

# Council Minutes

Date: 27 February 2014

Time: 6.30 - 8.46 pm

**PRESENT:** Councillor I L McEnnis (in the Chair)

Councillors Mrs J A Adey, K Ahmed, Z Ahmed, M Angell, M C Appleyard, D H G Barnes, I Bates, Mrs L M Clarke OBE, A D Collingwood, R B Colomb, C A Ditta, R Farmer, M A Foster, R Gaffney, J Gibbs, S Graham, A R Green, C B Harriss, A E Hill, Maz Hussain, Mahboob Hussain JP, D A Johncock, Mrs G A Jones, M E Knight, Ms R Knight, Mrs J D Langley, Ms P L Lee, Mrs W J Mallen, N B Marshall, H L McCarthy, R Metcalfe, S F Parker, B E Pearce, B R Pollock JP, J L Richards OBE, J A Savage, R J Scott, C Shafique MBE, D A C Shakespeare OBE, A Slater, T Snaith, Mrs J E Teesdale, Ms J D Wassell, D M Watson and R Wilson.

Honorary Aldermen J M Blanksby, D A E Cox and Mrs P Priestley,

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors D A Anson MBE, W J Bendyshe-Brown, D J Carroll, G C Hall, M Hanif, A Hussain JP, S P Lacey, J A Malliff, Mrs D V E Morgan, Mrs M L Neudecker, A Turner, P R Turner and Ms K S Wood

Honorary Aldermen: E H Collins, M B Oram, R W Jennings and Mrs K M Peatey MBE.

## 78 MINUTES

**RESOLVED:** That the minutes of the meeting of the Council held on 16 December 2013 be approved as a true record and signed by the Chairman subject from the deletion of Honorary Alderman Mrs K M Peatey MBE from amongst the attendees.

## 79 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Councillor B E Pearce declared a personal interest in respect of his question 3 to Councillor N Marshall under Item 6 (Minute 82) Questions from Members, in that he lived within 150 yards of Buckmaster Road Playing Fields the subject of the said question.

In respect of the number of questions regarding Red Kite Community Housing amongst the Public and Member Questions (Minutes 81 and 82) Councillors I L

McEnnis and J L Richards OBE declared a personal interest as Wycombe District Council representatives on the Executive Board of Red Kite Community Housing, whilst Councillors Ms R Knight & Mrs J E Teesdale similarly declared a personal interest in these questions as current tenants of Red Kite Community Housing.

Councillor S Graham declared an interest in Cabinet Minute 79 of the Meeting of 10 February 2014 in that he was a trustee of the Reggie Goves Centre.

All the above Members remained in the chamber during these items.

Councillor Ms J D Wassell declared a new disclosable pecuniary interest in that she had recently purchased a property within Wycombe District, declaring this in respect of the Council Tax Setting / Budget item (Minute 86), remaining in the chamber during this item and taking part in the voting and debates on such.

## **80 CHAIRMAN'S ANNOUNCEMENTS**

The Chairman advised the Meeting of the considerable number of events he had been involved in since the last Full Council meeting, singling out his involvement with the Sir Steve Redgrave Bursary Awards evening when he had met many inspiring local young sportspeople. He also mentioned that on a similar sporting line, he was looking forward to the forthcoming Paralympic Torch lighting event at Stoke Mandeville in respect of the Sochi Winter Paralympics.

The Chairman handed over to Councillor Richard Scott, Leader of the Council, to give an update on the recent Flooding within the District.

The Leader commented on the extensive damage to property in Marlow, Bourne End, Medmenham, Mill End, Skirmett, Radnage and Hughenden, some had even occurred in Saunderton. The Thames had been at its highest level since 1947 added to which was an exceptionally high water table level. As a result 50 plus properties had been affected, a number of roads had been closed and a series of evacuations had taken place.

The Buckinghamshire Fire and Rescue Service had established a mobile HQ during the floods, at Marlow, and had co-ordinated the various emergency services admirably. The District had received visits from Brandon Lewis MP (Under Secretary of State for Department of Communities and Local Government) and Dominic Grieve MP (member for Beaconsfield Constituency inclusive of Marlow and Bourne End). Councillor Scott had met with them both during the co-ordination of the emergency services responses.

The Leader wished to place on record his heartfelt thanks to all the emergency services involved, which had included the Royal Air Force and emergency fire crews from as far away as Staffordshire and Doncaster. A big thank you was also expressed to the local residents affected who had also helped extensively in the response.

Councillor Scott outlined the subsequent concessions granted in respect of flood victims; in that residents affected would receive 3 months' council tax relief,

businesses affected would similarly receive 3 months' business rates relief and a support scheme regarding the recovery of affected businesses which had been put in place by central government.

The Leader reported on the future flood prevention schemes being put forward by the Environment Agency, however there was a funding gap, and Councillor Scott was meeting with Dominic Grieve the following day to discuss the scheme and would keep Members updated. Dialogue had occurred with Buckinghamshire County Council in respect of the appropriate gullies and drains being regularly cleared in future, whilst a more equitable scheme of sand bag distribution was being formulated to ensure in future bags were used by residents most in danger i.e. where there was the greatest need.

## **81 QUESTIONS FROM MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC**

### **(a) Question from Dr L Derrick to the Cabinet Member for Community**

In Dec 2011, WDC sold over 6000 Council homes to Red Kite.

In order to get Government approval for this sale, WDC promised the Government that "receipts from the sale would enable the Council to provide more affordable homes". It said "affordable housing is our key priority" and that the Council anticipated "a considerable increase in affordable housing in the area. "

In order to get the tenants to vote for the sale, WDC promised the tenants that the money from the sale would be used to meet "the housing requirements of local people in housing need".

In Dec 2011, WDC received £18.5m in net receipts as a first instalment from the sale.

In July 2012, I wrote to WDC to ask how many additional homes would be provided with this 18.5m and by when.

The reply from the then Head of Homes and Housing said "The Council will be reviewing the prioritisation of reaching decisions on the allocation of all available capital resources in the autumn. It is not therefore yet possible to provide any indication of whether the Council will directly invest some of the receipts in affordable housing or how many affordable homes might be provided."

So already, 7 months after the sale, the council had broken its promises. From affordable housing being a key priority, WDC was now not even prepared to say that any of the receipts would be spent on affordable housing.

It is now over 2 years after the sale and I am repeating my questions.

How many additional affordable homes has WDC built with the £18.5 million and how much has that cost? And how many additional affordable homes does it plan to build with the £18.5 m and by when?

## **Response by Councillor J M Gibbs (Cabinet Member for Community)**

The Council has not broken its promises. We remain strongly committed to providing affordable homes.

I note you are repeating your question from July 2012, so I would also refer you to the answer that was given to you at that time by the then Leader of the Council. The Council's position was clearly stated in the Cabinet report, ahead of transfer, that the balance of the receipt was intended for the benefit of the wider community.

