

Council Minutes

Date: 22 February 2018

Time: 6.30 - 8.42 pm

PRESENT: Councillor Miss S Brown (in the Chair)

Councillors Mrs J A Adey, Mrs S Adoh, K Ahmed, M C Appleyard, M Asif, D H G Barnes, Ms A Baughan, S Broadbent, H Bull, D J Carroll, M Clarke, Mrs L M Clarke OBE, R Farmer, R Gaffney, S Graham, A R Green, G C Hall, M Hanif, M Harris, A E Hill, A Hussain, M Hussain, M Hussain JP, D A Johncock, M E Knight, D Knights, Mrs J D Langley, A Lee, Mrs W J Mallen, N B Marshall, H L McCarthy, I L McEnnis, R Newman, Ms C J Oliver, B E Pearce, G Peart, S K Raja, R Raja, S Saddique, J A Savage, D A C Shakespeare OBE, N J B Teesdale, Mrs J E Teesdale, A Turner, P R Turner, Ms J D Wassell, D M Watson, C Whitehead, R Wilson, L Wood and Ms K S Wood.

Honorary Aldermen: R Pushman.

1 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

The Chairman requested that all mobile phones be switched off for the duration of the meeting.

Apologies for absence were received from Honorary Aldermen: J M Blanksby, P Cartwright and EH Collins. Councillors Z Ahmed, A Collingwood, C Etholen, C Harriss, M Hashmi and R Scott.

2 MINUTES

RESOLVED: That the minutes of the meeting of the Council held on 18 December 2017 be confirmed as a true record and signed by the Chairman.

3 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

The Leader of the Council declared an interest in respect of Item 59 of the Cabinet minutes dated the 18 December 2017. The Leader left the room during this section of Item 10 (Cabinet Minutes).

Councillors A Turner, G Hall and D Knights declared for information a non-pecuniary interest in respect of Item 17 of the agenda (Extension Works to Risborough Springs Swim & Fitness Centre – Procurement Process) as they were members of the Town Council. Councillors A Turner, G Hall and D Knights did not withdraw from the meeting and took full part in the discussion and voting.

4 CHAIRMAN`S ANNOUNCEMENTS

The Chairman announced that she had undertaken many engagements since the last meeting of the Council and highlighted the following event:

- Afternoon tea with the Mayor & Mayoress of Royal Borough of Windsor & Maidenhead.

The Chairman informed Members that the above event had consisted of a very pleasant afternoon where she had learnt all about the Guildhall in Windsor, including why the pillars did not touch the building.

5 QUESTIONS FROM MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC

Question from Mr R B Colomb to the Cabinet Member for Economic Development & Regeneration

“In September 2017 the Park & Ride buses, supposed to provide a frequent, reliable, direct service to and from the Town centre were effectively converted into bus routes.

In view of the significant developer contribution WDC made to Bucks County Council as part of its transport contribution, will it now seek a refund?”

Response from Councillor S Broadbent (Cabinet Member for Economic Development & Regeneration)

“The section 106 agreement that was secured in relation to the redevelopment of the sports centre site at Handy Cross (Handy X Hub) included a planning obligation on the District Council in its role as landowner and developer, to make a financial contribution to Bucks County Council towards a frequent bus service between the Coachway Park and Ride at Handy X Hub and High Wycombe town centre. The County Council is responsible for agreeing an operational contract with a bus company (Carousel Buses).

The County Council report that passenger numbers have grown only slowly and, after reviewing the first year of operation, made adjustments in provision to reduce operating costs.

All the potential attractors for travel to Handy X Hub are not yet in place, such as new employment uses, the proposed on-site hotel and more regular motorway coach services; therefore the County Council changed the Park & Ride operation, so as to integrate it with other bus services in the area (and thereby reduce operating costs and extend the period over which services may be provided). In recent months (January 2018) WDC has liaised with the County about levels of unreliability in response to concerns expressed by some passengers. County's response was:

“Since the changes were made, passenger numbers are continuing to grow but clearly the exposure to traffic delays and other operational problems is greater

when relying on longer routes to also provide journeys to the Park & Ride site. There have also been problems with driver error and significant congestion issues in the lead up to Christmas but Carousel assure us that these have been addressed.

Given that the park and ride service has to consider a number of travel needs - most passengers were travelling into the town centre and bus station, but there are also trips to the hospital and the railway station - this has meant that some compromises were necessary with the timetable; hence the different service numbers (PR1, PR2 or X80). At times this can be confusing, particularly if the scheduled journey times are disrupted. We are looking at this again and have asked Carousel for options as to how we can offer a simpler park & ride timetable while still keeping within the budget available. They have also been told to focus on improving punctuality in the short term and ensure all buses are “tracking” correctly within the electronic journey system”.

Wycombe District Council will continue to monitor that the application of funding complies with the relevant planning obligations and is in discussions with the County Council to ensure that opportunities are taken to improve the services to HXH as far as practicable.

Supplementary question from Mr R B Colomb to the Cabinet Member for Economic Development & Regeneration

“It would appear that they are looking to extend the Park & Ride service as the buses are not running to time. I thought the principal of the Park & Ride was to park up and get on a bus for free so you can’t get income from pensioners with bus passes. Will you be able to get money from Bucks County Council?”

Response from Councillor S Broadbent (Cabinet Member for Economic Development & Regeneration)

“Not all contractors are yet there. I hope in the future they can park and hop on a bus. We’ll be making sure Bucks County Council protect the service and gather money as a primary objective.”

Question from Dr R Peters to the Cabinet Member for Community

“The draft Council minutes for December record concerns being raised about begging, homelessness, and antisocial behaviour arising from drug/alcohol abuse. I would like to highlight and commend the work of Street Angels and Wycombe Homeless Connection in these areas.

In what ways is the Council supporting these organisations?”

Response from Councillor G Peart (Cabinet Member for Community)

“Thank you Dr Peters for your question, which gives me the opportunity to highlight the very significant role played by our voluntary and community sector partners in supporting people in need of help and thereby making all of the towns in our District

safe and attractive places to visit.

My colleague, Cllr Mrs Langley, as the Cabinet Member for Housing, has awarded a grant for a number of years to support the vitally important work of Wycombe Homeless Connection in helping our most vulnerable residents. Last autumn WHC celebrated 10 years of service and only last week assisted 5 people who were sleeping rough on our streets, back into accommodation, a most notable achievement.

Street Angels work closely with our Community Safety service and the Police to ensure that those enjoying our night time economy are given the support they need at the end of their evening out. This is another great example of a voluntary service working late into the night to assist the people who are most vulnerable and also to call emergency services when necessary.

We also work with partners to deliver a Safe Places scheme, where people who feel at risk can be sure of a safe haven to stop in.

I know that Wycombe Police Superintendent, Kevin Brown, will echo me in saying that it is only by working in partnership that we can address and support those in need and I am delighted that we have a true partnership in the Street Community Group, addressing the issues we have with street drinking, begging and anti-social behaviour. WDC is most grateful to the very positive and speedy response from Superintendent Brown following our call for additional support in making the town centre a pleasant place to be in the evenings.

Some of the social issues will take longer to resolve than others as they are often complex but I am confident in saying that steady but significant progress is being made in assisting those who are in need on one hand and deterring those who are simply causing a nuisance or worse on the other.”

Supplementary question from Dr R Peters to the Cabinet Member for Community

“I am not a member of Street Angels or Wycombe Homeless Connection but have been impressed by ‘The Rock’ which has the goal of social interaction / bringing groups together. Would this be of value to Wycombe District Council?”

Response from Councillor G Peart (Cabinet Member for Community)

“I am familiar of the work of Deborah Green in Manchester. I’m open to every opportunity that brings cohesion and will look into it and work with yourself.”

6 QUESTIONS FROM MEMBERS

a) Question from Councillor R Raja to the Cabinet Member for Planning

“It appears to be WDC policy to allow affordable housing targets to be renegotiated downwards after the contracts have been agreed with developers.

If it is the case then is it possible for me to know the circumstances which merit renegotiation and can such practice be justified given that targets of affordable housing have never been met and when the definition of affordability does not make houses affordable by people on modest, low or medium income levels?”

