bigger part of the York and North Yorkshire LEP, and as such, would receive more funding per head of population. Members asked the Leader to request some financial implications information from the LEP.

Councillor Chris Pearson, Executive Member for Housing, Health and Culture

Councillor Pearson provided an update on the work he had recently undertaken, as outlined in his report.

Some Members expressed doubts regarding the results of the survey of Selby by Keep Britain Tidy, as some areas of the district were not very clean. It was explained by Councillor Pearson that the Council had no choice as to where in the district the survey had been undertaken.

A query was raised regarding collection points and associated costs; Councillor Pearson confirmed that he would look into this and send details to Members directly.

Some Members expressed concerns about a case of rough sleeping in Tadcaster and emphasised the importance of help and assistance being offered, as there were concerns the individual's safety. Councillor Pearson reassured Members that help had been offered but not been accepted. Councillor Pearson assured Members that he would investigate further and let them know the outcome.

The availability for use of local businesses toilets to the public was also queried by Members, particularly around how people would know they could use them and if they were advertised. A list of such facilities was requested for circulation to Members. A number of Councillors expressed concern at the

lack of public toilets in towns in the district, which could cause difficulty for people and vulnerable groups. Councillor Pearson explained that some public facilities had been closed for various reasons but agreed to investigate the matter further.

The Executive Member was also asked how two Members, himself included, had been chosen to feature on the Selby Treasures posters. Councillor Pearson explained that the project was advertised in the Selby Times for people to bring an artefact in and have their picture taken with it. The project had been a success and there had been some suggestions that a local museum for such artefacts would be welcome.

Two final questions were raised, the first on homelessness and utilising the local knowledge of town and parish councils, the second relating to where the 10 'Visitor Information Points' mentioned in the Executive Member's report would be sited. Councillor Pearson confirmed that parish and town councils would be consulted on the Homelessness and Rough Sleeping Strategy, and that he would provide a written response to Members regarding the siting of the information points.

RESOLVED:

To receive and note the reports from the Executive.

68 REPORTS FROM COMMITTEES

Councillor Steve Shaw-Wright, Chairman of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee

Councillor Shaw-Wright, Chairman of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee, provided an update on the work of the Committee as outlined in his report.

Councillor Shaw-Wright also updated the Council on the most recent meeting held on 13 February 2020 which was themed around education, and had several attendees from North Yorkshire County Council, York and Selby Colleges and Ebor Academy Trust. The meeting had been a success and numerous issues had been discussed, including school access to Section 106 and Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) monies.

As a result of the debate at the meeting the development of a district-wide skills strategy by the Council and education partners had been suggested; the Chair urged both Executive Members and Officers to explore this idea further.

Councillor Andrew Lee, Chairman of the Policy Review Committee

Councillor Lee, Chairman of the Policy Review Committee, provided an update on the work of the Committee as outlined in his report.

A query was raised regarding the inclusion of details as to how Members voted in relation to the budget item at the meeting of the committee held on 14 January 2020. The Chair explained that some Members had asked that their

position on the proposed increase in Council Tax be recorded.

Councillor Karl Arthur, Chair of the Audit and Governance Committee

Councillor Arthur, Chairman of the Audit and Governance Committee, provided an update on the work of the Committee as outlined in his report.

There were no questions from Members.

RESOLVED:

To receive and note the reports from the Committees.

69 MOTIONS

It was noted that two motions had been submitted for discussion. The first motion submitted was as follows:

'That this Full Council agrees that Selby District Council should move from an Executive Structure to a modern Committee based structure that recognises the primacy of the Full Council and in which every elected Councillor plays a full and meaningful part in the Council decision making process.

That a Working Party under the leadership of Chairman of the Scrutiny Committee, working with senior officers, is tasked with putting forward recommendations to this Full Council that enable the changes to occur as soon as possible.'

Councillor Mary McCartney proposed the motion and explained that approving the motion would ensure a fairer method of governance, rather than the current model where decisions were made by five Members.

The motion was seconded by Councillor John McCartney.

Discussion took place on the motion and comments were made by Members in support and against the motion.

In opposition to the motion, Members noted that the same motion had been considered six months ago and urged that it was not brought back again. Some Members stated that approving the motion would mean the Council returning to an antiquated committee system, causing Council business to take longer and decisions being taken in an ineffective way; slower decision making would hinder the progress of the Council.

In support of the motion, Members argued that the current system created two 'classes' of Councillor. As a result, this limited the engagement of many Members in the decision-making process. It was also felt by some Councillors that the powers of the Scrutiny Committee were too limited in affording proper examination of the work of the Executive.

A vote was taken on the motion, with 16 against, 14 in favour and 1

abstention. The motion was therefore rejected.

RESOLVED:

To refuse the above motion.

