

Minutes of the meeting of the Council held on 18th February 2014 at Pippbrook, Dorking from 7.00pm to 9.50pm

Present: Councillors David Sharland (Chairman), Emile Aboud (Vice Chairman), Lynne Brooks, Derrick Burt, John Chandler, Margaret Cooksey, Stephen Cooksey, Mary Cooper, Clare Curran, Rosemary Dickson, Paul Elderton, Dave Howarth, James Friend, Phil Harris, Paula Hancock, Raj Haque, Valerie Homewood, Chris Hunt, Roger Hurst, Tessa Hurworth (part of meeting), Bridget Lewis-Carr, Simon Ling, Tim Loretto, Vivienne Michael, David Mir, Wayne Monkman, John Muggeridge, Iain Murdoch, Paul Newman, John Northcott, Corinna Osborne-Patterson, David Preedy, Caroline Salmon, Philippa Shimmin, Chris Townsend, and Charles Yarwood.

41. Minutes

RESOLVED: The minutes of the meeting held on 3rd December 2013 were confirmed as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.

42. Apologies for Absence

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Richard Brooke, Mick Longhurst, Paul Potter and Kathryn Westwood.

43. Disclosure of Interests

Councillors Raj Haque, Chris Hunt, Wayne Monkman, Paul Newman and Caroline Salmon all disclosed a pecuniary interest in Item 14 – Urgent Item – Business Rates Local Discount Schemes as they were local business owners, and were required to leave the meeting during consideration thereof.

Councillors David Preedy and Charles Yarwood declared non pecuniary interests in Item 6 – Planning for 2014/15 – Corporate Plan and Budget Proposal as they were Chairman of Headley Parish Council/Vice Chairman of Charlwood Parish Council respectively, which received grants/funding from Mole Valley District Council, but were not required to leave the meeting during consideration thereof.

Councillors Stephen Cooksey and Iain Murdoch declared pecuniary interests in Item 7 – Report of the Independent Remuneration Panel – Members’ Allowances Scheme as they were Chairman of Scrutiny Committee/Chairman of Audit Committee respectively. They were not required to leave the meeting during consideration thereof, but would not to take part in the debate.

Councillor James Friend declared a pecuniary interest in Item 13 – Motion 1/2014 and was required to leave the meeting during consideration thereof.

44. Chairman’s Announcements

The Chairman announced that Commonwealth Day would fall on 10th March this year, and to recognise the date Mole Valley would be flying the Commonwealth Flag outside Pippbrook. The flag would be raised at 10am. The majority of other authorities in the country would be raising their Commonwealth flags at the same time.

The Chairman expressed his thanks to all those who supported his fund raising carol service in December and the dinner at the House of Commons. There had been some excellent choral presentations by Leatherhead St John’s Choral Society and singing from the pupils of Trinity School in Leatherhead. The Chairman also thanked Sir Paul Beresford for sponsoring the dinner at the House of Commons. The two events had raised a considerable amount of money for the Against Breast Cancer charity. Thanks were also extended to all those who had contributed with their attendance and generosity buying raffle and auction prizes.

Lastly, a fund raising lunch would be organised in the next few weeks; Members and staff would be sent the details by email.

45. **Service Shield Presentation from Surrey Fire and Rescue Service**

Eddie Roberts, Area Commander East of the Surrey Fire and Rescue Service attended the meeting to present the Chairman with a Service Shield, to thank the Council for the assistance given during the recent flooding.

Mr Roberts explained that by allowing the Fire Service to be temporarily based at Park House after the fire station in Leatherhead was flooded, the Council had helped the team to continue to support the local community during the floods which began on Christmas Eve.

The Chairman accepted the Service Shield on behalf of the Council and thanked the Fire Service for all the help they had offered residents in Mole Valley and Surrey during the past few weeks.

At this point the Chairman informed Members that Item 7 – Report of the Independent Remuneration Panel – Review of Members’ Allowances would be taken before Item 6 – Planning for 2014/15 – Corporate Plan and Budget Proposal to enable a decision to be taken prior to the Budget debate.

