

Council

Venue: Microsoft Teams - Remote
Date: Thursday, 18 February 2021
Time: 6.00 pm

Present: Councillor D Mackay in the Chair

Councillors J Duggan (Vice-Chair), K Arthur, D Brook, D Buckle, J Cattanach, 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, C Pearson, N Reader, J Shaw-Wright, R Sweeting, M Topping and P Welch

Officers Present: Janet Waggott – Chief Executive, Alison Hartley – Solicitor to the Council, Dave Caulfield – Director of Economic Regeneration and Place, Karen Iveson – Chief Finance Officer, Suzan Harrington – Director of Corporate Services and Commissioning, Peter Williams – Head of Finance, Martin Grainger – Head of Planning, Victoria Foreman – Democratic Services Officer

37 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors R Packham and S Shaw-Wright.

38 DISCLOSURES OF INTEREST

There were no disclosures of interest.

39 MINUTES

The Council considered the minutes of the meeting held on 15 December 2020.

RESOLVED:

To approve the minutes of the Council meeting held on 15 December 2020 for signing by the Chairman.

40 COMMUNICATIONS

There were no communications.

41 ANNOUNCEMENTS

There were no announcements.

42 PETITIONS

There were no petitions.

43 PUBLIC QUESTIONS

There were no public questions.

44 COUNCILLORS' QUESTIONS

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

Question One

Councillor J McCartney asked question one which related to untidy land and the Council's approach in tackling it.

The Leader explained that the Council had asked the landowner to remedy the situation, but that a dispute had ensued following damage to items in question during removal. If it was not removed, the Council would investigate the option of legal action.

Councillor J McCartney expressed his frustration at the amount of time taken to remove the items in question.

Question Two

Councillor M McCartney asked a question relating to the timing of the consultation on the Council's Local Plan Preferred Options Report.

The Leader stated that that it was the wrong time for local government reorganisation work to be undertaken in North Yorkshire, but that when it came to the Local Plan, the Council had been given clear instructions by central government that every authority had to have an up-to-date Local Plan and Five-Year Housing Land Supply. As such, the work being undertaken by Officer had to continue, and the need for a housing land supply was especially important in order to prevent development in the district that both Members and residents would not want. Local authorities had asked the government for more time due to the pandemic, but they had not been forthcoming with extensions of time.

Councillor M McCartney asked a supplemental question regarding the future

of the Council's Local Plan should devolution go ahead.

The Leader explained that should, for example, a North Yorkshire unitary model be decided upon, each local authority's Local Plan would be amalgamated into a single county-wide plan, until the time came for one overarching plan to be developed for the whole county.

Question Three

Councillor J McCartney asked a question about the fly tipping of tyres in the district.

The Lead Executive Member for Housing, Health and Culture described to Members how the Council relied on local people to report fly tipping in the district, and that Officers had been working with other local authorities such as Doncaster and Leeds to try to identify the source of the tyres. In 2019-20 there had been 50 incidents, and in 2020-21 35 to date, which was a reduction. However, even one occurrence was too many. The Council had deployed CTV units that were operational 24/7 and had numerous fixed penalty notices and fines at its disposal to issue to those caught fly tipping, littering, dog fouling or failing in household duty of care. The income current from fines and fixed penalty notices was around £5,800.

Councillor J McCartney asked a supplemental question, asking what was being done by the Council and other local authorities to track down the origins of the tyres.

The Lead Executive Member for Housing, Health and Culture acknowledged that it was very difficult to trace the source of the tyres, and that they were often dumped across the whole district.

Question Four

Councillor J McCartney asked a question about the publication date of the Council's Infrastructure Delivery Plan, which was associated with the Local Plan Preferred Options sites, and when it would be available in order for sites to be properly assessed and enable residents to receive answers to their questions.

The Deputy Leader and Lead Executive Member for Place Shaping clarified the purpose of the Local Infrastructure Plan and confirmed that the Council had been working with several infrastructure providers including the County Council, healthcare providers, Highways England and utility providers. The Plan would establish the importance of the local infrastructure required to support proposals set out in the Local Plan; it would constitute a key piece of evidence at the Local Plan's publicity stage which would be in early 2022. Officers had already identified a number of requirements, with further work to be undertaken in the coming months on specific costs for improvements to the district's highways network, utilities, healthcare and flood and water management. All of these elements would be factored into an assessment for

the viability and deliverability of the sites at the publication stage of the plan.