Response from Councillor D Johncock (Cabinet Member for Planning)

“Thank you for your question Councillor Raja.

As we all know, housing delivery is clearly a national priority at the moment.

Policy CS13 (Affordable housing and housing mix) of our Core Strategy Development Plan Document sets out this Councils policy with regard to the provision of affordable housing. With further detail on the operation of the policy set out in the Supplementary Planning Document on Developer Contributions.

Affordable Housing is defined in The National Planning Policy Framework and where affordable housing is required this is secured by means of a section 106 legal agreement.

The National Planning Policy Framework however makes it clear that such obligations under a S106 legal agreement will not be appropriate if they impact the viability of the development. The delivery of all forms of open market housing, not just affordable, being as I have said a current priority for the country.

As a result during the consideration of a planning application, or even at the point of implementation, the Developer Contributions Supplementary Planning Document provides a process where the viability of the scheme can be independently reviewed. This can result in a development providing reduced affordable housing where there are particular issues, such as soil contamination as occurred at the Gas Works site, which impacts its viability.

However it would be wrong to say that the targets for affordable housing are never met, as many residential schemes do provide such housing (in the form of affordable rent or shared ownership), and indeed some such as the redevelopment at Olympic Way in High Wycombe have delivered 100% affordable housing.

Moving forward we will shortly be submitting our new Wycombe District Local Plan to the Planning Inspectorate and Policy DM24 (Affordable Housing) sets out how we will be seeking appropriate levels of affordable housing to meet the needs of our residents moving forward.”

Supplementary question from Councillor R Raja to the Cabinet Member for Planning

“A small residential development at Terriers does not contain any reference to affordable housing. This apparently is the result of a financial settlement agreed with the developer in lieu of building affordable houses. How can this be in the best interests of the people of Wycombe?”

Response from Councillor D Johncock (Cabinet Member for Planning)

“Please provide me with the details – I can’t respond now as I have no background details.”

b) Question from Councillor M Knight to the Leader of the Council

“In the light of the collapse of Carillion could you outline what safeguards are in place to protect the public services which Wycombe District Council has contracted out to private companies?”

Response from Councillor Ms K Wood (Leader of the Council).

“Thank you for the question Councillor Knight.

The Council as you know has detailed governance arrangements in place to manage risk including the risk of a failure of our suppliers.

In the light of the collapse of Carrillion we are enhancing our current supplier monitoring system.

As a first stage of this improvement the finance team will conduct a review of the financial standing of relevant suppliers. The Council has access to an on-line financial tool which can issue automated notices when an organisation’s financial circumstances change.

Within that system the finance team will set a series of criteria for each strategic supplier which if breached would trigger a warning notice.

If either the review of the financial standing or the on line system triggers an alert, the finance team will pass the information to the relevant Head of Service to inform their risk assessments and contingency plans.

Additionally, in the coming weeks Heads of Service will be asked to update their business continuity plans to be invoked in the event of failure of one of their strategic suppliers. This is monitored as one of the risks on the strategic risk register.”

Supplementary Question from Councillor M Knight to the Leader of the Council

“Risks outweigh the benefits of contracting out to private contractors / developers?”

Supplementary Response from Councillor Ms K Wood (Leader of the Council)

“We are not aware of any issues with suppliers which are likely to impact on service delivery. We are strengthening the robust system we already have in place”

c) Question from Councillor M Hanif to the Cabinet Member for Housing

“What progress is the Council making to reduce the human and economic cost on local residents of rising level of rough sleeping and homelessness?”

Response from Councillor Mrs J Langley (Cabinet Member for Housing)

“Thank you for your question Councillor Hanif.

The Council has in place a 5 year homelessness strategy (I have a copy for you and can provide to other Members: It is on the website). It is very clear that the Council aims to assist and prevent and relieve homelessness for as many people as possible.

Not all persons rough sleeping wish to accept offers of assistance. However, I can assure you the Outreach Service works tirelessly with us and our partners to assist anyone rough sleeping, seeking assistance.

The Council has also annually provided grant funding of over £120,000, to agencies in order to assist homeless persons and households – Wycombe homeless connection, Wycombe Women’s Aid and Wycombe Rent Deposit Guarantee Scheme.

In relation to the Modular Build, which is subject to planning permission, as a forward thinking Council and not afraid to take on challenges and more to the point a Council looking for ways to improve (as promised by the Leader) living conditions for those most in need of our help.

We are working on plans to increase our temporary accommodation provision, which is of course subject to planning permission from 34 units to 57 by using modular build in a Town Centre location. Thus providing better access to amenities / services than currently exists at Saunderton Lodge, also removing the institutional feel of living at the lodge. We were also constrained as to the number of units at Saunderton Lodge if we had gone for refurbishment.”

Supplementary Question from Councillor M Hanif to the Cabinet Member for Housing

“Wycombe District Council, on behalf of residents, spent £295k in 2016/17 housing 84 families and £62k in 2015/16 housing 95 families. How have the costs risen so sharply? Is it poor decision making by your Cabinet?”

Supplementary Response from Councillor Mrs J Langley (Cabinet Member for Housing)

“Re: 21.02.2018 - There were 8 households in Bed & Breakfast with 75 households in temporary accommodation.

Only Bed & Breakfast invokes a cost: we have 34 units at Saunderton Lodge for which we receive a rental income: with no charge to Wycombe District Council for temporary accommodation provided by our partner Registered Housing Providers.

It is very important to note that this is the lowest number of households in temporary accommodation for over 2 years.

I cannot take the credit for that as Cabinet Member for Housing) I am however, extremely fortunate to work with officer's in the Housing Team, whereby this clearly demonstrates to Members the excellent work carried out by the officers which continues to prevent homelessness wherever possible (just one element of their work.

I want to draw your attention to the Member Seminar - 13th March - on the Homelessness Reduction Act: this will help explain the new duties to prevent and relieve homelessness which will come into effect in April this year.

I hope you will be free to attend. Thank you."

d) Question from Councillor B Pearce to the Leader of the Council

"I assume you are aware that there is an action afoot to try to establish parish councils in the un-parished areas of High Wycombe Town. Do you agree with me that this would be disastrous and that a Town Council would be much more advantageous for everyone concerned?
One voice for the town as opposed to many voices with divisions."

Response from Councillor Ms K Wood (Leader of the Council).

"Thank you for the question Councillor Pearce.

This council is responsible for decisions on the outcome of Community Governance Reviews which consider matters such as the creation of parishes. If such a review was to be carried out it would consider a range of options. One of which may be that the town is well served by the current arrangements."

Supplementary Question from Councillor B Pearce to the Leader of the Council

"Some time ago West Wycombe was part of the time declared DPI – do you think it would be disastrous if other areas did the same?"

Supplementary Response from Councillor Ms K Wood (Leader of the Council)

"This would be subject to a full Community Governance Review."

e) Question from Councillor M Asif to the Leader of the Council

"Is the council ready to deal with one unitary authority for Bucks if that is the decision of the secretary of state for Communities and Local Government?"

Response from Councillor Ms K Wood (Leader of the Council)

Thank you for your question Councillor Hanif.

“We will deal with whatever decision emerges from central government when it emerges. But as yet, we have had no decision. The announcement of the minded decision in relation to the Dorset County, Bournemouth and Poole unitary areas was made on 7th November and just yesterday the first decisions are being taken about the nature and function of the shadow board. The Structural Change Order for that area has yet to be produced by government. In the event of an announcement we will take what action is necessary to respond but even where there is broad consensus, as in Dorset, there is a limit to what can be done before a decision is announced.”

Supplementary Question from Councillor M Asif to the Leader of the Council

“Should Wycombe District Council be worried about its reserves being plundered?”

Supplementary Response from Councillor Ms K Wood (Leader of the Council)

“This would be for any new Council to make decisions on.”

f) Question from Councillor K Ahmed to the Cabinet Member for Housing

“The Government's own statistics released this year show the number of people in Wycombe accepted as statutorily and unintentionally homeless rose again in 2016-7 to a record 121.

These people were supported through temporary accommodation in 2016-17 which costs the local taxpayer both dearly and needlessly.

What strategy does the Council have to reduce the number of people being made statutorily homeless?”