The Council has kept its promise and fully allocated the net receipt to a range of schemes contained in our approved Major Projects Programme, which will benefit the wider community.

We are dealing with affordable housing separately and the Council holds £1.7m in S106 monies for this purpose. We continue to work with registered social landlords and through the planning system to secure more affordable homes in our district. We have delivered 128 affordable homes since the transfer and will continue to provide as many as we can in the future.

### **Supplementary Question**

Looking at Wycombe District Council's Major Projects Programme for 2013/4 to 2017/8 - £63 million worth of spend. £45.5 million to be spent on the Handy Cross Master plan phase 2 and the New Sports Centre and track. £3million on Travelodge..... And then down the bottom of the page, with no explanation, £478,000 for affordable housing/land purchase. And that's it. No other mention of affordable housing.

So where's the other £18 million gone?

So what does the paper say? Well first, the medium and longer term budget prospects "could not be more uncertain". So in plain English, we don't know whether we will have enough money.

Then the Programme "remains affordable" but it "will be necessary to apply the external borrowing" (LEP - £3.3m). In plain English we haven't got enough money and we will have to take out an external loan of £3.3 m.

And here's the interesting bit, it will be necessary to apply "an element of internal borrowing from other earmarked resources that are available on a temporary funding basis." So Wycombe District Council will need to shift money internally.

So perhaps here's where the £18.5 million has gone?

I suspect that the £18.5 million which WDC promised to spend on affordable housing is being spent on the Handy Cross Master Plan and the Sports Centre. Am I right in thinking that Wycombe District Council is simply renegeing on its promises to provide additional affordable housing with the £18.5 m?

## **Supplementary Response**

As outlined previously, I can give you a simple one word response of 'No' we have not reneged on the promises featured in page 13 of the Housing Transfer offer documents. These stated that the receipts from the transfer would be utilised for the wider community.

## 82 QUESTIONS FROM MEMBERS

### a. Question from Councillor S F Parker to the Cabinet Member for Community

Is the cabinet member for community satisfied that, 14 months after the transfer of WDC housing stock, that Red Kite Housing are consistently serving the best needs of their tenants?

#### **Response from Councillor J M Gibbs (Cabinet Member for Community).**

Since the transfer of the housing stock to Red Kite Community Housing in December 2011 I do believe the needs of the tenants have been exceptionally well served. Red Kite is tenant led, there are a number of tenants on the board, that board is chaired by a tenant. Tenants' interests are paramount to Red Kite.

#### **Supplementary Question**

'Let down', 'stitched up', 'stabbed in the back' these I believe to be comments of a senior member of the majority group in respect of the closure of Red Kite sheltered housing. This forced closure was never part of the Red Kite deal. What measures does the Cabinet Member have in place to re-assure elderly residents utilising these facilities?

#### **Supplementary Response**

As you are aware we sat down in a cross party discussion on these matters immediately after the 10 February 2014 Cabinet meeting, where we looked in detail at 2 particular issues; sheltered housing and the community call facility. As a result we made contact with the Chief Executive of Red Kite and all Members received a full response setting out full details of the changes being implemented, a seminar outlining these and offering a suitable discussion forum (incidentally poorly attended) was held for Members. I can only go by what I hear in that these changes have been tenant led, not dictated by this Council.

Remember Wycombe District Council had been unable to reach the 'decent homes' standard that Red Kite now can, Red Kite regularly talk to us, we have 2 Members as board members, there are communication channels, we continue to work well and extensively with our Red Kite colleagues.

### b. Question from Councillor I Bates to the Cabinet Member for Community.

The Community Call Service is an emergency call service used by hundreds of mostly elderly and frail people in the Wycombe District Council area. Its management was transferred by WDC along with Council Housing in 2011. On 2 February this year the external contract provider was changed with the majority of users transferring to the new provider. Red Kite chose at this point not to transfer 280 of the users and informed them at a month's notice that their service was to be terminated and that they would have to make their own arrangements from then on.

Users of a service formerly administered by WDC and entrusted to Red Kite with their undertaking to continue the care have been left to fend for themselves. Elderly and vulnerable residents who had the security and peace of mind of being able to summon assistance 24 hours a day at the pull of a cord or the push of a button were left with a piece of paper containing two phone numbers and an internet url to sort it out on their own.

Would the Cabinet Member for Community accept my thanks to him for intervening in this matter and ensuring that (at the latest reckoning) all but one of the 280 have been assisted in finding an alternative provider of emergency on-call assistance?

**Response from Councillor J M Gibbs (Cabinet Member for Community).**

I welcome the Labour Group's response in sorting out this matter; it was a good example of polite, effective cross party co-operation. I can formally respond that all but 1 of the residents concerned have been sorted out with alternative providers, Red Kite I am confident will provide a suitable solution for that remaining resident shortly.

**No Supplementary Question was posed.**

**c. Question from Councillor B E Pearce to the Cabinet Member for Planning & Sustainability.**

Do you think that the possibility of a proposed development on the Buckmaster Road playing field would be beneficial to the local residents in view of the fact that Holmers Farm estate is a high density housing development and this field is vital for the area to act as a breathing lung, an area for children to play in, adults to participate in sport and for dog walkers?

**Response from Councillor N B Marshall (Cabinet Member for Planning & Sustainability).**

The new Local Plan consultation document identifies the Buckmaster Playing fields as being in a location that could be attractive for new business. At the current time there are no firm proposals for the playing fields to be redeveloped.

The Council's Economy Study forecasts an increase in office based employment by 2031, this is strategically important for the town as our economy continues to switch from being industrially based to being office based and the associated shift in the markets perception of Wycombe. There are also limited opportunities to provide new land to meet this forecast need because of Green Belt and the Chiltern Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty boundaries being so tight around towns in the district. Where sites are considered to meet this need they need to be attractive to the commercial property market in accessible locations. This site being close to Junction 4, Handy Cross of the M40 and between two large existing commercial uses is considered to be one such site. We are also consulting on business uses on the reserve sites Abbey Barn South, the Gomm Valley; in the Green Belt between

the Abbey Barn South site and Flackwell Heath associated with a new motorway junction and at Westhorpe junction in Marlow.

The playing fields are currently used for weekend football matches between September and Mid-May, there is also a teen shelter, and a skateboard ramp and a goal end on-site. The area is also used for informal uses such as dog walking. The area that was formally a BMX track is no longer used for this purpose and because of the distance from the existing residential area is not attractive or suitable for other recreational uses currently and due to poor surveillance attracts anti-social behaviour.

The aim of the consultation report is to get local views on the possibility of new development here. If development did occur here, the playing pitches, which are a town-wide resource, would need to be relocated elsewhere in the town, and local open space could be retained on-site or provided on another local site locally that meets the needs of the local community.