Councillor McCartney felt that not enough background work had been done by the Council into any prospective sites, and that the Infrastructure Delivery Plan should have been completed already.

The Deputy Leader and Lead Executive Member for Place Shaping stated that it was an emerging plan, with information being gathered constantly. Over 400 sites had been submitted by landowners, and as such it was not practical to evidence the required infrastructure for all of them; therefore, Officers would be bringing forward preferred options and asking for comments on these instead. Infrastructure was a key part of this work; residents were urged to comment on the plans and await detailed propositions in a year's time.

45 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 and added that he had heard nothing more about the timetable for local government reorganisation but was expecting to hear from the government by the end of February 2021, after which the consultation would begin. The Leader also stated that he had that week heard that there would be further negotiations on the devolution deal put forward by the local authorities in North Yorkshire; these were expected to happen over the next few weeks.

A query was raised regarding the need to go into Part II to discuss elements of the following matter, relating to the Summit Leisure Centre and its future, particularly if it would open again, and if the Council would have to pay back any of the grants from Sport England for the build.

It was clarified by the Chief Executive that if the information was already publicly available, it would not be necessary to move into Part II. However, if discussions entered the realm of future negotiations, it may be advisable to move into private session later in the meeting. The Solicitor to the Council was in agreement with the Chief Executive's advice to Members, and as such, the Chair stated that any discussions relating to the question should be undertaken in Part II.

Another question was submitted to the Leader regarding the proposed unitary arrangements in North Yorkshire and whether residents' views would truly be taken into account as part of the consultation. The Leader explained that the government had published a list of who would be consulted with and had also stated that any parish/town council or individual could make representations, but that at the conclusion of the process it would be a government decision.

Councillor Richard Musgrave, Deputy Leader and Lead Executive Member for Place Shaping

The Deputy Leader of the Council presented his update on the work he had recently undertaken, as outlined in his report and added that he had attended the majority of the public enquiry relating to the site at Main Street, Church Fenton, for which a decision was expected from the Planning Inspectorate by the end of the month.

Members asked about responses to the Councils' Local Plan consultation and for an update on the work; the Deputy Leader confirmed that there were still three weeks left for the consultation, but that engagement had been promising with thousands of interactions online on the matter.

A question was asked about the new Officer role relating to the Council's carbon capture work, including the proposed salary and if evaluations from the Officer be considered by the Executive and then full Council. The Deputy Leader was unable to reveal the salary but could confirm that there was a strong shortlist of candidates, with the low carbon work (including that of the Low Carbon Working Group) progressing very well. It was important that all elements of the Council's services were included in the carbon capture work. Significant progress had been made in the first quarter of 2021, with detailed proposals to be brought forward for Members' consideration soon. It was key that costs did not spiral out of control and that the work was not rushed; the goal was still for the Council to be carbon neutral by 2030.

A query was raised around the current vacancies in the Planning Department, which the Deputy Leader explained was as a result of the planning service review through which the Council was ensuring that its Development Management and Planning Policy Teams were fit for purpose. Good progress was being made recruiting to the roles, with two PPU vacancies having been interviewed for and offered to candidates. The roles in the Development Management and Planning Policy Teams had also been shortlisted and interviews would be forthcoming.

Another question was asked in relation to the Low Carbon Action Plan, specifically as to why recruitment for the Low Carbon Officer was taking place when the action plan had not yet been signed off by the Executive. The Deputy Leader explained that decisions related to recruitment were within the remit of Officers but confirmed that good progress was being made with the low carbon work and that resources would be required to take it further forward.

Members thanked Planning Officers for their continued work on the Local Plan and queried whether responses had been received from the people of the Tadcaster area, who were hopeful of the proposals in the plan. The Deputy Leader had been pleased to attend a meeting of Tadcaster Town Council in the previous week, and explained that as the consultation was still ongoing, he was unable to give any detail around where responses had come from and how many. There were some transformative plans being put forward for the future of Tadcaster in both the Local Plan and the Places and Movement Study, both of which would hopefully get a lot of engagement from local people.