Response from Councillor Mrs J Langley (Cabinet Member for Housing)

“Many of the points I have covered in answering Councillor Hanif’s question are relevant to the question you have raised. I am happy to repeat them if you so wish.”

Supplementary Question from Councillor K Ahmed to the Cabinet Member for Housing

“Is the member aware of the fact that Wycombe District Council has only bothered to use 31% of its £362 million allocation from central government for *discretionary housing payments* to help tenants who are in rental arrears, many of them hit by the Benefits Cap, the Bedroom Tax and the freeze to Local Housing Allowance, pay their rent and avoid a Section 21 eviction notice?”

Given that discretionary housing payments are there provide urgent financial help to people whose benefits do not cover the rent, wouldn't greater use of the allocation payment help lower the number of people unintentionally becoming homeless and therefore reduce the cost to the local authority on private temporary accommodation, not to mention the suffering of the sadly growing number of local people who are made unintentionally homeless every year (53 percent up since 2010-11)?”

Supplementary Response from Councillor Mrs J Langley (Cabinet Member for Housing)

“I am very confident we are making good progress and through our Action Plan with the help of valuable partners, we flag up a number of ‘green’ statuses.

In terms of continuing to prevent homelessness: myself and my officer’s accept that we have to work to do and I can assure you that hard work will continue in order to assist our residents:

With relatively low numbers of households in temporary accommodation when compared to nearby authorities and the national average it is clear the progress that has been made and continues / which demonstrates the excellent work of officer’s.

For information; according to national statistics at the last recorded period in September 2017, the national average of households in temporary accommodation was 3.59 households per 1,000 households with Wycombe recording a figure of 1.61-less than half the national average. The figures for South Bucks was 2.42, Slough 7.12 and Luton 17.46 by way of comparison. The figure for London was 16.72.

g) Question from Councillor Ms A Baughan to the Leader of the Council

“As it looks likely that Bucks County Council will withdraw funding and close Children’s Centres across the county - it has been suggested by the BCC Cabinet Member that centres may be devolved to local communities and Parish Councils. Will Wycombe District Council be offering any support, financial or otherwise, to similar initiatives for example to continue to have Children’s Centres established in the unparished wards of the District?”

Response from Councillor Ms K Wood (Leader of the Council).

Thank you for your question Councillor Baughan.

“We understand that the buildings could be reused as valuable community assets in some locations. However the County will be delivering from community venues the early years services that were previously delivered from the Children’s Centres identified for closure. It does not seem sensible to suggest we may fund and operate a service from a Children’s Centre when the same service is still being delivered in the area, regardless of the fact that children’s services are not our responsibility but that of our County colleagues.

However, fully appreciate your concern regarding Bucks County Council, so many due to the service. I will ask the Cabinet Member, Councillor Warren Whyte at Bucks County Council for feedback which I will share with you.”

There was no supplementary question.

h) Question from Councillor Ms J Wassell to the Cabinet Member for Finance and Resources

“I am concerned £150,000 is being spent on the Council Chamber at Wycombe District Council. What are the nature of these improvements?”

Response from Councillor L Wood (Cabinet Member for Digital Development & Customer Services)

“Thank you Councillor Wassell for your question.

The £150,000 outlined in the budget has been requested in readiness for a series of essential maintenance and renewal works to sustain the operational capabilities of this chamber.

The budget has not yet been allocated to particular tasks, as we need to complete our feasibility and capability assessments to determine what works are most essential, and how they can be completed in the most cost effective and operationally efficient way.”

Supplementary Question from Councillor Ms J Wassell to the Cabinet Member for Finance and Resources

“I expected to hear specific details – what a waste of money! Please be more specific.”

Supplementary Response from Councillor L Wood (Cabinet Member for Digital Development & Customer Services)

“Money has been allocated.

We haven’t made any works to the Council Chamber for 30 years.

We are looking to replace the audio / visual system and also the air handling system which needs to be changed in the next 5 years. Going forward we’ll put forward a full business case which will go to Full Council.”

i) Question from Councillor B Pearce to the Cabinet Member for Economic Development & Regeneration

“Now that Costco have withdrawn from their proposal for their new store on Cressex Island, can you tell me what measures are in place to encourage another establishment/business to develop the site?”

Although I with many residents had reservations regarding the infrastructure capability, it is a great disappointment that Costco have withdrawn.

I understand that the said site cannot be used for housing due to measured poor air quality.”

Response from Councillor S Broadbent (Cabinet Member for Economic Development & Regeneration).

Thank you for your question Councillor Pearce.

“The site is allocated in the Local Plan for business use – one of the few sites left in Council ownership with job creating potential.

It’s a prime site and concept plans are already underway for alternative potential commercial uses that would improve the town and district’s offer. The proposals have yet to be tested against the planning policy for the site (and highways capacity), and soft market tested, before the Council seeks a development partner, by means of a competitive commercial process. So it would be premature to expand upon proposals at this stage.

But given the level of unsolicited interest already received from the development market, I expect attractive and revised options for the site to be secured in a relatively short space of time.”

There was no supplementary question.

j) Question from Councillor K Ahmed to the Cabinet Member for Planning

“The national picture is one of housing availability being in crisis.

Wycombe has people living on the streets and families in temporary accommodation. Looking at the councils own advice note which requires you to build between 30-40% affordable housing.

Can you explain why the figure given in the Wycombe local plan works out at a 23.5% affordable housing ratio?”

Response from Councillor D Johncock (Cabinet Member for Planning).

“Thank you for your question Councillor Ahmed but, in reply, I must start by saying that it doesn’t help to make histrionic comments about the housing situation in Wycombe. Thanks to the good work undertaken by this council, we don’t have thousands of people in temporary rented accommodation or living on the streets. However, I must be careful not to stray into my colleagues patch on housing and so I will focus on your specific question concerning the requirement for affordable homes as laid down in the new Local Plan.

In that respect, it is frustrating that despite numerous member briefings on the new local plan, you still don't seem to understand how the numbers are calculated so let me repeat it again.

We start the calculations through a process called a housing and economic development needs assessment. This calculates the housing need for the District and, within that, the number of affordable homes required which, for the new local plan period, amounts to 3,100 homes. This equates to 23.5% of the objectively assessed need.

So, in preparing the local plan, we have to take into account the fact that not all sites will provide affordable housing as they do not meet the size thresholds which would trigger a developer to provide affordable housing. So in order to achieve the figure of 3,100 affordable homes, we need to set a higher percentage for those developments that will provide affordable homes.

With that in mind, the local plan requires the provision of between 30 and 40% (30% previously developed or as we say brownfield land and 40% greenfield). The actual number to be delivered also takes into account a financial viability assessment which factors in all costs that a development is likely to incur including those arising from other policies in the plan.

However, as I have said, not every development will provide affordable homes and so when you average the number out over the whole plan period, it is expected to deliver 3,100 homes or 23.5% of the objectively assessed need figure of 13,200 homes.

As you will also remember, we have an agreement with AVDC to take our unmet need, so that we are building 10,925 homes in WDC. But please note, we are planning to provide the amount of affordable housing required on the full 13,200 figure.

Please also note that we currently believe that, overall, we will deliver more than that number as we have calculated that sites that already have planning permission and the sites proposed for allocation in the plan would provide approximately 3000 affordable homes.

I hope that clarifies matters for you."

Supplementary Question from Councillor K Ahmed to the Cabinet Member for Planning

"You have stated targets in the current Wycombe Housing Strategic Action Plan, that an average of 402.5 new homes a year will be built and that in the 2 years 2015 –17 71 affordable homes will be built. Has even this pitifully low 9% been achieved?"

Supplementary Response from Councillor D Johncock (Cabinet Member for Planning)

“These are the numbers over the whole period. Figures for 2 years don’t help. We will meet the numbers.”

Questions 11-13 were not put as the 30 minutes time period had expired. In accordance with Standing Orders, a written reply would be sent to the questioner by the appropriate Member within 10 working days, and would also be appended to the minutes of the meeting.

7 PETITIONS

No petitions were received by the deadline of 5pm on Thursday 15 February 2018.