### **Supplementary Question**

I am very concerned regards these possible developments, does the Member not appreciate the feeling locally that the area is overdeveloped as it is. John Lewis has been extended; Johnson and Johnson good as its presence is, is sizeable; there is a new Next planned along with the new Handy Cross sports complex, the new waste site and the demolition of Westwood aged persons complex. The infrastructure cannot take more traffic; we must fight to keep this area's open spaces.

Does the Member understand and realise this?

### **Supplementary Response**

Yes I do genuinely realise this, this is the very reason that the extensive consultation now underway is taking place.

#### **d. Question from Councillor M Hanif to the Cabinet Member for Finance.**

A National Housing Federation survey suggests that two-thirds - 66% - of social sector tenants affected by benefit cuts for those with extra bedrooms were behind with rent after six months. It also said that 38% were in debt because of the "unfair, unworkable" policy change - dubbed the "bedroom tax".

Since April last year, people deemed to have one spare bedroom have had their housing benefit reduced by 14%, while those with two or more spare bedrooms have seen reductions of 25%. The report also said that benefit changes were "heaping misery and hardship on already struggling families, pushing them into arrears".

Can you please tell us, how many requests for help has WDC received from social tenants so far this financial year, how many have been given help and how much has this cost WDC; with comparable information for 2012/3?



**Councillor M Hanif was unfortunately not at the Meeting having tendered his apologies, so under Standing Order 11.3.(g) his question was withdrawn.**

**e. Question from Councillor R B Colomb to the Cabinet Member for Environment.**

During the pre- and post-Christmas period our Waste Collection service appeared to be under severe strain, if I am to judge by the complaints I received from residents. Whilst they might have some sympathy with the missed collections, they seemed unanimous in their criticism about the way complaints to the Call Centre were handled.

E Mails did not receive a reply and if they did it was an anodyne standard one that did not relate to the specific query

I have one resident whose food waste was not collected for 23 days and he received no response communication during that entire period.

I have another with a complaint about the way bags were collected who was told they would not respond further.

In my own case I contacted the call centre and it was obvious the Centre had no idea about the state of collections.

Does the Contractor notify the Call Centre of missed collections at close of business each day?

**Response from Councillor J E Teesdale (Cabinet Member for Environment).**

Collections over the Christmas and New Year period are always more challenging than during the rest of the year, not least due to the need to change collections days for our residents. This year in the main the Christmas catch up period was very successful, despite the recent changes to our collection scheme. The addition of glass and plastic packaging collections have been welcomed by our residents during the festive season.

The Customer Service Team worked hard throughout the festive season, with almost 1,000 calls answered in the two days between Christmas and New Year. Due to the Council being closed at times for bank holidays etc. the call levels do average higher than a standard day. In the last full week before Christmas 2,153 calls were offered, with 656 in the Christmas week and 3,112 in the New Year week with this being a reflection of the earlier shorter working weeks .

All emails received an automatic response during this time, which gave details of collection changes in the form of a table. In some cases, this dealt with the resident's question about when collections were due. The response also said the if residents were reporting a missed collect, this would be logged and we would return

to collect the container as soon as possible, but we would not respond further unless we needed further information.

Unfortunately sometimes containers are missed, which residents then report to us. Over the three weeks of the Christmas and New Year catch up 1,200 **containers** were reported as missed out of a potential 500,000 containers collected.

If a whole round is not completed then this is reported to the Councils by the contractor, and updates are put on our website and tweeted.

We are dealing with the blips that have occurred, please do tell me if you or your residents experience any particular problem, I will take these up for you and get them sorted. I accept utilising a new system at Christmas time was a tall order, but it did go pretty well, much better than I feared.

### **Supplementary Question**

I've heard your impressive figures but surely the call centre should provide a service, residents are worried that they cannot get a response from the call centre, does the contractor daily record the missed services? Could the Customer Service Centre not be advised of these problem areas?

### **Supplementary Response**

I will find out whether Serco are reporting daily at the next of our regular meetings with them. I would like to specifically invite you Councillor Colomb along to one of our meetings with the operators when we will also have Kitran Eastman (Senior Waste Officer) and the Call Centre representatives present.

**f. Question from Councillor K Ahmed to the Cabinet Member for Community.**

The Wycombe Racial Equality Council has ceased to function and its affairs are being wound up.

Until 2011, the REC was jointly funded by Wycombe District Council and Bucks County Council. They had an office in Desborough Road from which they gave expert and specialist advice on a range of subjects to the people in Wycombe, education, employment, benefits, hate crime and other race related issues. It had support and commitment from individuals and organisations representing different communities in Wycombe and in the 50 years of its existence it did much to promote and support good relationships in the town.

Despite considerable opposition and concern, WDC funding was withdrawn in 2011. The two remaining posts were transferred to Bucks County Council and the personal advice service provided in the heart of the community and the solid work for good race relations in Wycombe stopped at that point.

Although best efforts were made to continue its work without funds this proved impossible and the people of Wycombe are poorer for it.

The Council has a statutory duty to promote and support racial cohesion what is being done to full fill this important duty?

**Verbal reply to be given by Councillor J M Gibbs (Cabinet Member for Community).**

The Council has a duty to consider equalities implications in relation to a number of protected characteristics, such as gender, marital status, age, faith, sexual orientation and race. The steps we took between 2009 and 2011 to move towards an equalities advice service that covered considerably more than race equality were well debated at the time. We remain part of and contribute funding to the Bucks-wide consortium to ensure this important service continues to be available to residents. At the time BCC conducted consultation that showed that most people would refer to the Citizens' Advice Bureau for assistance with an equalities issue and the local CAB has confirmed that it continues to provide equalities advice. We are therefore confident that residents will continue to benefit from good advice in this important area.

**Supplementary Question**

Wycombe's Citizen's Advice Bureau are currently overwhelmed as they try to aid the poorer in society, who get poorer as the rich get richer! The Racial Equality Centre understood the problems of the ethnic minorities, the CAB do what they can and this is much appreciated. A vibrant well-funded REC would have helped prevent some of the recent problems experienced at Highcrest Academy, eased the problems of police stop and search tactics and calmed concerned residents regards the uncalled for comments of local MP and Attorney General; Dominic Grieve, that

corruption was endemic in British Pakistani communities. Should not Mr Grieve have resigned over these remarks?

### **Supplementary Response**

It is not my place to call for an MP's resignation. It is surely a matter for his local party association which he represents.

#### **g. Question from Councillor Ms R Knight to the Cabinet Member for Planning & Sustainability.**

Please can the Cabinet Member update us for the requirements for numbers of new dwellings required for the Wycombe District over the next five years and how he proposes to meet this requirement?