The second motion submitted was as follows:

“Background

A new definition of anti-Semitism was adopted by the International Holocaust Remembrance Alliance (IHRA) in Bucharest in 2016 - *‘Anti-Semitism is a certain perception of Jews, which may be expressed as hatred toward Jews. Rhetorical and physical manifestations of anti-Semitism are directed towards Jewish or non-Jewish individuals and/or their property, towards Jewish community institutions and religious facilities.’*

The UK Government announced on December 11th, 2016 that it would sign up to the internationally recognised IHRA guidelines. Over 100 councils across the UK have adopted the definition.

Proposal

The Leader proposes the following motion:

That Council notes:

The new definition of anti-Semitism is an important tool for public bodies to understand how anti-Semitism manifests itself as it gives examples of the kind of behaviours which can constitute anti-Semitism.

Adopting the new definition will:

- Demonstrate the Council’s commitment to ensuring everyone in the District is treated with the respect they deserve;
- Make it clear that hatred of any kind, including anti-Semitism or discrimination against people for their beliefs has no place in our communities;
- Support the Council’s obligations under the Equality Act 2010, and its responsibilities under the Public Sector Equality Duty, to demonstrate due regard and to:
 - Eliminate unlawful discrimination, harassment and victimisation and other conduct prohibited by the Act.
 - Advance equality of opportunity between people who share a protected characteristic and those who do not.
 - Foster good relations between people who share a protected characteristic and those who do not.

That Council therefore commits to: adopting the International Holocaust Remembrance Alliance (IHRA) definition of anti-Semitism:

‘Anti-Semitism is a certain perception of Jews, which may be expressed as hatred toward Jews. Rhetorical and physical manifestations of anti-Semitism are directed towards Jewish or non-Jewish individuals and/or their property, towards Jewish community institutions and religious facilities.’

The Leader proposed the motion and expressed his support for it.

The motion was seconded by Councillor R Packham, who added that the Council and Members must demonstrate their dedication to the sentiments within the motion and act where it was needed.

Discussion took place on the motion and comments were made by Members in support of the motion.

Some Members expressed their concern that anti-Semitism was again becoming more prevalent and emphasised the importance of every individual being able to practice their religion. There was some debate around the separation of anti-Semitism with criticism of the state of Israel, but the overwhelming opinion of Members was that this motion should be adopted.

A vote was taken on the motion, with all in favour; the motion was therefore agreed.

RESOLVED:

To agree the above motion.

70 THE BUDGET, RESERVES AND BALANCES 2020/21

Karen Iveson, Chief Finance Officer presented the report which provided the Council with assurance on the proposed budget and the Council's reserves in order to formally set the budget and Council Tax for 2020-21.

The Chief Finance Officer confirmed that she felt that the Council's budget proposals were robust and that the reserves were adequate.

RESOLVED:

To consider the Chief Finance Officer's statements in paragraphs 2.6 and 2.12 of the report when setting the Council Tax.

REASON FOR DECISION:

To provide Council with assurance on the proposed budget and the Council's reserves in order to formally set the budget and Council Tax for 2020-21.

71 REVENUE BUDGET AND CAPITAL PROGRAMME 2020/21 AND MEDIUM TERM FINANCIAL PLAN

Councillor Lunn, Lead Executive Member for Finance and Resources provided a presentation on Executive's proposed revenue budget, capital programmes and outline Programme for Growth, for 2020-21 to 2022/23. The proposed

budget also set out recommendations for formal Council Tax setting.

The key elements of the presentation were as follows:

- A Band D Council Tax increase of £5 was proposed for 2020/21 which was in accordance with the approved Medium Term Financial Strategy.
- The 2020/21 budgets showed a forecasted balanced budget, after taking into account planned savings and reserve transfers.
- In 2020/21 it was proposed that £10.46m be transferred to the Special Projects Reserve to support delivery of the new Council Plan objectives. In accordance with the approved Medium Term Financial Strategy (MTFS), the allocation of these receipts would be subject to confirmation as part of the next MTFS refresh and budget for 2021/22 although indicatively, it was planned that these would be allocated to the Programme for Growth.
- The Medium Term Financial Plan (3 year budget) showed there was an underlying gap between core spending and current assumed core funding as a result of New Homes Bonus being phased out, and the renewable energy business rates windfalls ceasing. Beyond 2020/21 the Council awaited the outcome of the Government's Fair Funding Review, further consultation on the future of New Homes Bonus and reform of the Business Rates Retention System, to confirm the need for and level of future savings.
- Whilst there was capacity in reserves to smooth the impact of savings and manage risk, the on-going use of reserves to support the revenue budget was not a long term sustainable solution, and therefore achievement of efficiency savings and additional income generation remained crucial as plans for Business Rates and Council Tax growth were brought to fruition.
- The proposed budget also included recurring revenue budget growth proposals along with Capital Programme proposals for the General Fund and Housing Revenue Account (HRA), which were funded from reserves, external funding and borrowing, along with outline proposals for an extended Programme for Growth.
- The draft budget proposals had been subject to public consultation, scrutiny by the Policy Review Committee and briefings for all Councillors. The results of the consultation along with proposed officer responses were appended to the report as were the minutes of Policy Review Committee.