8 TREASURY MANAGEMENT STRATEGY

The Leader of the Council explained that the Local Government Act 2003 required the Council to set out a statement of its treasury management strategy for borrowing and to prepare an Annual Investment Strategy. Members were informed that this set out the Council’s policies for managing its investments and for giving priority to the security and liquidity of those investments. It was noted that the report set out the Council’s proposed Treasury Management Strategy Statement (TMSS) and Annual Investment Strategy (AIS) for the year 2018/19. The item had been considered by both the Audit Committee and Cabinet.

The proposed recommendation was put to Council.

RESOLVED: That

- The Treasury Management Strategy Statement (TMSS) and Prudential Indicators for 2018/19 be approved.
- The Annual Investment Strategy (AIS) for 2018/19 as set out at Appendix A of the report be approved.
- The Minimum Revenue Provision Policy Statement for 2018/19 as set out at Appendix B of the report be approved.

9 CORPORATE PLAN

The Leader of the Council explained that the Council’s current Corporate Plan (approved by Council in December 2015 and published in January 2016) had been in place for two years. Members were informed that within the ‘delivering our priorities’ section it was recognised that as the environment and circumstances that we work in change - and new opportunities (or challenges) arise, there was a need to periodically ‘pause’ and review the ambitions and activities.

It was noted that the refresh process had started in June 2017 with involvement and input from Members to revisit and refine the focus of ambitions in light of the

journey the Council had taken since 2015 – to reflect where the Council was now and where it was going.

The proposed recommendation had been submitted from Cabinet and was put to Council.

RESOLVED:

- (i) Members approve the refreshed Corporate Plan as attached to the report at Appendix A.
- (ii) That the Corporate Plan document be included within the Budget and Policy Framework and that the Constitution be amended accordingly.

10 CABINET

The Leader presented the minutes of the meeting of Cabinet held on the 18 December 2017. The Deputy Leader presented item 59 (Ashwells) on page 70 of the agenda as the Leader had to withdraw for that item and the Leader returned after this item to presented the minutes of the meeting of Cabinet held on the 5 February 2018.

Councillor P Turner explained that Item 59 needed to read with Item 61 as a note had been inserted in the text to clarify that the allocation being recommended would only be required should planning consent be obtained. The Democratic Service Manager, asked Members to take this point of clarification into consideration which they all agreed to do.

RESOLVED: That the minutes of the meeting of the Cabinet held on 18 December 2017 and 5 February 2018 be received, and the recommendations as set out at minute numbers 59 and 67 be approved and adopted (recommendations at minute numbers 64 & 66 had been approved earlier in the meeting. Recommendation at minute number 63 was taken under the Budget item below).

11 COUNCIL TAX SETTING 2018/19 AND PRESENTATION FROM LEADER OF THE COUNCIL

The meeting then specifically turned to the recommendation outlined in minute number 63 of the Cabinet Minutes of 5 February 2018 (Revenue Budget & Council Tax Setting 2018/19) along with the supplement issued to the item in advance of the meeting.

The Chairman explained the process that would be followed.

The Leader of the Council in introducing the Cabinet Member for Finance to make the Budget presentation, explained that the budget this year was forward thinking

and aimed to serve the interests of all residents by ensuring we continue to provide excellent value for money services and improve the district year on year. The Leader stated that she wanted the Council to continue to champion local communities whilst regenerating our District for all to live in, work and enjoy. She also wanted to provide housing for those who need it from first time buyers through to those wanting to downsize. Members were informed that the Leader also wanted to be able to include and listen to the Youth of our District as well as to work with neighbouring Local Authorities. The Leader explained that there were challenging times ahead and that team work was needed.

The Leader expressed her thanks to the Chief Finance Officer and Chief Executive along with the Senior Management Team and the many other officers involved in the budget preparation. The Leader went onto thank all staff for making Wycombe District Council function and the Council's Improvement and Review Commission's cross party Budget Task and Finish Group for their thorough examination of the budget. The Leader asked everyone to remember that the majority of other Councils were increasing Council Tax by the maximum amount and that Wycombe District still has the lowest Council Tax in Buckinghamshire.

The Cabinet Member for Finance rose to give his budget speech beginning with some background to this year's budget. He explained that as local council tax payers everyone had an interest in the continued provision of high standard services across our District at the lowest long term cost. It was noted that this budget sought to address the key challenges and risks facing the Council and how it was planned to fund both the Revenue and Major Projects expenditure during the year ahead.

Members were informed that there were a number of financial challenges facing the Council namely the reduction in the Revenue Support Grant (a £518K decrease in 2018/19 alone) , uncertainty about the future of business rates , to what extent the Council will see negative revenue support grant in the coming years and the impact of inflation. Councillor Watson explained that the Council also set the challenge to become "self – financing" within the medium term – that is to say that the revenue budget would become independent of central government funding, New Homes Bonus and Business Rates. Members were informed that there were also a number of financial risks which faced the Council which included a possible increase in homelessness arising from new responsibilities coming into effect on April 1st, the planned October roll out of Universal Credit and also the potential volatility in retail rentals and the possible need for interim staff – there were also other risks which at this time remained unknown.

Councillor Watson explained that an innovation since last year had been the introduction of the draft budget which was first reported at the 18 December Cabinet meeting – a detailed initial look at the budget enabled Members to reflect upon the year ahead and in particular allowed the Improvement and Review Commission Budget Task and Finish Group the opportunity to scrutinise the numbers, and also discuss them with myself and the S151 officer. It was noted that a series of one on one meetings between Cabinet members, the relevant Head of Service, the S151 officer and Councillor

Watson also took place during January and, as a consequence, the December draft had been amended – mainly within Major Projects.

Councillor Watson explained that as the financial future of the Council was considered he would first remind Members of what had gone before - notably during the period since the Tenant Lead Transfer of the Housing stock to Red Kite the Council had not had to borrow and we have become accustomed to being in a financially advantageous situation and this had meant that neither interest costs nor any Minimum Revenue Provision have had to be charged to Revenue – the benefit of not having any borrowing costs had served to keep the Council Tax flat for most of the last few years. It was noted that looking ahead the Council had ambitious plans for the future and the budget included a £152.5M Major Projects programme over the period including this year and the subsequent five years. Members were informed that the prevailing situation of not having to borrow was now forecast to change from 2021/22.

Councillor Watson explained that £87.5M of projects were planned to be funded from reserves, £20M from borrowing and £45M of projects to be funded from external Grant from Central Government and also from Community Infrastructure Levies and Section 106 Contributions. Councillor Watson stated that he was pleased to say that the Council had already received £20M of the £45M external funding - £19.5M of which was from the Housing Infrastructure Fund - £7.5 million to improve the junction at Kingsmead Road and Abbey Barn Lane in High Wycombe, following the release of Abbey Barn North and South reserve sites - and in addition, £12 million of funding had been awarded to help with new infrastructure that would be needed to support housing growth in Princes Risborough, subject to the local plan being approved.

Members were informed that some of the other areas identified for investment included:

- £4.7m investment in community facilities including car parks, cemeteries, community and sports premises – notably the Princes Risborough Springs Sports Centre.
- £43.2m investment in Economic Development including town centre investment and the regeneration in order to develop the public realm and develop an increased income stream to fund council services in the future - notably enabling a second Aldi, land at Ashwells and a number of Strategic Acquisitions.
- £15.5M investment in Housing – included Temporary Accommodation, a development of park homes at the Bassetbury Triangle, the use of Disabled Facilities Grants and the delivery of Affordable Housing.
- £5.1m investment in IT improvements that would reduce the day-to-day costs of delivering our services and further improve the customer experience for all our residents in the future – the so called Digital First IT Transformation programme.

Councillor Watson explained that with regard to the forecasted return to borrowing the Council would do all that it could to mitigate the impact but did

need to begin to plan for that situation now. Members were informed that as a rule of thumb the purchase of an asset with an economic life of 20 years financed from borrowing would result in an 8% annual charge to the Revenue budget. It was noted that the implication of a future return to borrowing was that the costs charged to Revenue would rise sharply during the coming years – the best way to prepare for this was to increase the council tax now – we need to recognise that the Council was not a business and could not increase its prices sharply when its costs sharply rise – the council was subject to the referendum limit and thus needed to set its council tax whilst considering the longer term and not just the immediate year ahead.