#### **Response from Councillor N B Marshall (Cabinet Member for Planning & Sustainability).**

The Council is working on a new Local Plan for the District that is looking at how much more housing we need to plan for over the next 15 years or so up to the year 2031. As I hope you are aware we are currently consulting on an Options Consultation Document on the new Local Plan. This indicates that we may need to plan for in the region of 500 – 700 homes per year over that period. This means in the range of 2,500 – 3,500 homes over the next 5 years. This compares with the target in our current plan of around 400 homes per year or 2,000 homes over 5 years.

A key part of the consultation is how we might meet this housing need. The Consultation Document sets out 6 main options for how this might happen, including intensifying development on previously developed (or brownfield) sites in urban and rural areas, and a range of options involving "greenfield" land including the option of a major expansion of Princes Risborough and a review of the Green Belt focused on the south east of the District. What we do know is that unlike over the last 10-15 years we will not be able to meet our new housing requirements solely on brownfield sites – we will need to look seriously at significant development on greenfield land. However no decisions have been made on the balance of housing coming from these different options. In the next 5 years some of our needs will be met through brownfield sites including sites that have already got planning permission, but we will need to consider some greenfield sites also, including reserve sites currently identified in our approved Core Strategy.

### **Supplementary Question**

Bearing in mind the recent flooding, is sufficient consideration being given to the ever increasing concreting over of land in the District, with the resultant risk of further flooding and sink holes?

### **Supplementary Response**

The Councillor can be assured that the flood plain is a 'no go' area in respect of development and that our building control officers are well in control in respect of responding to the recent sink holes in our District.

### **h. Question from Councillor B E Pearce to the Cabinet Member for Community.**

There is a rumour that the new sports centre will not have a crèche or pre-school type playing facility. Do you not think that this is very surprising in view of the fact that the provision of a crèche or pre-school playgroup would encourage mothers and fathers to participate in the facilities at the new sports centre?

### **Response from Councillor J M Gibbs (Cabinet Member for Community).**

It is not usual for a leisure centre to have a day care centre and, as the initial plans for the Handy Cross site at that time included a possible separate day care centre, we did not include one in the specification. The provision of a crèche was considered at the outset and discussed with leisure centre operators and users of the current centre. This consultation indicated that a purpose built crèche should not be specified as operators prefer to provide a sessional crèche in other multi use spaces if and when demand requires rather than tying up a dedicated room solely for this occasional use. The facility mix and specification was agreed by the Council following widespread consultation some time ago and the Council is ready to let the contract to build the new centre, which will be a much needed replacement for our rather elderly Centre as well as a considerable asset to the District that people will enjoy for years to come.

### **Supplementary Question**

Why was there provision of a crèche facility in the original plans displayed 2years ago? We are aware that the current facility is always full. A crèche is needed so that parents use the facility. It would be like having a sports centre with no café!

### **Supplementary Response**

The operators have indicated that they would prefer a sessional crèche, so that they are free to provide such, as and when demand is there. Please note that the final phase of the master-plan could accommodate such a facility if the demand was shown.

## **83 PETITIONS**

A petition was received from Councillor B E Pearce which read as follows:

'We the undersigned feel very strongly about the proposed development to the Buckmaster Road Playing Field possibly for offices.

We feel very strongly that this should remain an open space for children to play, people to enjoy games and sports, and for dog walkers.

We believe this field is vital to act as a breathing lung for the whole area as Holmers Farm Estate is a high density housing area.'

Councillor Pearce indicated that he believed he had obtained 583 signatures.

The Chairman received the petition and commented that it would be validated against the Council's Petitions Scheme. Members would be informed outside of the meeting how the petition would be administered once the validation had taken place.

### **Secretary's Note**

Following the validation of the petition outside of the meeting, in accordance with the Council's Petitions scheme, it was considered to be a one ward issue, given that 579 signatures featured were considered as valid. This exceeded the 500 signatories required for a debate at Full Council to occur, and therefore in accordance with Standing Orders, this petition was to be scheduled for debate at the next Full Council meeting (Monday 28 April 2014).

## **84 PROPOSED CONSTITUTION AMENDMENT - STANDING ORDERS**

The Meeting had before it a short report outlining a proposed amendment to the Standing Orders of the Council regarding the requirement for recorded votes to be included in the Minutes of the Budget setting Council meeting, showing how each Member present voted, i.e. in favour, against or abstaining from voting.

This requirement being included in the Local Authorities (Standing Orders) (England) (Amendment) Regulations 2014 which were laid before Parliament on 31 January 2014 and came into effect 25 February 2014.

As a result of this requirement, the proposed amendment to the appropriate standing order in the Council's constitution was put to the Meeting and agreed, with the suggested amendment that the word 'at' be substituted for 'before' in the penultimate sentence to aid clarity.

**RESOLVED:** That the following paragraph be added at subsection (5) of the Council's Standing Order 16 (Voting):

"At the Annual Budget Council Meeting, a recorded vote shall take place on decisions relating to the setting of the Budget and Council Tax. The Head of Democratic, Legal and Policy Services, or their representative, shall call upon each member present to say if that Member votes for, against, or abstains from the voting on the proposals at the meeting. This will then be set out in the Minutes of the meeting".

## **85 CABINET**

The Leader of the Council presented the minutes of the Cabinet Meeting of 10 February 2014 with the exclusion of Minute 77 (Revenue Estimates 2014/15 and Council Tax Proposals) which would be recommended to Council separately as part of the Council Tax Setting item to be presented by the Cabinet Member for Finance.

**RESOLVED:** That the minutes of the meeting of the Cabinet held on 10 February 2014 be received and the recommendations as set out at Minute numbers 75, 81, 83, 84, 85, 87 and 88 be approved and adopted.

## **86 COUNCIL TAX SETTING 2014/15 AND CABINET MINUTE 77 - 10 FEBRUARY 2014**

The meeting then specifically turned to the recommendations outlined in minute number 77 of the Cabinet Minutes of 10 February 2014 (the Revenue Estimates 2014/15 and Council Tax Proposals) along with the supplements issued to this item outlining the final Parish/Town, Buckinghamshire County Council, Thames Valley Police Authority and Buckinghamshire & Milton Keynes Fire Authority precepts and confirmation of the Formula Grant figures required in order to set Council Tax.

The Leader of the Council in introducing the Cabinet Member for Finance to make his Budget presentation, referred to the improvements in the national economic position against which this budget was to be considered; nationally job levels had increased and unemployment was slightly down, but the national deficit was still high. There were considerable future challenges the Council faced, this was a budget not for just one year but for future years. This budget had additionally been well examined by the Council's Improvement and Review Commission's Task and Finish Group in a challenging and professional manner.

The Leader thanked the Chief Finance Officer and Chief Executive along with the Senior Management team and the many other officers involved in the budget preparation. The Council was not allowed to run a deficit, a balanced budget was essential. The budget before the Council addressed the Council's key issues affordably, with full regard to its legal duties, with care of the vulnerable in the community and genuine consideration of the views of the residents paramount in its

formulation. As a result the Budget represented the fourth consecutive year Wycombe District Council would be freezing its Council Tax.