Members debated the budget proposals before them, with concerns being raised around the volume of new homes being built that did not have the necessary associated infrastructure to support them.

Amendments to the recommendations in the budget report were proposed and seconded. Members discussed the amendments, some expressing their support for it as it gave more Councillors an influence on how money was

being spent at the Council. The importance of helping those living in the most deprived areas was emphasised.

Other Members disagreed and felt strongly that the proposals in the amendment would increase bureaucracy and the demand on Officer time.

Some Councillors agreed with the recommendation in the budget to increase the council tax by £5 in order to prevent a widening funding gap in the future. However, others felt that savings targets should be met before increasing council tax and that any increase equated to less money in the pockets of residents of the district.

Members felt that the P4G funding should be spent on more environmental projects in order to improve cleanliness and tackle fly tipping and the dumping of rubbish that was a real issue in some parts of the district.

The potential for better collaborative working between the different groups on the Council was also discussed, as well as the opportunities that this could afford for better collaborative working by Members and being able to make a real difference for local people.

A vote was taken on the amendment with 30 in favour and 1 against. The amendment was therefore carried.

In line with the Local Authorities (Standing Orders) (England) (Amendment) Regulations 2014, the Chairman explained that a recorded vote must be taken on the amended proposals which had been put forward as outlined in the report.

For the proposal: 29

Councillors K Arthur, D Brook, D Buckle, J Cattnach, I Chilvers, J Chilvers, M Crane, S Duckett, J Duggan, K Ellis, K Franks, T Grogan, E Jordan, M Jordan, A Lee, C Lunn, D Mackay, J Mackman, R Musgrave, W Nichols, B Packham, C Pearson, N Reader, J Shaw-Wright, S Shaw-Wright, R Sweeting, M Topping, P Welburn and P Welch

Against the proposal: 2

Councillors J McCartney and M McCartney

RESOLVED:

- i) To approve the revenue budgets, savings, capital programme and programme for Growth at Appendices A to E;**
- ii) To agree the increase in Council Tax by £5 to £183.22 for a Band D property for 2020/21;**
- iii) To approve the formal Council Tax resolution set out in Appendix I;**
- iv) To agree the transfer of the Surplus of £3.176m on the HRA to the**

Major Repairs Reserve to support the capital programme.

- v) To carry out a full review of the use of Green Energy Rebates and New Homes Bonus insofar as these are utilised to fund P4G projects by:**
 - a) Considering the reallocation of the unspent P4G budget relating to abandoned or unsustainable projects where there is no progress, as part of the annual process set out below; and**
 - b) With the exception of salaries and the Town Centre Action Plans, which are supported and are recommended for inclusion in the budget, considering which new projects for the P4G (included in Appendix E2 of the agenda, and other projects suggested in respect of (vi) below), should be pursued, utilising any savings from the above, and the approximately £18 million pounds that is expected to be transferred to the SPR over the next two financial years; and**
 - c) When reviewing P4G projects to consider establishing a Programme 4 People (P4P) within the P4G budget, identifying projects, the aim of which would be to enhance the environment of the District and the lives of our residents by improving access to facilities, and addressing infrastructure shortcomings.**
- vi) To involve all Councillors in this process by:**
 - a) Inviting all Councillors to put forward ideas for projects either individually or in Groups.**
 - b) Holding an 'Ideas Lab', involving all Councillors, to discuss suggestions for projects, express their views on each option (including Appendix E2 projects), and request advice from Officers on their proposals.**
 - c) Requiring Officers to compile a report outlining projects proposed at the 'Ideas Lab' and Appendix E2 projects and their views on financial and operational feasibility and potential costs.**
 - d) Following the Executive's consideration of this report, for the Executive to submit a report to Full Council giving their view on the Officer's report and their recommendations. The final decision, following consideration of the Executive's views, would be taken by Full Council and become part of the Council's budget for the next financial year. This would allow all Councillors to have a considered input into what projects the Council undertake.**
 - e) To repeat the 'Ideas Lab' at a frequency proposed by the**

Executive and agreed by Council to review existing and propose new ideas for P4G and P4P projects.

REASON FOR DECISION:

To ensure the Executive's budget proposals are fully funded for 2020-21.

72 PAY POLICY STATEMENT 2020/21

Councillor Crane, Leader of the Council, presented the report which sought approval of the Council's Pay Policy Statement 2020-21 in accordance with section 38 of the Localism Act 2011.