Councillor Watson stated that he was grateful to past and present councillors and officers who have run this council in a “small c conservative” manner for many years and thus had inherited healthy financial reserves which could, if needed be, be called upon in time of economic uncertainty – the Council did not want to be in a similar position to Northamptonshire County Council.

Councillor Watson explained that the background to the Revenue budget was that over the past years the Council had worked hard to deliver the efficiencies required through fostering a culture of innovation and a focus on continuous improvement, engaged in shared services with other councils and obtained the optimum return from the cash held. It was noted that meanwhile the number of council employees had been reduced from over approximately 650 to approximately 250 during the past decade. This had enabled the Council to deliver savings for its 176,000 residents through a range of initiatives including more efficient structures, improved commercialisation, the pro-active use of council assets and the delivery of economic regeneration projects. With regards to 2018/19 the Council had set aside revenue budget for a number of additional purposes including the following:-

1. £60K in the Youth Mentoring project
2. £103k for car park security
3. A £273K grant had been made available to tackle the cost of homelessness.

Members were assured by Councillor Watson that no increase in car parking charges was assumed within the budget.

It was noted that Wycombe was the third largest District Council in terms of tax base but 24th out of 200 in terms of council tax collected. Members were informed that in order to fund the budget for 2018/19, the Council was proposing to increase Council Tax by £5 for a band D tax payer – i.e. an increase of 3.8%. It was noted that this would be only the second rise during the past seven years.

Councillor Watson then commented that one might ask what does the council tax increase bring to the local community? He outlined that:

1. It allows the council to maintain its services at a high standard – no reduction in front line services was planned.
2. Invest in the district to enable the locality to remain economically strong.

3. Improve on line access to council services.
4. Deliver a sustainable future for many years to come.

Councillor Watson explained that as a low tax conservative he would prefer not to have to increase the level of the council tax but would point out that the Council Tax, even after this increase, would remain the lowest amongst the four Buckinghamshire district councils and would also remain amongst the lowest 25% in the country – (175/200).

Councillor Watson informed Members that Wycombe District Council was in a financially strong position, he then commended the Budget to Council and asked for the recommendations to be approved. Councillor Barnes seconded the proposal.

The Leader of the Labour Group, Councillor Raja, rose to respond to the Budget speech. He explained that before he responded to the budget statement by Councillor Watson, he would like to make it clear that any points he made, which might be deemed to be critical were not directed at any of the officers. Councillor Raja went on to thank, at the outset, a practically new finance team at WDC for having produced a budget with plenty of explanations.

Councillor Raja explained that the Improvement & Review Commission had made 23 recommendations to the Cabinet, after a very lengthy and intense period of reviewing and scrutinizing the budgetary process, yet of the 23 recommendations 8 were merely noted, one was not agreed and two were not required, so roughly 50% of the I & R's recommendations had been discarded. He went onto explain that the High Wycombe Town committee's budgetary exercise had also been thrown in abeyance.

Councillor Raja informed Members that apart from the usual aspirations and numbers the main point of this budget was that it proposed to increase the Council tax by £5 for Band D properties or a 3.8% rise across all bands. It was noted that the £5 was only a small part of the overall increase (6%), which included the precept. Councillor Raja stated that what residents of WDC were entitled to know was what benefits would they get for this £5 increase and why was WDC not arguing for the much delayed revaluation of properties and the establishment of higher bands above 'H'? It was noted that the current council tax assessments were based on valuations from 1991.

Councillor Raja stated that the draft budget (as presented to Cabinet on 5 February) also hinted that based on the 5 year capital programme it was expected that the Council may need to borrow £20M to finance the programme in 2021/22 (page 17 (section 4.2), but there was no explanation as why this was needed.

Councillor Raja went onto explain that ironically, there was considerable amount of cash in the system: should the leadership not be afraid of keeping these reserves in case a single unitary authority in Bucks leads to these reserves being plundered by the County Council? He stated that Members may also have noticed that throughout the document, the background information explained that: Wycombe

District Council had good reserves (section 5.6) and was 'under-borrowed'. Councillor Raja questioned what the extra £20M of borrowing from 2021/22 was for.

Councillor Raja also noted that Link Asset Services was the new name for Wycombe District Council's 'external treasury management advisors'. His concern was that Wycombe District Council might be being advised (by the consultants) to borrow more simply because it could. Councillor Raja explained that this might be 'good financial management' for an investor, but was questionable for a Council and raised questions about motivation: was the advisor making an extra fee on any borrowing?

Councillor Raja informed Members that the revenue implications of borrowing would be around £1.1M per annum from 201/22 onwards. It was noted that the Council had sat tight on its reserves and did not borrow when the interest rates had been historically low; so much for prudent housekeeping!

It was noted that according to the blurb in the draft budget the Council had adopted the four key priorities, Place, People, Prosperity and Progress (the four Ps). Councillor Raja asked Members to briefly examine what the budget said about the four Ps. Members were informed that the Corporate Plan 2015-2020 stated that the Place priority focused on the environment, towns and rural areas buildings and landscape, it did not say anything about the state of the High Street or Frogmoor in High Wycombe, let alone places in Bowerdean, Micklefield or Castlefield, as it went on to say that the Council wanted people who lived and worked in the area to have an environment that met their needs and also so that the visitors could enjoy all Wycombe had to offer; that is if visitors can find a parking place.

Councillor Raja explained that for the People priority it stated that the Council wanted its children to have the best start in life. Councillor Raja questioned how this was possible for many who would no longer have access to the Children's Centers, thanks to a Tory administration at County Hall or the fact that a growing number of school children cannot get into their local schools or in some cases in any school? Members were informed that according to the Centre for Policy studies a third of the children in Micklefield, Bowerdean, Castlefield and even in Disraeli Ward lived in poverty and many people, even those in work were known to have registered with food banks. What sort of prosperity is this budget offering them?

Councillor Raja went onto explain that the Corporate Plan also said that the Council would work to support integration and promote cohesion. Perhaps Members ought to know of some examples of the Council's work on this front, promoting integration and community cohesion.

It was noted that the Council had another aspiration to "allocate homes fairly to those in greatest need. Well what about people in their mid-30's still living with their parents and does the Council not need to have houses before they could be given? Perhaps the clue was in the text as it referred to "those in greatest need". Perhaps Members could be told of the definition of greatest need?

It was noted that the Corporate Plan also wanted people to be healthy and active. Again a commendable sentiment but what evidence was there that Wycombe District Council would help to improve homes? Are grants going to be made available to residents to make their homes safe and environmentally friendly?

It was noted that the Corporate Plan also wanted to support the creation of new businesses; do cabinet members know that many smaller businesses are deterred by high business rates?

Councillor Raja explained that the budget did nothing for the vulnerable and poor in the community who had suffered cuts to their benefits. The majority of the cuts had fallen on working people in Wycombe. Councillor Raja questioned how could it be assumed that the governing councillors were not totally divorced from the realities of life of many of the people living in Wycombe?

Councillor Raja stated that he looked forward to seeing the governing group's plans for meeting all of the promises made in the supporting documents. Members were informed that it was easy to make promises but the hard part was to deliver on promises and the people of Wycombe were looking for results and not platitudes.

Councillor Raja asked about the elephant in the room or the two elephants: Brexit & Single unitary authority for Bucks, the Budget was pretty silent about both of these mega issues, which would change the way everyone lived and worked for the future.

Councillor Raja stated that the proof of the pudding was in the eating; to him the aspirational clap trap was just wishful thinking or pious words.

It was noted that as the Leader of the Council said in her introduction things had changed and Councillor Raja was sure the people in the Council Chamber who have seen Wycombe evolve over the last half century would agree that things in Wycombe had changed as they had in the rest of the country. Those in Wycombe, now lived in a knowledge based economy, with service and leisure industries in the forefront instead of the manufacturing sector of old. Councillor Raja stated that in his younger days people aspired to have a fridge, fitted carpets, central heating, double glazing, a car but now a days people expected these material comforts coupled with proper public services; thus the Council had to see things in relative terms and note deprivation where it existed.