The Cabinet Member for Finance rose and drew Members attention to an amendment he wished Members to make to the papers before them; due to a technical error, the Band Charges featured in the final chart featured on page 10 of the Item 10 Council Tax Setting 2014-15 Supplement before them was to be changed as follows:

All figures for all parts of the Council's Area featured in the 3<sup>rd</sup> column marked Band C Charge were to be increased by £0.01, whilst all figures in 1<sup>st</sup> column marked Band A Charge were also to be increased by £0.01 with the exception of the entries for High Wycombe Town and West Wycombe which were to be increased by £0.02 instead.

The Cabinet Member for Finance outlined the general fragility of the national economy, yet inflation had dropped below 2% for the first time since 2009 which was encouraging. Locally the number of businesses had increased along with some residential development, but against this employment levels locally had yet to equal the rest of the UK. The end of December had seen the lowest ever number of local residents in temporary accommodation and considerable homelessness prevention had occurred.

Transformation savings with re-engineered service delivery with the likes of the new joint waste contract, recycling and the roll out of ANPR (Automatic Number Plate Recognition) had taken place.

The new sports and leisure centre with adjacent prestige offices and food store represented an exciting new chapter for the District, the new synthetic pitches were in use, the new running track nearly complete with the main facility due to open in 2015.

Central Government funding reductions had impacted greatly; and the concerns regarding the New Homes Bonus administration whereby they may not be received on planning appeals did create a degree of uncertainty.

Challenges for future years would include the continued provision of essential services whilst continuing to make the District attractive to residents, visitors and businesses.

A current focus on High Wycombe town centre was underway, evidenced by the pedestrian crossing across Abbey Way outside these offices, and plans for a café under the Market House at the end of the High Street and other improvements in Pauls Row and Frogmoor.

The New Local Plan was a crucial document setting the scene for Housing and Businesses locally to 2031.

The balanced Budget before the Council represented a crucial part of all these plans, no increase in Council Tax was to occur, this being the fourth year in succession that this freeze had occurred. The Council with this budget wished to



maintain and improve core services and show its determination to deliver best value.

The Cabinet Member for Finance concluded his speech by commending the budget to the Council.

The Leader of the Council seconded the budget as presented by the Cabinet Member for Finance.

The Leader of the Liberal Democrat Group, Councillor Parker rose to propose two amendments to the budget for the Council's consideration. He outlined that there was a case to be made for consideration of an increase in Council Tax, the revenue generated even by the maximum 1.99% permitted before the obligation to put the matter to public approval via referendum was insignificant, as this would involve loss of the freeze grant roll over into the next year. Accordingly his Group supported the decision to freeze Council Tax.

However Councillor Parker added that there were those amongst the District's residents who had been and would continue to be disproportionately disadvantaged by the effects of the current recession. The utilisation of Section 106 Developer Contribution monies for the provision of affordable housing via partnership arrangements was imperative, it was noted £1.78m currently sat awaiting such use. The Liberal Democrats proposed that a further £750,000 be made available to Housing Officers extending their budget to £2.5m. This £750,000 being vired from £424,000 identified from the award of the New Homes Bonus which was allocated in the budget as an investment fund, along with £430,000 currently in contingency funding within the proposed budget, which might reasonably be made available for use in addressing this pressing social issues.

From these funds Councillor Parker also proposed £100,000 be offered to Credit Unions in Buckinghamshire currently supported by Buckinghamshire County Council and Buckinghamshire Community Foundation, to expand their operations.

Neither of these amendments threatened the balanced budget but would, he believed, deliver the twin Liberal Democrat aims of a stronger economy and a fairer society.

Councillor T Snaith seconded these amendments.

The Leader of the Council responded indicating that the Credit Unions were not in fact short of funds and that he could not support, as an accountant, the use of what were considered required contingency funds, additionally the materialisation of the new homes bonus funds the Liberal Democrats wished to utilise was not guaranteed.

Members responded with a number of remarks in respect of these proposed amendments as follows:

- The provision of further funds in respect of affordable housing provision would strengthen officers bargaining position when negotiating schemes with registered social housing providers;
- The exact amendments before the Council were unclear, it was felt that opposition members had had adequate opportunity to contribute to the budget formulation by means of their involvement with the Improvement and Review Commission's Budget Task and Finish Group; and
- The weight attached to the Budget's Task and Finish Group's findings was evident by the acceptance of the majority of their recommendations by the Cabinet in the formulation of the Budget.

The Cabinet Member for Finance did point out that a recent sale of four Council owned properties in Benjamin Road, released a considerable further sum, ring fenced for affordable housing, which was not featured in the Budget, but would be added to the £1.78m funding.

The two amendments to the budget (as follows) were put to the vote:

- £750,000 be made available to the Housing Officers, extending their budget for the affordable homes project to £2.5m; and
- £100,000 be offered from Wycombe District Council funds to Credit Unions in Buckinghamshire supported by Buckinghamshire County Council and Buckinghamshire Community Foundation.

In accordance with subsection (5) of the Council's Standing Order 16 (Voting) the voting of the Members in respect of this Council Tax setting amendment was recorded as follows:

In favour of the recommendations:-

Councillors K Ahmed, I Bates, C A Ditta, R M H Farmer, S Graham, M Knight, Ms R Knight, Ms P L Lee, S F Parker, B R Pollock JP, A Slater, T Snaith and Ms J D Wassell.

Against the recommendations:-

Councillors Mrs J A Adey, Z Ahmed, M Angell, M C Appleyard, D H G Barnes, A D Collingwood, R B Colomb, M A Foster, R H W Gaffney, J M Gibbs, A R Green, C B Harriss, A E Hill, Mahboob Hussain JP, Maz Hussain, D A Johncock, Mrs G A Jones, Mrs J D Langlely, Mrs W J Mallen, N B Marshall, H L McCarthy, R S Metcalfe, B E Pearce, J L Richards OBE, J A Savage, R J Scott, C Shafique MBE, D A C Shakespeare OBE, Mrs J E Teesdale, D M Watson and R Wilson.

Abstentions:-

Councillors Mrs L M Clarke OBE and I L McEnnis

Total:

In Favour:- 13

Against:- 31

Abstention:- 2

The amendments were therefore rejected.

The Meeting turned to the original Budget Proposal as previously put.

Councillor I Bates, Leader of the Labour Group addressed the Meeting admitting that he too would like to see more money spent on affordable housing throughout the District. The fact that proposals could not be made by opposition members at Cabinet Meetings was remarked upon, along with the timing of Budget Task and Finish Group meeting which had proved problematic to a number of Members.

Councillor Bates did ask that investigation into the second homes and empty homes council tax reductions be carried out, was a substantial income being missed under current policy?