A further question was raised around the recruitment of the Low Carbon Officer, the role's reporting line and whether this would be submitted for consideration to the Low Carbon Working Group and the Council. The Deputy Leader explained that the reporting line for the role would be through the Officer management structure. In terms of its political placement, the role would come under his portfolio, with updates being reported through him as Lead Executive Member, the Low Carbon Working Group, the Executive and also full Council as necessary; the precise arrangements would be clarified in due course. It was noted that the Low Carbon Working Group had asked that it be able to continue its work which had been undertaken on a cross party basis; the Deputy Leader was pleased that this had been requested and looked forward to working with them in the future.

The matter of the new SEND school in Osgodby was raised, in particular its absence from the Local Plan which, according to Officers, was due to the proposals having been submitted to the Department for Education and the subsequent wait for a planning application being submitted to the Council. Members asked for confirmation that the site would remain marked for the school which was sorely needed in the local area. The Deputy Leader stated that he had also noticed its absence from the submission and had contacted North Yorkshire County Council himself to check. He was sure that representations for the use of that site, including those from the County Council, would now come forward. Any applications for the site would be subject to consideration by Planning Committee. Those Members of the Council who served on Planning Committee would need to keep an open mind about the scheme.

Concerns were raised by some Members about the lack of Local Plan leaflet delivery in some areas of the district, as well as difficulty accessing the information online and the volume and complicated nature of the documentation. The Deputy Leader confirmed that a leaflet had been sent out to over 41,000 properties across the area, but that this was only one way in which engagement with local people had been undertaken by the Council. The development of the Local Plan was a long and legal process, and there had been some positive feedback on the published information; the content of it had been made as simple and straight forward as possible. The Planning Policy Team were also available to speak to residents should they so wish.

Councillor C Lunn, Lead Executive Member for Finance and Resources

The Lead Executive Member presented his update on the work he had recently undertaken, as outlined in his report and added that there had been a number of queries around business grants that the Council had administered to local businesses during the coronavirus pandemic. Members noted that this was a very complex issue, and that the Council had been issued with nine different grant schemes since the first lockdown, some of which had included policy set by central government, others which the Council itself had needed to develop. The Policy Review Committee, at its forthcoming meeting on 16 March 2021, would be considering and scrutinising business grants in detail;

the Lead Executive Member confirmed that he would be in attendance at the meeting.

A question was asked if more could be done to support the licensed trades; it was explained that the Council's business support grants for some licensed premises to pay were getting passed on to the breweries. The Lead Executive Member explained that when the grants were issued to the Council by the government, instructions were given alongside them, which had to be followed. Some of the instructions were in place to avoid fraudulent applications. The government were trying to ensure that grants were issued to any businesses that had 'fallen through the net', but Officers had to operate the process in the precise way the government had instructed them to.

Lastly, the Lead Executive Member echoed Members' thanks to the Officers who had worked so hard on the administration and management of business grants during the pandemic.

Councillor D Buckle, Lead Executive Member for Communities and Economic Development

The Lead Executive Member presented his update on the work he had recently undertaken, as outlined in his report and added that the upgrades to electric vehicle charging points and ticket machines in the Council's car parks would take place in mid-March 2021. Members noted that the machines would be taking both card and coin payments.

In relation to the Transforming Cities Fund for the Selby Station Gateway, the Lead Executive Member explained that there would shortly be a media release about the project, including a presentation for Ward Members showing the proposed plans. All Members of the Council would receive a copy of the plans before they were made public; the Council were encouraged to engage with as many people and organisations as possible about the plans to ensure good levels of feedback.

A question was raised regarding the future of the Natwest Bank in Tadcaster, which seemed to have damaged and potentially dangerous masonry. The Lead Executive Member expressed his frustration at the state of the building and had raised it with Officers, who had advised that some 'shop wrap' could be installed on the windows to make it look more presentable than the boarding. There had previously been two interested parties who had indicated they wished to develop it into a retail unit; unfortunately, due to the pandemic, both potential deals had fallen through. However, with the development of the Local Plan it was clear that the bank was a key asset for Tadcaster and should be reassessed by the Council for other uses.

A second query was raised regarding a live planning application; Officers advised that it was inappropriate for discussion at full Council.