Councillor Raja explained that the Council needed to see whether the residents were happy with the state of the roads and footpaths, with the lack of sufficient school places for their children and a hospital which lacked an A&E. Our High Street and some of the other shopping centres felt as if all commercial life was draining out of them. Councillor Raja stated that he felt the Budget required improvement.

The Leader of the East Wycombe Independent Group, Councillor Knight, also addressed the meeting and thanked the Head of Finance and his team, and his colleagues on the Budget Task and Finish Group, as well as the Cabinet Member

and his Cabinet colleagues for all contributing to the preparation of the budget presented to Members this evening.

Councillor Knight explained that since joining the council in 2011 there had been a massive reduction in government grant placing unprecedented pressure on local authority finances. At the same time austerity savings had seen budgets slashed across all public services and increasingly we were beginning to see the consequences of those cost savings.

Councillor Knight went on to explain that the emergency services, health services and at a county level our social care and children's services were struggling to meet the demands placed on them within the resources available. It was noted that for eight years a Conservative led government had presided over an economy where vital public services have had their resources cut and local authorities had been put under extreme pressure.

Councillor Knight explained that it was a very, very difficult time to be setting local authority budgets and as Conservative councillors leading the council he was not sure why they put up with it. Councillor Knight stated that he hoped that within the Conservative Party they were sending a clear message to those at the top – enough is enough.

Councillor Knight explained that continuing to reflect back over the last few years, in 2015 he used his budget response to highlight three points; the need to cut waste, the need to make the Councils extensive property portfolio deliver better financial returns and to pursue a Unitary Authority. Councillor Knight stated that he was pleased to see that three years later there had been a considerable shift on all three things – the sudden enthusiasm about a Unitary Authority being perhaps the most remarkable turnaround. Of course, backed into a corner by an aggressively low tax, small government Conservative administration was perhaps a case of desperate times called for desperate measures.

Councillor Knight explained that in 2016 he had spoken about Wycombe District Council needing to create solutions to the impending and worsening housing crisis by using its own land and resources. Members were informed that last year he had expressed frustration at the lack of progress and so he was now pleased to see this beginning to happen – with the proposed replacement of Saunderton Lodge and the release of Ashwells and the former Bassetsbury Allotments. It was noted that the Council was moving slowly in the right direction but were still some way off the vision he cast of the Wycombe District becoming a nationally recognised innovator in the provision of truly affordable housing. Councillor Knight explained that he still longed to see a budget which reflected a more ambitious and creative approach to resolving the chronic shortage of housing which was so damaging, particularly for young people starting out in life.

Councillor Knight explained that in 2017 he had expressed concern about the lack of readiness for the impending roll out of Universal Credit. The impact of the transfer to Universal Credit on the most vulnerable across our nation had been severe and at times devastating. It was noted that at least this year it got a brief mention but that was all. Presently anticipated to be introduced in the District in

September or October this year Members could only guess at what impact it might have on the Revenue and Benefits Team and the demand for discretionary support. Members were informed that some authorities were setting aside millions of pounds in contingencies to ensure the most vulnerable in their communities were looked after. Yes – the Council has healthy reserves but Councillor Knight explained that he would be more reassured to see ring fenced contingencies and a specific commitment in the budget.

Councillor Knight explained that if the transfer to Universal Credit was not managed well, and there was plenty of evidence that it often wasn't, the financial risks it presented to the wider budget was significant. In particular the pressure on the Councils Housing and Homelessness Prevention teams as people faced rent arrears and the consequences of this.

Members were informed that last year saw the council support a freeze in council tax which Councillor Knight had warned would leave the Council less able to support those in the District who needed the Councils help the most. This year the Council was now being asked to support a significant rise of just under 4%. It was noted that a modest rise last year might not have made a great difference but the compound effect over five years would have increased the Councils budgets significantly in the longer term.

Councillor Knight explained that the Conservative mantra of being the party of low taxes was all well and good but years of successive tax freezes and savings cuts eventually catch up with you. So this year the Council was asking its residents to shoulder a big hike in their Council Tax because of last year's much feted freeze. No doubt with District elections coming up in May 2019 the Council can anticipate another zero rise next year.

Councillor Knight stated that he had some sympathy with the ruling group having to put together a balanced budget while being put under pressure to save, save, save by their national Conservative government. It was noted that there wasn't exactly a lot of room for manoeuvre when everything had been cut to the bone. But equally household budgets were tight – and it was not fair on residents to offer a tax freeze one year only to have it cranked up the next year.

Councillor Knight explained that budgeting for hard pressed families, young people and pensioners was increasingly difficult and the Council should be planning ahead to avoid making rises that were higher the rate of inflation.

For that reason Councillor Knight stated he could not support the budget.

Other Members also made a number of remarks in respect of the Budget proposals.

The Cabinet Member for Finance made some closing remarks and asked Members to support his proposed recommendations. 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 decision was recorded as follows:

In favour of the recommendations:-

Councillors Mrs J Adey, Shade Adoh, M Appleyard, D Barnes, S Broadbent, Miss S Brown, H Bull, D Carroll, R Farmer, R Gaffney, G C Hall, M Harris, A Hussain, M Hussain, Maz Hussain, D Johncock, D Knights, Mrs J Langley, T Lee, Mrs W Mallen, N Marshall, H McCarthy, I McEnnis, R Newman, Mrs C Oliver, B Pearce, G Peart, S Saddique, D Shakespeare, N Teesdale, A Turner, D Watson, C Whitehead, R Wilson, Miss K Wood and L Wood.

Against:- Councillors K Ahmed, A Baughan, M Knight and Ms J Wassell.

Abstentions:- Councillors M Asif, M Clarke, S Graham, A R Green, M Hanif and R Raja

In Favour:- 36

Against:- 4

Abstention:- 6

(Councillors Mrs L Clarke, A Hill, S K Raja, J Savage, Mrs J Teesdale and P Turner were not present when the above vote was taken.)

RESOLVED that the Council:

- i. That the recommendations contained in Minute 63 of the Cabinet Meeting held on 5 February 2018 be approved and adopted; and
- ii. Approved the formal Council Tax Resolution as set out in Appendix A (and set out below);
- iii. Noted the Head of Finance and Commercial's report;
- iv. Noted the statement by the Chief Finance Officer regarding the robustness of the budget estimates and level of reserves as set out in Appendix B; and
- v. Noted the Council Tax Reduction Scheme for the Council attached at Appendix C. The rules of the 2018/19 scheme remains unchanged and is the same as what was originally approved in 2013/14.

1)

(A) 68,083.50 being the amount calculated by the Council, in accordance with the Local Authorities (Calculation of Council Tax Base) England) Regulations 2012, as its Council Tax Base for the year.

(B)

Parish	2018-19
Bledlow-cum-Saunderton	1,208.17
Bradenham	231.56

Chepping Wycombe	6,415.93
Downley	1,973.67
Ellesborough	440.98
Fawley (Parish Meeting)	144.84
Great & Little Hampden	164.28
Great & Little Kimble cum Marsh	492.92
Great Marlow	719.64
Hambleden	843.36
Hazlemere	4,001.40
Hedsor (Parish Meeting)	81.56
High Wycombe Town	22,669.83
Hughenden	3,993.46
Ibstone	145.96
Lacey Green	1,249.37
Lane End	1,423.53
Little Marlow	801.03
Longwick-cum-Ilmer	682.86
Marlow Bottom	1,522.44
Marlow Town	6,674.86
Medmenham	517.52
Piddington & Wheeler End	265.95
Princes Risborough	3,546.12
Radnage	384.72
Stokenchurch	1,955.49
Turville	217.99
WestW'- Parish Council	545.86
Wooburn and Bourne End	4,768.20
Total	68,083.50

The amounts calculated by the Council, in accordance with regulation 6 of the Regulations, as the amount of its Council Tax Base for the year for dwellings in those parts of its area to which one or more special items (i.e. Parish precepts) relate, are shown above.

2) That the Council calculates the following amounts for 2018/19 in accordance with Sections 31A, 31B and 34 to 36 of the Local Government Finance Act 1992 (as amended by the Localism Act 2011):

- a) £85,978,373 being the aggregate expenditure which the Council estimates for the items set out in Section 31A(2) (a) to (f) of the Act (including the General Fund and Parish Precepts).
- b) £73,577,685 being the aggregate income which the Council estimates for the items set out in Section 31A(3) (a) to (d) of the Act.