It was noted this report had to be produced each year.

RESOLVED:

To approve the Pay Policy Statement for 2020-21.

REASON FOR DECISION:

To comply with Localism Act 2011 (the Act) to prepare a Pay Policy Statement articulating the Council's policy towards the pay of the workforce.

73 URGENT DECISION TO INCREASE THE CAPITAL FUNDING TO COMPLETE THE WHEELED BIN DISTRIBUTION FOR NEW RECYCLING SERVICE

The Chief Executive explained to Members the reasons for the urgent decision for additional funding to complete the distribution of wheeled bins for recycling to all domestic properties in the district.

A report to Council on 17 September 2019 had recommended the purchase and distribution of 74,400 wheeled bins at an estimated cost of £1.35 million, including an estimated cost of distributing the bins. The procurement exercises for the procurement of bins and the distribution had resulted in a revised budget requirement of £1.42 million to complete the distribution of bins to all domestic properties, for service commencement at the start of April 2020 as planned.

Members queried how and why the estimated cost had been different from the original figures. The Chief Executive explained that the costs had originally been worked out on a basis of per household, not per bin, which had caused the discrepancy.

RESOLVED:

To note the urgent decision of the Chief Executive after consultation with the Chairmen of the Scrutiny and Policy Review Committees and previously reported to the Executive meeting on 5 February 2020. The increase in the capital programme for this scheme was for £74,725 from an

original budget of £1.35 million to £1.42 million.

REASON FOR DECISION:

Due to the urgent nature of the decision it had not been included on the Forward Plan; in accordance with Rule 5.6 (Special Urgency) the Chief Executive has obtained the agreement of the Chairs of the Scrutiny Committee and Policy Review Committees that the decision may reasonably be regarded as urgent.

74 CALENDAR OF MEETINGS 2020/21

Councillor Crane, Leader of the Council presented the report which asked Council to consider and approve the attached Calendar of Meetings for 2020-21.

Two amendments to the calendar were proposed and seconded; these were to move the date of Annual Council in May 2020 and Budget Council in February 2021.

It was subsequently agreed that Annual Council in May 2020 would be held on Tuesday 19 May 2020, and that Budget Council in February 2021 would be held on Thursday 18 February 2021.

RESOLVED:

To approve the Calendar of Meetings for 2020-21, subject to the amendments the Council dates set out above.

REASON FOR DECISION:

To enable the proper functioning of the Council in the 2020-21 municipal year.

75 TREASURY MANAGEMENT STRATEGY

Councillor Lunn, Lead Executive Member for Finance and Resources presented the report which presented for approval the proposed Treasury Management Strategy together with the Minimum Revenue Provision Policy Statement, Annual Investment Strategy for 2020/21, Capital Strategy 2020/21 and Prudential Indicators 2020/21 as required by the Ministry for Housing, Communities and Local Government and CIPFA (as updated 2017). A review of CIPFA's Commercial Property Investment Guidance (issued in autumn 2019) has also been undertaken.

The capital expenditure plans for the next three years, along with re-profiled budgets carried forward from 2019/20 totalled £42m, which included Housing Delivery projects and Programme for Growth. Given the anticipated level of expenditure, whilst there were no immediate plans to externally borrow, authorised borrowing limits remained at £90m to enable prudent assessment of the Council's borrowing needs over the year.

Cash balances were expected to remain relatively high over the three-year period, whilst Programme for Growth projects were still in progress, and due to re-profiled capital plans. The Council would continue to adopt the NYCC investment strategy for cash balances, along with consideration of other alternative investment opportunities, where considered prudent and operating within CIPFA's investment guidance.

There were no comments from Members on the report.

RESOLVED:

- i) That the Operational Borrowing Limit for 2020/21 be set at £85m.
- ii) That the Authorised Borrowing Limit for 2020/21 be set at £90m
- iii) To delegate authority to the Chief Finance Officer to effect movement within the agreed authorised boundary limits for long-term borrowing for 2020/21 onwards.
- iv) To delegate authority to the Chief Finance Officer to effect movement within the agreed operational boundary limits for long-term borrowing for 2020/21 onwards.
- v) To approve the treasury management strategy statement 2020/21.
- vi) To approve the minimum revenue provision policy statement for 2020/21.
- vii) To approve the treasury management investment strategy for 2020/21.
- viii) To approve the prudential indicators for 2020/21 which reflected the capital expenditure plans which were affordable, prudent and sustainable.
- ix) To approve the Capital Strategy for 2020/21.

REASON FOR DECISION:

To ensure the Council's Treasury Management Strategy and associated policies are prudent and affordable.

76 URGENT ACTION

There was no urgent action.

The meeting closed at 8.24 pm.