Firstly, Members queried if rural areas were going to be considered as part of the Places and Movement Study and not just larger settlements such as

Selby, Tadcaster and Sherburn, particularly in relation to highways infrastructure. Secondly, with regards to economic development, the potential move of Clipper Logistics from Olympia Park was questioned. Lastly, numerous enquiries had been received around economic development and potential employment land in relation to the Local Plan; the importance of planning for economic growth in the district was emphasised and as such it was queried whether the current allowances in the Local Plan were sufficient.

The Lead Executive Member confirmed that the A63 roundabout was marked for an upgrade due to the amount of housing development and industrial upgrades that were due in the surrounding areas. Some CIL money that had been generated as a result of a site in Sherburn had meant that traffic lights in the area were upgraded to facilitate better traffic flow. Members were pleased to note that the Places and Movement Study would be beneficial for the whole of Selby district.

It was explained to the Council that as Clipper Logistics did a large amount of online business, they would be taking on an additional site in Sherburn, resulting in the biggest deal of its kind in the country so far this year, with the creation of approximately 1,000 additional jobs. Despite the pandemic, the Council was receiving some excellent enquiries about the area from a number of businesses. Several sites around the district were very promising with the potential for well paid, good quality jobs in the years to come. The Local Plan consultation proposed 110ha of employment land, and there were numerous policies to support such development set out in it.

A further question was submitted regarding works undertaken between Riccall and York by Sustrans; Members asked what further assistance could be provided for routes between Selby and York.

The Lead Executive Member emphasised the importance of cycling and walking routes in the district. There was the potential for funding from the Local Enterprise Partnership (LEP) to do some improvement works, but further detailed information would need to be provided to Members after the meeting.

Members thanked the Lead Executive Member for the Council's work in supporting job opportunities in the Sherburn area but expressed concern that around 90% of the employment on the industrial estate fell within the 'low pay/no pay' category, and did not offer life-time full employment or career progression. As such, given the amount of building and development planned for Sherburn, it was queried what else the Council could do to promote other sectors coming to Sherburn.

The Lead Executive Member acknowledged that a few years ago it had been noted that around 90% of people working in Sherburn were imported from outside of the area. As a result, the Council was now more particular, especially on Sherburn 2, about employers and businesses coming into the district. The Officer team were more aware of the situation and were working hard with landowners to ensure that the area was attracting top paid companies. There was also evidence that the figure of 90% had come down,

and that despite the current pandemic there were plenty of jobs available on the industrial estates.

A question was asked regarding some of the land near the footbridge over the river in Selby, and if it could be made into recreational land for the people of the town. The Lead Executive Member suggested that the matter be raised at the Member briefing the following day at which the appropriate Officers would be present to consider it. There was an enhancement scheme planned for both sides of the river that the footbridge would cross.

Councillor C Pearson, Lead Executive Member for Housing, Health and Culture

The Lead Executive Member presented his update on the work he had recently undertaken, as outlined in his report.

A question regarding housing repairs was asked, specifically around waiting times for such works to be undertaken for council housing tenants. The Lead Executive Member confirmed that some members of the Housing Team had been supporting people in the community during the pandemic. Repairs were being assessed on a basis of urgency and worked through steadily, but there was a lengthy list of works required. The Council would do all it could to get round to all the repairs as soon as possible.

A second question was asked relating to the use of small vehicles on some of the back lanes and smaller roads in Selby, such as Darcy Road, for waste collection, and the details of decisions relating to this. An initial response had been received by the questioner confirming that it was not the intention to revert back to collecting from the rear of properties, but it seemed a decision had been taken without consulting Ward Members.

The Lead Executive Member explained that the small vehicles had been purchased to access difficult to reach areas but not specifically for use on back lanes. However, the Council did provide assisted collections if residents needed help and would also return the bins to these same locations. The Lead Executive Member confirmed that further clarification and information would be requested from Officers and a written reply forwarded to Members for information.

Members also commented on an HMO (Houses in Multiple Occupation), specifically some issues around a couple of properties on Brook Street in Selby, and how the conditions that some people were living in were worrying.

Further concerns were raised again around housing repairs in the district, which were not being undertaken in a timely manner. There had been an example some Members had seen via the local MP's office of a woman fleeing domestic violence, who had initially been turned down for a repair; it was only through the intervention of the MP that the repairs were completed. Members asked who had set the repairs policy and why they had been set as they had and requested that the matter be investigated urgently by the Lead Executive

Member and Officers.