Councillor Colomb congratulated the Leader and Cabinet Member for Finance on the budget before the Meeting; he only regretted that the District Council had not been able to set its budget first to set a trend for Buckinghamshire County Council and the Police who unlike Wycombe were increasing their precept.

Other Members made a number of remarks in respect of the Budget as follows:

- A Member who was also a County Councillor indicated that she was proud to be a member of a County Council who were putting up their council tax by 1.5%; the County was providing serious services: social services, education, services for children etc., these needed to be properly funded, these services involved vulnerable people.
- A Member saw the Budget as a continuation of the good work done by previous Leaders of the Council; Councillors Mrs Clarke and Collingwood. Services were being improved by continual efficiencies but at less cost.
- Another Member felt that the real cost of zero council tax increase was evident in the increased food bank usage within the District and the need of charities to pick up issues formerly addressed by the Council.

In response the Cabinet Member for Finance pointed out that the allowances on 2<sup>nd</sup> homes and unoccupied properties were set to not prove a disincentive to property owners, finance officers regularly (as did all officers across the Council)

benchmarked their policies with other authorities, not necessarily following but calibrating and seeking best value.

The considerable reduction in central government funding over the next two years, estimated at 28% less, was challenging; the need to implement worthwhile major projects resulting in job and wealth creation was imperative. The Member was confident Wycombe District would continue to be a proactive and viable council.

The Budget was then put to the recorded vote.

In accordance with subsection (5) of the Council's Standing Order 16 (Voting) the voting of the Members in respect of these Council Tax setting decisions was recorded as follows:

In favour of the recommendations:-

Councillors Mrs J A Adey, Z Ahmed, M Angell, M C Appleyard, D H G Barnes, A D Collingwood, R B Colomb, M A Foster, R H W Gaffney, J M Gibbs, A R Green, C B Harriss, A E Hill, Mahboob Hussain JP, Maz Hussain, D A Johncock, Mrs G A Jones, Mrs J D Langley, Mrs W J Mallen, N B Marshall, H L McCarthy, R S Metcalfe, B E Pearce, J L Richards OBE, J A Savage, R J Scott, C Shafique MBE, D A C Shakespeare OBE, Mrs J E Teesdale, D M Watson and R Wilson.

Against the recommendations:-

Councillors K Ahmed, I Bates and S Graham.

Abstentions:-

Councillors Mrs L M Clarke OBE, C A Ditta, R M H Farmer, M Knight, Ms P L Lee, I L McEnnis, S F Parker, B R Pollock JP, A Slater, T Snaith and Ms J D Wassell.

Total:

In Favour:- 31

Against:- 3

Abstention:- 11

**RESOLVED:** That (i) the recommendations contained in Minute 77 of the Cabinet Meeting held on 10 February 2014 be approved and adopted; and

(ii) it be noted that the following amounts have been calculated for the year 2014/15 in accordance with regulations made inter alia under Sections 31 to 36 of the Local Government Finance Act 1992:-

- (A) 64,731.19; being the amount calculated by the Council, in accordance with the Local Authorities (Calculation of Council Tax Base) (England) Regulations 2012 (“the Regulations”) as its Council Tax Base for the year.

(B)

<b>Parish/Town Area</b>	<b>Council Tax Base</b>
Bledlow-cum-Saunderton	1182.13
Bradenham	224.71
Chepping Wycombe	6247.33
Downley	1931.39
Ellesborough	432.46
Fawley (Parish Meeting)	139.95
Great & Little Hampden	158.88
Great & Little Kimble cum Marsh	466.92
Great Marlow	712.29
Hambleden	815.45
Hazlemere	3946.13
Hedsor (Parish Meeting)	82.99
High Wycombe Town	20564.43
Hughenden	3906.27
Ibstone	142.77
Lacey Green	1234.16
Lane End	1300.45
Little Marlow	795.30
Longwick-cum-Ilmer	679.76
Marlow Bottom	1500.58
Marlow Town	6504.20
Medmenham	506.69
Piddington & Wheeler End	255.07
Princes Risborough	3435.90
Radnage	378.22
Stokenchurch	1866.26
Turville	215.98
WestW'- Parish Council	523.43
Wooburn and Bourne End	4581.09
<b>Grand Total</b>	<b>64731.19</b>

being the amounts calculated by the Council, in accordance with the Regulations, as the amounts of its Council Tax Base for the year for dwellings in those parts of its area to which one or more of the special items relate;

- (iii)** That the following amounts be now calculated by the Council for the year 2014/2015 in accordance with Sections 31 to 36 of the Local Government Finance Act 1992 (“the Act”).
- (A)**  
£93,408,451 being the aggregate of the amounts which the Council estimates for the items set out in Section 31(A)(2) of the Act; taking into account all precepts issued to it by parish councils as at the date of the meeting.
- (B)**  
£82,623,775 being the aggregate of the amounts which the Council estimates for the items set out in Section 31(A)(3) of the Act;
- (C)**  
£10,784,676 being the amount by which the aggregate at (iii)(A) above exceeds the aggregate at (iii)(B) above, calculated by the Council in accordance with Section 31(A)(4) of the Act, as its Council Tax requirement for the year.
- (D)** £166.61 being the amount at (iii)(C) above divided by the amount at (ii)(A) calculated by the Council, in accordance with Section 31(B)(1) of the Act, as the basic amount of its council tax for the year;.
- (E)**  
£ 2,564,462 being the aggregate amount of all special items referred to in Section 34(1) of the Act;

(F) £126.99

being the amount at (iii)(D) above less the result given by dividing the amount at (iii)(E) above by the amount at (ii)(A) above, calculated by the Council, in accordance with Section 34(2) of the Act, as the basic amount of its Council Tax for the year for dwellings in those parts of its area to which no special item relates:



(G)

Part of the Council's Area	2014-15
<b>Bledlow-cum-Saunderton</b>	<b>£141.20</b>
<b>Bradenham</b>	<b>£158.14</b>
<b>Chepping Wycombe</b>	<b>£179.92</b>
<b>Downley</b>	<b>£173.07</b>
<b>Ellesborough</b>	<b>£176.63</b>
<b>Great &amp; Little Hampden</b>	<b>£142.07</b>
<b>Great &amp; Little Kimble cum Marsh</b>	<b>£180.53</b>
<b>Great Marlow</b>	<b>£140.96</b>
<b>Hambleden</b>	<b>£161.33</b>
<b>Hazlemere</b>	<b>£184.53</b>
<b>High Wycombe Town</b>	<b>£146.90</b>
<b>Hughenden</b>	<b>£166.60</b>
<b>Ibstone</b>	<b>£169.02</b>
<b>Lacey Green</b>	<b>£146.84</b>
<b>Lane End</b>	<b>£203.18</b>
<b>Little Marlow</b>	<b>£178.10</b>
<b>Longwick-cum-Ilmer</b>	<b>£152.89</b>
<b>Marlow Bottom</b>	<b>£147.24</b>
<b>Marlow Town</b>	<b>£169.92</b>
<b>Medmenham</b>	<b>£163.16</b>
<b>Piddington &amp; Wheeler End</b>	<b>£197.56</b>
<b>Princes Risborough</b>	<b>£222.20</b>
<b>Radnage</b>	<b>£190.45</b>
<b>Stokenchurch</b>	<b>£160.97</b>
<b>Turville</b>	<b>£157.08</b>
<b>West Wycombe</b>	<b>£203.60</b>
<b>Wooburn and Bourne End</b>	<b>£181.14</b>

being the amounts given by adding to the amount at (iii)(F) above the amounts of each of the special items relating to dwellings in those parts of the Council's area mentioned above divided in each case by the appropriate amount at (ii)(B) above, calculated by the Council, in accordance with Section 34(3) of the Act, as the basic amounts of its Council Tax for the year for dwellings in those parts of its area to which one or more of the special items relate.