- c) £12,400,688 as its council tax requirement for the year including Parish Precepts being the amount by which the aggregate expenditure at 2(a) above exceeds the aggregate income at 2(b) above, calculated by the Council, in accordance with Section 31A(4) of the Act.
- d) £182.14 as the basic amount of its Council Tax for the year, being the council tax requirement at 2(c), divided by the Council Tax Base for the year 68,083.50 at 1(a) above, calculated by the Council, in accordance with Section 31B(1) of the Act.
- e) £3,073,929 being the aggregate amount of all special items referred to in Section 34(1) of the Act.
- f) £136.99 as the basic amount of its Council Tax for dwellings in its area, excluding Parish Precepts, being the amount at 2(d) above less the result given by dividing the amount at 2(e) above by the amount at 1(a) above, calculated by the Council, in accordance with Section 34(2) of the Act.
- g) The amounts given by adding to the amount at 2(f) above the amounts of the Parish Precepts for the relevant Parish divided in each case by the Council Tax Base for the Parish at 1(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 each Parish is:

2018/19 Basic Council Tax £		
Parish / Town Area	Parish	WDC + Parish
Bledlow-cum-Saunderton	15.02	152.01
Bradenham	30.83	167.82
Chepping Wycombe	55.20	192.19
Downley	49.66	186.65
Ellesborough	42.26	179.25
Fawley	0.00	136.99
Great & Little Hampden	19.16	156.15
Great & Little Kimble cum Marsh	91.29	228.28
Great Marlow	17.18	154.17
Hambleton	37.94	174.93
Hazlemere	71.19	208.18
Hedsor	0.00	136.99
High Wycombe Town	19.50	156.49
Hughenden	52.99	189.98
Ibstone	47.96	184.95
Lacey Green	20.79	157.78
Lane End	106.75	243.74
Little Marlow	62.99	199.98
Longwick-cum-Ilmer	40.35	177.34
Marlow Bottom	24.96	161.95
Marlow Town	51.24	188.23
Medmenham	38.26	175.25
Piddington & Wheeler End	83.66	220.65

Princes Risborough	99.87	236.86
Radnage	71.87	208.86
Stokenchurch	40.50	177.49
Turville	25.23	162.22
WestW'- Council	84.63	221.62
Wooburn and Bourne End	73.19	210.18

This is the sum of the District Council's band D tax and the individual Parish/Town/Special Expenses band D taxes for each parish area. Hedsor and Fawley issue nil precepts.

The amounts given by multiplying the basic amounts for each Parish 2(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.

Parish / Town Area	Band A	Band B	Band C	Band D	Band E	Band F	Band G	Band H
	£	£	£	£	£	£	£	£
Bledlow-cum-Saunderton	101.35	118.24	135.12	152.01	185.79	219.57	253.36	304.02
Bradenham	111.88	130.53	149.17	167.82	205.11	242.40	279.70	335.64
Chepping Wycombe	128.13	149.48	170.84	192.19	234.90	277.60	320.32	384.38
Downley	124.44	145.17	165.91	186.65	228.13	269.60	311.09	373.30
Ellesborough	119.50	139.42	159.33	179.25	219.08	258.91	298.75	358.50
Fawley	91.33	106.55	121.77	136.99	167.43	197.87	228.32	273.98
Great & Little Hampden	104.10	121.46	138.81	156.15	190.85	225.55	260.25	312.30
Great & Little Kimble cum Marsh	152.19	177.55	202.92	228.28	279.01	329.73	380.47	456.56
Great Marlow	102.78	119.91	137.04	154.17	188.43	222.69	256.95	308.34
Hambleden	116.62	136.06	155.49	174.93	213.80	252.67	291.55	349.86
Hazlemere	138.79	161.92	185.05	208.18	254.44	300.70	346.97	416.36
Hedsor	91.33	106.55	121.77	136.99	167.43	197.87	228.32	273.98
High Wycombe Town	104.32	121.71	139.10	156.49	191.25	226.03	260.81	312.98
Hughenden	126.66	147.76	168.87	189.98	232.20	274.41	316.64	379.96
Ibstone	123.30	143.85	164.40	184.95	226.05	267.15	308.25	369.90
Lacey Green	105.18	122.71	140.25	157.78	192.84	227.90	262.97	315.56
Lane End	162.50	189.58	216.66	243.74	297.90	352.06	406.24	487.48

Little Marlow	133.32	155.54	177.76	199.98	244.42	288.86	333.30	399.96
Longwick-cum-Ilmer	118.23	137.93	157.64	177.34	216.75	256.15	295.57	354.68
Marlow Bottom	107.97	125.96	143.96	161.95	197.94	233.92	269.92	323.90
Marlow Town	125.49	146.40	167.32	188.23	230.06	271.88	313.72	376.46
Medmenham	116.83	136.30	155.78	175.25	214.19	253.13	292.08	350.50
Piddington & Wheeler End	147.10	171.62	196.13	220.65	269.68	318.71	367.75	441.30
Princes Risborough	157.91	184.23	210.54	236.86	289.49	342.13	394.77	473.72
Radnage	139.24	162.45	185.65	208.86	255.27	301.68	348.10	417.72
Stokenchurch	118.33	138.06	157.77	177.49	216.93	256.37	295.82	354.98
Turville	108.15	126.17	144.19	162.22	198.27	234.31	270.37	324.44
WestW'-Council	147.74	172.38	196.99	221.62	270.86	320.11	369.37	443.24
Wooburn and Bourne End	140.12	163.48	186.83	210.18	256.88	303.59	350.30	420.36

3) That it be noted that for the year 2018/19 the main precepting authorities have stated the following amounts in precepts issued to the Council, in accordance with s40 of the Local Government Finance Act 1992.

	Bucks County Council £	Police & Crime Commissioner for Thames Valley £	Bucks & Milton Keynes Fire Authority £	Total Preceptors £
Band A	860.69	121.52	41.80	1,024.01
Band B	1,004.14	141.77	48.77	1,194.68
Band C	1,147.59	162.03	55.73	1,365.35
Band D	1,291.04	182.28	62.70	1,536.02
Band E	1,577.94	222.79	76.63	1,877.36
Band F	1,864.84	263.29	90.57	2,218.70
Band G	2,151.73	303.80	104.50	2,560.03
Band H	2,582.08	364.56	125.40	3,072.04

4) That, having calculated the aggregate in each case of the amounts of the District's and preceptors requirements, in accordance with s30(2) of the Local Government Finance Act 1992, hereby sets amounts of the council tax for the year 2018/19 for each category of dwelling as follows.

2018/19 Council Tax £			
	WDC & Parishes	Total Preceptors	Total Council Tax
Band A	121.43	1,024.01	1,145.44
Band B	141.67	1,194.68	1,336.35

Band C	161.90	1,365.35	1,527.25
Band D	182.14	1,536.02	1,718.16
Band E	222.61	1,877.36	2,099.97
Band F	263.09	2,218.70	2,481.79
Band G	303.57	2,560.03	2,863.60
Band H	364.28	3,072.04	3,436.32

The council tax for each category of dwelling by parish is as follows.