The Lead Executive Member confirmed that he would take up this matter and come back to Members on it. It was noted that the Council was steadily making progress with housing repairs, but that some were being prioritised and assessed by urgency.

A query was submitted regarding tree planting in the district, particularly how many trees had been planted in the last year by the Council.

The Lead Executive Member was unsure of the exact figure and would need to make enquiries on the matter but would come back to Members with the information when he had received it.

Members asked further questions around fixed penalties, specifically relating to how they were being paid, the fixed limit for court prosecutions, the harsher fines and sentencing for large amounts of fly tipping, the time frames and criteria for housing repairs, and lastly the tracking of the disposal of tyres for all garages in the district.

The Lead Executive Member confirmed that every fixed penalty had been paid in full. With regards to fly tipping prosecutions, Members noted that the courts had a backlog of cases at present and as such were trying not to deal with more minor claims. However, if the amount fly tipped was very large the Council would take the offender to court, but it could take some time for it to be heard. When it came to housing repairs, the timescales were 25 days for a minor repair, 5 days for urgent and 1 day for emergency; not every repair could be resolved instantly. Members were given examples of what qualified as an emergency or urgent repair.

A number of Members indicated that there were some serious concerns around housing repairs and as such, that the matter should be referred to the Scrutiny Committee for urgent consideration at its next meeting in March 2021. This was proposed, seconded and agreed by the Council.

RESOLVED:

- 1. To receive and note the reports from the Executive.**
- 2. To refer the matter of housing repairs to Scrutiny Committee for consideration.**

46 REPORTS FROM COMMITTEES

Report of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee

There was no report from the Overview and Scrutiny Committee.

Councillor Andrew Lee, Chair 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 work of the Low Carbon Working Group and White Rose Forest Partnership.

The Chair explained that the Low Carbon Working Group had made great strides and produced action plan that, as it stood, would take carbon emissions to net zero in ten years. The action plan had been considered by the Executive who had requested that further scoping work be undertaken; the Working Group were in broad agreement with this suggestion. The enhanced action plan, which was being worked on by Officers, would then be presented to the Executive for approval. Members noted that there were several interventions and business cases within the plan that would need to be costed up to ensure value for money.

With regards to tree planting, the Chair of Policy Review reported that at the last meeting of the Policy Review Committee it had been agreed that the number of trees to be planted in the district, in conjunction with the White Rose Forest Partnership, should be increased.

The input of Members into the development of the Working Group and the Committee itself had been meaningful; the Chair was pleased that as a Council, such a robust plan had been developed by Members for the future.

A second query was raised regarding when the tree planting would commence in the Selby area; the Chair of Policy Review stated that the Council had committed to a considerable increase in the number of trees across the district over the coming years, in conjunction with the White Rose Forest Partnership. Partnership working to identify pieces of land on which to plant trees was key to the project, as well as articulating to landowners the benefits of tree planting on their land; the fact that the agreement had been reached and the process had begun was a positive step forward. The Chair confirmed that he was happy to keep Members updated with the tree planting progress. The Lead Executive Member for Place Shaping expressed his support for the tree planting project.

Councillor E Jordan left the meeting at this point and did not return.

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.

It was proposed, seconded and agreed by the Council to note the reports.

RESOLVED:

To note the reports.

47 MOTIONS

There were no motions.

48 THE BUDGET, RESERVES AND BALANCES 2021/22

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 2021-22.

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 2.7 and 2.13 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 2021-22.

49 PROPOSED REVENUE BUDGET AND CAPITAL PROGRAMME 2021/22 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 2021-22 to 2022-23. The proposed budget also set out recommendations for formal Council Tax setting.

The key elements of the presentation were as follows:

- The proposals before Members were approved by the Executive at their meeting on 4 February 2021 following briefings for political groups, public consultation and consideration by Policy Review Committee.
- The budget had been set against the backdrop of Covid-19 and the prospect of local government reorganisation in North Yorkshire, a time of unprecedented risk and uncertainty.
- The proposed budget delivered the necessary financial investment to meet the Council's stated priorities, balanced the investment of cash windfalls with future financial sustainability, and allocated resources and reserves to support financial resilience and manage risk.
- Savings had been delayed to 2023-24 with limited discretionary growth; there was to be a focus on delivering existing plans.
- Members noted the General Fund £22.5m net revenue budget, with a

precept of £5.875m. The final Local Government Finance Settlement amount was a rollover of 2020-21 with some additional one-off funding of circa £1.6m. Due to on-going Covid impacts and the prospect of local government review, the budget included substantial contingencies.