<b>(H) Part of the Council's Area</b>	<b>Band A Charge</b>	<b>Band B Charge</b>	<b>Band C Charge</b>	<b>Band D Charge</b>	<b>Band E Charge</b>	<b>Band F Charge</b>	<b>Band G Charge</b>	<b>Band H Charge</b>
Bledlow-cum-Saunderton	£94.18	£109.82	£125.51	£141.20	£172.58	£203.96	£235.33	£282.40
Bradenham	£105.43	£123.00	£140.57	£158.14	£193.28	£228.42	£263.57	£316.28
Chepping Wycombe	£119.95	£139.94	£159.93	£179.92	£219.90	£259.88	£299.87	£359.84
Downley	£115.38	£134.61	£153.84	£173.07	£211.53	£249.99	£288.45	£346.14
Ellesborough	£117.75	£137.38	£157.00	£176.63	£215.88	£255.13	£294.38	£353.26
Fawley (Parish Meeting)	£84.66	£98.77	£112.88	£126.99	£155.21	£183.43	£211.65	£253.98
Great & Little Hampden	£94.71	£110.50	£126.28	£142.07	£173.64	£205.21	£236.78	£284.14
Great & Little Kimble cum Marsh	£120.35	£140.41	£160.47	£180.53	£220.65	£260.77	£300.88	£361.06
Great Marlow	£93.97	£109.64	£125.30	£140.96	£172.28	£203.61	£234.93	£281.92
Hambleden	£107.55	£125.48	£143.40	£161.33	£197.18	£233.03	£268.88	£322.66
Hazlemere	£123.02	£143.52	£164.03	£184.53	£225.54	£266.54	£307.55	£369.06
Hedsor (Parish Meeting)	£84.66	£98.77	£112.88	£126.99	£155.21	£183.43	£211.65	£253.98
High Wycombe Town	£97.93	£114.26	£130.58	£146.90	£179.54	£212.19	£244.83	£293.80
Hughenden	£110.07	£129.58	£148.09	£166.60	£203.62	£240.64	£277.67	£333.20
Ibstone	£112.68	£131.46	£150.24	£169.02	£206.58	£244.14	£281.70	£338.04
Lacey Green	£97.89	£114.21	£130.52	£146.84	£179.47	£212.10	£244.73	£293.68
Lane End	£135.45	£158.03	£180.60	£203.18	£248.33	£293.48	£338.63	£406.36
Little Marlow	£118.73	£138.52	£158.31	£178.10	£217.68	£257.26	£296.83	£356.20
Longwick-cum-Ilmer	£101.93	£118.91	£135.90	£152.89	£186.87	£220.84	£254.82	£305.78
Marlow Bottom	£98.16	£114.52	£130.88	£147.24	£179.96	£212.68	£245.40	£294.48
Marlow Town	£113.28	£132.16	£151.04	£169.92	£207.68	£245.44	£283.20	£339.84
Medmenham	£108.77	£126.90	£145.03	£163.16	£199.42	£235.68	£271.93	£326.32
Piddington & Wheeler End	£131.71	£153.66	£175.61	£197.56	£241.46	£285.36	£329.27	£395.12
Princes Risborough	£148.13	£172.82	£197.51	£222.20	£271.58	£320.96	£370.33	£444.40
Radnage	£126.97	£148.13	£169.29	£190.45	£232.77	£275.09	£317.42	£380.90
Stokenchurch	£107.31	£125.20	£143.08	£160.97	£196.74	£232.51	£268.28	£321.94
Turville	£104.72	£122.17	£139.63	£157.08	£191.99	£226.89	£261.80	£314.16
West Wycombe	£135.73	£158.36	£180.98	£203.60	£248.84	£294.09	£339.33	£407.20
Wooburn and Bourne End	£120.76	£140.89	£161.01	£181.14	£221.39	£261.65	£301.90	£362.28

being the amounts given by multiplying the amounts at (iii)(F) and (iii)(G) above by the number which, in the proportion set out in Section 5(1) of the Act, is applicable to dwellings listed in a particular valuation band divided by the number which in that proportion is applicable to dwellings listed in valuation band D, calculated by the Council, in accordance with Section 36(1) of the Act, as the amounts to be taken into account for the year in respect of categories of dwellings listed in different valuation bands.

**(iv)**

That it be noted for the year 2014/15 the Buckinghamshire County Council, the Police and Crime Commissioner Thames Valley and the Buckinghamshire and Milton Keynes Fire Authority have stated the following amounts in precepts issued to the Council, in accordance with Section 40 of the Act for each of the categories of dwellings shown below.

<b>Precepting Authority</b>	<b>Valuation Bands</b>							
	<b>A</b>	<b>B</b>	<b>C</b>	<b>D</b>	<b>E</b>	<b>F</b>	<b>G</b>	<b>H</b>
Buckinghamshire County Council	£729.27	£850.81	£972.36	£1,093.90	£1,336.99	£1,580.08	£1,823.17	£2,187.80
Police and Crime Commissioner Thames Valley	£107.01	£124.84	£142.68	£160.51	£196.18	£231.85	£267.52	£321.02
Buckinghamshire & Milton Keynes Fire Authority	£39.42	£45.99	£52.56	£59.13	£72.27	£85.41	£98.55	£118.26

- (v) That having calculated the aggregate in each case of the amounts at (iii)(H) and (iv) above, the Council in accordance with Section 30 of the Act, hereby sets the following amounts as the amounts of Council Tax for the year 2013/2014 for each of the categories of dwellings shown below.