Parish / Town Area	Band A	Band B	Band C	Band D	Band E	Band F	Band G	Band H
	£	£	£	£	£	£	£	£
Bledlow-cum-Saunderton	1,125.36	1,312.92	1,500.47	1,688.03	2,063.15	2,438.27	2,813.39	3,376.06
Bradenham	1,135.89	1,325.21	1,514.52	1,703.84	2,082.47	2,461.10	2,839.73	3,407.68
Chepping Wycombe	1,152.14	1,344.16	1,536.19	1,728.21	2,112.26	2,496.30	2,880.35	3,456.42
Downley	1,148.45	1,339.85	1,531.26	1,722.67	2,105.49	2,488.30	2,871.12	3,445.34
Ellesborough	1,143.51	1,334.10	1,524.68	1,715.27	2,096.44	2,477.61	2,858.78	3,430.54
Fawley	1,115.34	1,301.23	1,487.12	1,673.01	2,044.79	2,416.57	2,788.35	3,346.02
Great & Little Hampden	1,128.11	1,316.14	1,504.16	1,692.17	2,068.21	2,444.25	2,820.28	3,384.34
Great & Little Kimble cum Marsh	1,176.20	1,372.23	1,568.27	1,764.30	2,156.37	2,548.43	2,940.50	3,528.60
Great Marlow	1,126.79	1,314.59	1,502.39	1,690.19	2,065.79	2,441.39	2,816.98	3,380.38
Hambleden	1,140.63	1,330.74	1,520.84	1,710.95	2,091.16	2,471.37	2,851.58	3,421.90
Hazlemere	1,162.80	1,356.60	1,550.40	1,744.20	2,131.80	2,519.40	2,907.00	3,488.40
Hedsor	1,115.34	1,301.23	1,487.12	1,673.01	2,044.79	2,416.57	2,788.35	3,346.02
High Wycombe Town	1,128.33	1,316.39	1,504.45	1,692.51	2,068.61	2,444.73	2,820.84	3,385.02
Hughenden	1,150.67	1,342.44	1,534.22	1,726.00	2,109.56	2,493.11	2,876.67	3,452.00
Ibstone	1,147.31	1,338.53	1,529.75	1,720.97	2,103.41	2,485.85	2,868.28	3,441.94
Lacey Green	1,129.19	1,317.39	1,505.60	1,693.80	2,070.20	2,446.60	2,823.00	3,387.60
Lane End	1,186.51	1,384.26	1,582.01	1,779.76	2,175.26	2,570.76	2,966.27	3,559.52
Little Marlow	1,157.33	1,350.22	1,543.11	1,736.00	2,121.78	2,507.56	2,893.33	3,472.00
Longwick-cum-Ilmer	1,142.24	1,332.61	1,522.99	1,713.36	2,094.11	2,474.85	2,855.60	3,426.72
Marlow Bottom	1,131.98	1,320.64	1,509.31	1,697.97	2,075.30	2,452.62	2,829.95	3,395.94
Marlow Town	1,149.50	1,341.08	1,532.67	1,724.25	2,107.42	2,490.58	2,873.75	3,448.50
Medmenham	1,140.84	1,330.98	1,521.13	1,711.27	2,091.55	2,471.83	2,852.11	3,422.54
Piddington & Wheeler End	1,171.11	1,366.30	1,561.48	1,756.67	2,147.04	2,537.41	2,927.78	3,513.34

Princes Risborough	1,181.92	1,378.91	1,575.89	1,772.88	2,166.85	2,560.83	2,954.80	3,545.76
Radnage	1,163.25	1,357.13	1,551.00	1,744.88	2,132.63	2,520.38	2,908.13	3,489.76
Stokenchurch	1,142.34	1,332.74	1,523.12	1,713.51	2,094.29	2,475.07	2,855.85	3,427.02
Turville	1,132.16	1,320.85	1,509.54	1,698.24	2,075.63	2,453.01	2,830.40	3,396.48
WestW'-Council	1,171.75	1,367.06	1,562.34	1,757.64	2,148.22	2,538.81	2,929.40	3,515.28
Wooburn and Bourne End	1,164.13	1,358.16	1,552.18	1,746.20	2,134.24	2,522.29	2,910.33	3,492.40

5) That in accordance with section 52ZB of the Act it is determined that the Council's relevant basic amount of Council Tax for 2018/2019 is not excessive.

12 STANDARDS COMMITTEE

In the absence of the Chairman the Vice Chairman of the Committee Councillor M Clarke rose to present the minutes of the meeting.

RESOLVED: That the minutes of the meeting of the Standards Committee held on 9 January 2018 be received and the recommendation as set out in minute number 44 be approved and adopted.

13 IMPROVEMENT & REVIEW COMMISSION

RESOLVED: That the minutes of the meeting of the Improvement & Review Commission held on 10 January 2018 be received.

14 AUDIT COMMITTEE

RESOLVED: That the minutes of the meeting of the Audit Committee held on 25 January 2018 be received.

15 HIGH WYCOMBE TOWN COMMITTEE

The Chairman of the High Wycombe Town Committee informed Members that the Special Expenses Budget 2018/19 recommendation had not made it into the Cabinet report.

Councillor Ms J Wassell explained that the match-funding question had been raised under the Special Expenses Budget 2018/19 item because High Wycombe did not have a Town Council but instead had the High Wycombe Town Committee which she felt seriously disadvantaged the wards involved. The Chairman of the High Wycombe Town Committee informed Members that there had been discussions in the past but that Members had believed it was not in the best interest of residents to have a High Wycombe Town Council.

RESOLVED: That the minutes of the meeting of the High Wycombe Town Committee held on 23 January 2018 be received.

16 PLANNING COMMITTEE

RESOLVED: That the minutes of the meetings of the Planning Committee held on 15 November 2017 and 17 January 2018 be received.

17 EXTENSION WORKS TO RISBOROUGH SPRINGS SWIM & FITNESS CENTRE - PROCUREMENT PROCESS

The Cabinet Member for Community, Councillor G Peart, referred Members to the report which could be found on pages 112-116 of the agenda. It was noted that research conducted on behalf of the Council had identified that there was already latent demand for leisure facilities at RSSC. The local plan proposed the building of around 2500 additional homes in the Princes Risborough area. Members were informed that the resulting increase in population would add to that demand. Councillor G Peart went on to explain that the Council intended to sign a DA with its current leisure management contractor PFPL so that PFPL could directly manage the building works from design through to construction of the enlarged health and fitness facilities at RSSC.

Members were informed that officers believed the most appropriate procurement route was to:

- (i) non-competitively sign a DA with PFPL, which would provide an agreed sum of money to develop and manage the works on the Council's behalf;
- (ii) To enter into a Deed of Variation varying the Leisure Operator Agreement to allow for the improvement works to be carried out and varying the services to allow for the new facilities. There would also be a surrender and re-grant of leases on completion to take into account any changes in the plans for the facilities.

During debate, Councillor Mrs L Clarke stated that she felt this was exactly the right thing to be happening in Princes Risborough. Councillor Marshall stated that he supported the principal but questioned how the Council would ensure fully competitive bidding. Councillor Peart explained that this would be a completely transparent process and whilst the building element was not technically difficult being open whilst the works took place was difficult. It was noted that the Council therefore needed to use a contractor that was used to people being present on site from a behavioural point of view.

Councillor P Turner commented that the proposal would be subject to planning and asked for advice about members of the Planning Committee voting on this item. It was noted that 'subject to planning' should be inserted to the resolution but also that as this item was focussing on the procurement process and not any planning considerations, Members were able to take part in the decision. . It was noted that the resolution should be amended to also encompass 'subject to legal input'. .

The proposed recommendation was put to Council.

RESOLVED, Subject to planning and the Council's Legal Team reviewing the wording and process, the following be agreed:

- To provide an exemption from Contract Standing Orders ("CSO's") to allow the non-competitive award of a Development Agreement with a value of £1.2m to allow Places for People ("PFPL") to complete development works at Risborough Springs Swim and Fitness Centre ("RSSFC").
- To delegate authority for entering into a Development Agreement, Deed of Variation and any associated legal documents in relation to the existing Leisure Operator Agreement to the Head of Community Services, in consultation with the District Solicitor, Head of Finance and Commercial Services with the Cabinet Member for Community Services.
- To delegate authority for the surrender and re-grant of the lease to PFPL for RSSFC, and amendment as required to the ground lease for RSSFC with Princes Risborough Town Council to the Major Projects & Property Executive in consultation with the District Solicitor, the Cabinet Member for Growth and, Regeneration, the Head of Community Services and the Cabinet Member for Community Services.

18 QUESTIONS UNDER STANDING ORDER 11.2

There were none.

19 URGENT ACTION TAKEN BY CABINET OR INDIVIDUAL CABINET MEMBER

The urgent action taken by Cabinet or individual Cabinet Member as set out in the summons was noted.

Chairman

The following officers were in attendance at the meeting:

Peter Druce	- Democratic Services
Tanya Brown	- Democratic Services
Ian Hunt	- Democratic Services Manager
Karen Satterford	- Chief Executive