- There was £184k of savings, with the rest to be reprofiled out to 2023-24. The overall net cost of £2.1m (after Council Tax, Business Rates and other government funding) would be covered by the Business Rates Equalisation Reserve.
- It was proposed that there would be a freeze in the Band D charge, remaining at £183.22 in 2021-22. The tax base was 32,064.65 (showing 0.24% growth), and the precept being calculated from multiplying the base with the Band D charge; this equalled £5,874,885.
- With regards to the Housing Revenue Account (HRA) there was an £8.7m net revenue budget with a surplus of £3.6m (available for major repairs). A rent increase of 1.5% had been approved by the Executive in January 2021 from an average of £84.98 in 2020/21 to £86.37 in 2021/22, on a 48-week basis. It also included £195k of planned savings. The capital programme would require a drawdown of funds from the Major Repairs Reserve.
- Members noted that there were numerous budget risks, including the on-going Covid impacts on services such as leisure, key income streams being under pressure, delays in savings delivery, the development of a new government funding formula, rates retention being under review, including renewable energy business rates receipts; the future was uncertain as the Council approached a potential system reset from 2022/23. Lastly, the New Homes Bonus was also to be reviewed, with a consultation launched recently.
- Risk mitigation had been considered with contingency budgets available; there was £2.4m in the General Fund and £75k in the HRA. Reserves were used to plan for long term commitments and provide a buffer to manage risks, as well as providing a resource to fund capital programmes.
- There were significant revenue and capital investments already planned over the next three years; in total amounting to approximately £1.61m in the General Fund Capital Programme, £22.1m in the HRA Capital Programme and £10.6m in the Programme for Growth. Programmes funded through earmarked reserves established for this purpose and capital receipts, and where appropriate the Council would go through the Public Works Lending Board for borrowing.
- The Lead Executive Member concluded that the budget before the Council was one to steer through a time of crisis and unprecedented risk and uncertainty. It was a budget to ensure that vital public services continued, as well as supporting the authority's delivery of its own priorities.

Members considered and debated the budget proposals before them, expressing their support for the Council's freezing of the Council Tax, but also their concerns for losses from the Council Tax base. Some Members were disappointed that North Yorkshire County Council had not also frozen their Council Tax. Further issues were raised around the rental increase which would particularly affect people from low incomes, some of whom were living in the Council's housing stock.

A question was asked around how much incomes there would be from the 1.5% rental increase; the Lead Executive Member for Finance and Resources explained that the rent proposed was less than it was five years ago, and that there was also additional help for those in need which was offered by central government.

The Lead Executive Member and the Leader stated that rents had gone down over a number of years and underlined that all rental income from Council properties went back into the HRA and was spent on improving the housing stock and conditions for those tenants living in them.

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

For the proposal: 25

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

Against the proposal: 0

RESOLVED: That

- i) the revenue budgets, savings, capital programme and programme for Growth at Appendices A to E be approved;**
- ii) Council Tax be frozen at £183.22 for a Band D property for 2021/22;**
- iii) the formal Council Tax resolution set out in Appendix I be approved; and**
- iv) the surplus of £3.589m on the HRA be transferred to the Major Repairs Reserve to support the capital programme.**

REASON FOR DECISION:

To ensure the Executive's budget proposals are fully funded for 2021-22.

50 PAY POLICY STATEMENT 2021/22

Councillor Crane, Leader of the Council, presented the report which sought approval of the Council's Pay Policy Statement 2021-22 in accordance with section 38 of the Localism Act 2011.

RESOLVED:

To approve the Pay Policy Statement for 2021-22.

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.

51 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 2021/22, Capital Strategy 2021/22 and Prudential Indicators 2021/22 as required by the Ministry for Housing, Communities and Local Government and CIPFA.