<b>Part of the Council's Area</b>	<b>Band A Charge</b>	<b>Band B Charge</b>	<b>Band C Charge</b>	<b>Band D Charge</b>	<b>Band E Charge</b>	<b>Band F Charge</b>	<b>Band G Charge</b>	<b>Band H Charge</b>
Bledlow-cum-Saunderton	£969.83	£1,131.46	£1,293.11	£1,454.74	£1,778.02	£2,101.29	£2,424.57	£2,909.48
Bradenham	£981.13	£1,144.64	£1,308.17	£1,471.68	£1,798.72	£2,125.76	£2,452.80	£2,943.36
Chepping Wycombe	£995.65	£1,161.58	£1,327.53	£1,493.46	£1,825.34	£2,157.22	£2,489.10	£2,986.92
Downley	£991.08	£1,156.25	£1,321.44	£1,486.61	£1,816.97	£2,147.33	£2,477.68	£2,973.22
Ellesborough	£993.45	£1,159.02	£1,324.60	£1,490.17	£1,821.32	£2,152.47	£2,483.62	£2,980.34
Fawley (Parish Meeting)	£960.36	£1,120.41	£1,280.48	£1,440.53	£1,760.65	£2,080.77	£2,400.88	£2,881.06
Great & Little Hampden	£970.41	£1,132.14	£1,293.88	£1,455.61	£1,779.08	£2,102.55	£2,426.02	£2,911.22
Great & Little Kimble cum Marsh	£996.05	£1,162.05	£1,328.07	£1,494.07	£1,826.09	£2,158.10	£2,490.12	£2,988.14
Great Marlow	£969.67	£1,131.28	£1,292.90	£1,454.50	£1,777.72	£2,100.94	£2,424.17	£2,909.00
Hambleden	£983.25	£1,147.12	£1,311.00	£1,474.87	£1,802.62	£2,130.37	£2,458.12	£2,949.74
Hazlemere	£998.72	£1,165.17	£1,331.63	£1,498.07	£1,830.97	£2,163.88	£2,496.78	£2,996.14
Hedsor (Parish Meeting)	£960.36	£1,120.41	£1,280.48	£1,440.53	£1,760.65	£2,080.77	£2,400.88	£2,881.06
High Wycombe Town	£973.64	£1,135.90	£1,298.18	£1,460.44	£1,784.98	£2,109.52	£2,434.07	£2,920.88
Hughenden	£986.77	£1,151.22	£1,315.69	£1,480.14	£1,809.06	£2,137.98	£2,466.90	£2,960.28
Ibstone	£988.38	£1,153.10	£1,317.84	£1,482.56	£1,812.02	£2,141.48	£2,470.93	£2,965.12
Lacey Green	£973.59	£1,135.85	£1,298.12	£1,460.38	£1,784.91	£2,109.44	£2,433.97	£2,920.76
Lane End	£1,011.15	£1,179.67	£1,348.20	£1,516.72	£1,853.77	£2,190.82	£2,527.87	£3,033.44
Little Marlow	£994.43	£1,160.16	£1,325.91	£1,491.64	£1,823.12	£2,154.59	£2,486.07	£2,983.28
Longwick-cum-Ilmer	£977.63	£1,140.56	£1,303.50	£1,466.43	£1,792.30	£2,118.18	£2,444.05	£2,932.86
Marlow Bottom	£973.86	£1,136.16	£1,298.48	£1,460.78	£1,785.40	£2,110.02	£2,434.63	£2,921.56
Marlow Town	£988.98	£1,153.80	£1,318.64	£1,483.46	£1,813.12	£2,142.78	£2,472.43	£2,966.92
Medmenham	£984.47	£1,148.54	£1,312.63	£1,476.70	£1,804.86	£2,133.01	£2,461.17	£2,953.40
Piddington & Wheeler End	£1,007.41	£1,175.30	£1,343.21	£1,511.10	£1,846.90	£2,182.70	£2,518.50	£3,022.20
Princes Risborough	£1,023.83	£1,194.46	£1,365.11	£1,535.74	£1,877.02	£2,218.29	£2,559.57	£3,071.48
Radnage	£1,002.67	£1,169.77	£1,336.89	£1,503.99	£1,838.21	£2,172.43	£2,506.65	£3,007.98

<b>Part of the Council's Area</b>	<b>Band A Charge</b>	<b>Band B Charge</b>	<b>Band C Charge</b>	<b>Band D Charge</b>	<b>Band E Charge</b>	<b>Band F Charge</b>	<b>Band G Charge</b>	<b>Band H Charge</b>
Stokenchurch	£983.01	£1,146.84	£1,310.68	£1,474.51	£1,802.18	£2,129.85	£2,457.52	£2,949.02
Turville	£980.42	£1,143.82	£1,307.23	£1,470.62	£1,797.42	£2,124.23	£2,451.03	£2,941.24
WestW'- Parish Council	£1,011.44	£1,180.00	£1,348.58	£1,517.14	£1,854.28	£2,191.42	£2,528.57	£3,034.28
Wooburn and Bourne End	£996.46	£1,162.53	£1,328.61	£1,494.68	£1,826.83	£2,158.98	£2,491.13	£2,989.36

- (vi) That in accordance with sections 52ZB and 52ZC of the Act it is determined that the Council's relevant basic amount of Council Tax for 2014/15 is not excessive.

**87 IMPROVEMENT AND REVIEW COMMISSION**

**RESOLVED:** That the minutes of the meeting of the Improvement and Review Commission held on 15 January 2014 be received.

**88 AUDIT COMMITTEE**

**RESOLVED:** That the minutes of the meeting of the Audit Committee held on 16 January 2014 be received.

**89 HIGH WYCOMBE TOWN COMMITTEE**

**RESOLVED:** That the minutes of the meeting of the High Wycombe Town Committee held on 21 January 2014 be received.

**90 PERSONNEL AND DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE**

**RESOLVED:** That the minutes of the meeting of the Personnel and Development Committee held on 20 January 2014 be received and the recommendation as set out at minute numbers 16 be approved and adopted.

**91 PLANNING COMMITTEE**

**RESOLVED:** That the minutes of the meetings of the Planning Committee held on 20 and 26 November 2013, 18 December 2013 and 22 January 2014 be received.

**92 QUESTIONS UNDER STANDING ORDER 11.2**

No questions were received under Standing Order 11.2

**93 CHIEF OFFICER`S REPORT (IF ANY)**

There were no Chief Officer's reports.

**94 COMMITTEE APPOINTMENTS/CHANGES**

Council noted the changes in Committee membership in accordance with Standing Order 18(9) as included in the agenda:

Councillors Z Ahmed, Maz Hussain and Mrs M L Neudecker to replace Councillors W J Bendyshe Brown, Mrs J D Langley and J A Malliff as standing deputies on the Planning Committee.

**95 URGENT ACTION TAKEN BY CABINET OR INDIVIDUAL CABINET MEMBER (IF ANY)**

The five individual decisions published since the last meeting of the Council were listed within the summons.

---

Chairman

**The following officers were in attendance at the meeting:**

Peter Druce	- Democratic Services
Ian Hunt	- Democratic Services Manager
Karen Satterford	- Chief Executive
Ian Westgate	- Corporate Director