Members noted the capital expenditure plans for the next three years, along with re-profiled budgets carried forward from 2020/21 total £48.62m, 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 were set at £78m to enable prudent assessment of the Council's borrowing needs over the year.

Councillor Lunn also explained that cash balances were expected to remain relatively high over the three-year period, whilst Programme for Growth projects were still in progress, 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.

A question was asked by Members regarding the potential increase in interest rates, and how this would affect the Council's own interest rates. Councillor Lunn explained that it would not affect the rates the Council paid but would affect those on the monies it lent. The rates paid by the authority were set through the Public Works Lending Board at fixed rates for a fixed term.

RESOLVED: That

- i) the Operational Borrowing Limit for 2021/22 be set at £73m.**
- ii) the Authorised Borrowing Limit for 2021/22 be set at £78m.**

- iii) Councillors delegate authority to the Chief Finance Officer to effect movement within the agreed authorised boundary limits for long-term borrowing for 2021/22 onwards.
- iv) Councillors delegate authority to the Chief Finance Officer to effect movement within the agreed operational boundary limits for long-term borrowing for 2021/22 onwards.
- v) the treasury management strategy statement 2021/22 be approved.
- vi) the minimum revenue provision policy statement for 2021/22 be approved.
- vii) the treasury management investment strategy for 2021/22 be approved.
- viii) the prudential indicators for 2021/22 which reflect the capital expenditure plans which are affordable, prudent and sustainable be approved.
- ix) the Capital Strategy for 2021/22 be approved.

REASON FOR DECISION:

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

52 SELBY DISTRICT COUNCIL'S MEMBERS' ALLOWANCES SCHEME - THE INDEPENDENT REMUNERATION PANEL'S (IRP) RECOMMENDATIONS TO COUNCIL

The Solicitor to the Council introduced the report which, as per the Local Authorities (Members' Allowances) (England) Regulations 2003, stated that all local authorities had to convene an Independent Remuneration Panel to review and make recommendations on Members' Allowances. The local authority must then consider the recommendations of the Panel before agreeing or amending their Members' Allowances Scheme.

The last review of the Members' Allowances Scheme was undertaken in late 2016 and early 2017. The Local Authorities (Members' Allowances) (England) (Amendment) Regulations 2003 stated that if a scheme was referenced to an index (the current Members scheme is indexed to the National Joint Council (NJC) pay award) then it needed to be reviewed no later than four years from when the scheme was introduced. In light of this, a Panel had been convened and a review undertaken; the recommendations of the Panel were outlined in the report.

Members noted that at page 179 of the agenda the Special Responsibility Allowance (SRA) listed for 'Licensing Committee' should have read 'Chair of Licensing Committee'.

RESOLVED: It was agreed

- i) to amalgamate the ICT allowance with the basic allowance resulting in the ICT allowance also being subject to the annual increase with the NJC pay award; however, to retain the wording relating to guidelines for Members on the usage of their ICT device.**
- ii) to retain all of the special responsibility allowances as currently weighted and outlined in the Members' Allowances Scheme.**
- iii) to incorporate wording under the Travel and Subsistence part of the scheme to allow non-Councillors appointed by the Council to outside bodies to claim mileage or travel costs for attending meetings where representing the Council, provided such expenses were not re-imbursed by the respective Outside Body.**
- iv) to retain the Dependents' / Child Carers' allowance as currently worded in the Members' Allowances' Scheme.**
- v) to retain the Chairman's and Vice Chairman's allowance as currently worded in the Members' Allowances' Scheme.**
- vi) to index the overall Members' Allowances Scheme to match local government pay settlements using the NJC annual pay award until the next review of the scheme.**

53 URGENT ACTION

The Chief Executive reported that on 12 January 2021 Councillor J McCartney had been appointed to Cridling Stubbs Parish Council, in accordance with Section 91 of the Local Government Act 1972, until such time as sufficient councillors were elected or co-opted on to the parish council to restore the quorum.

Lastly, the Chief Executive confirmed that written answers would be sent to Councillor Nichols after the meeting in response to the following two questions:

1. Was the Council charging rent for the use of the Summit (Leisure Centre) as a vaccination centre?
2. If the Summit did not reopen as a leisure centre, would the Council have to pay back some of the grant money that had been awarded to it for its use as a leisure facility?

The meeting closed at 8.16 pm.