46. **Report of the Independent Remuneration Panel – Review of Members’ Allowances**

The Council considered the report as set out on pages 59 to 80 of the agenda, and was asked to decide if it wished to accept the recommendations of the Independent Remuneration Panel to come into effect from 1st April 2014.

Councillor Charles Yarwood proposed and Councillor Chris Townsend seconded the recommendations of the Panel. Councillor Yarwood drew Members’ attention to the only changes which were being recommended by the Panel which related to the Special Responsibility Allowances paid to the Chairmen of the Scrutiny and Audit Committees, where an increase from £1,500 to £2,000 was recommended, in recognition of the increased workload and responsibilities of each Committee since the Special Responsibility Allowances were last considered in 2011.

Members noted that it was possible to claim for attendance at formal site visits, prior to meetings of the Development Control Committee. Any ‘inflationary’ increases in allowances were determined each year as part of the budget setting process.

The Chairman clarified that the next review would take place in 2017/2018.

Members went on to consider the report in full and it was accordingly

RESOLVED: That the recommendations of the Independent Remuneration Panel be accepted to come into effect from 1st April 2014, as set out in Annex 1 of the report to the Council and attached to these minutes (Annex 1).

47. **Planning for 2014/15 – Corporate Plan and Budget Proposal**

The Council considered the Executive’s recommendations with regards to the 2014/15 Budget as set out on page 2 of the agenda, and the draft Council Tax resolutions.

A revised version of the Parish Council precepts for 2014/15 had been circulated at the meeting.

The Leader advised the Council that a named/recorded vote on the 2014/15 Budget had been suggested in recent guidance from central government, and that Members were asked to give some thought as to whether they would wish to do this.

Councillor Simon Ling proposed and Councillor James Friend seconded the recommendations as set out on page 2 of the agenda, including the following amendment to recommendation 8:

‘(8) That no inflationary increase be applied to Members’ Allowances following consideration of the report of the Independent Remuneration Panel.’

The speeches of the Finance and Communities and Assets Portfolio Holders and Leader of the Opposition are set out in Annex 2 to these minutes.

Councillor Preedy proposed the following amendment to recommendation 8:

‘(8) That the level of the Basic Allowance for Members be increased in line with the recommendations of the Independent Remuneration Panel, set out on page 68 of the agenda.’

The amendment was seconded by Councillor Stephen Cooksey.

The Section 151 Officer confirmed that the proposed amendment was acceptable under Standing Order 22 of the Council’s Constitution.

Members debated the amendment, with some expressing the opinion that Members should be remunerated to reflect the time and commitment they have to the role. However, some Councillors felt that it was not appropriate for Members to receive an increase from 1st April 2014.

A counted vote was taken on the amendment with 14 in favour and 14 against; the Chairman exercised his casting vote against the amendment, and it was therefore LOST.

The Council went on to debate the substantive motion.

RESOLVED:

(1) That

- i. The 2014/15 Corporate Plan be approved.
- ii. The proposed budget for 2014/15 be set at £10,064,000.
- iii. The Council Tax Freeze Grant, offered by Government, be rejected for 2014/15.
- iv. The Band D Council Tax for 2014/15 be set at £157.47 representing a 1.9 per cent increase in Council Tax for 2014/15.
- v. A cost of living pay award of 1.4% be approved for staff, with a minimum addition of £505 pa to provide a higher award for lower paid staff.
- vi. A capital programme of £3,182,000 be approved for 2014/15.
- vii. The Section 151 Officer’s statement regarding the 2014/15 budget and medium term financial outlook for the Council be noted.
- viii. No inflationary increase be applied to Members’ Allowances from 1st April 2014.

(2) That the Council Tax resolutions for 2014/15 (as set out at Annex 3 to the minutes) be approved.

N.B. Recorded vote

In favour – 35: Councillors Emile Aboud, Lynne Brooks, Derrick Burt, John Chandler, Margaret Cooksey, Stephen Cooksey, Mary Cooper, Clare Curran, Rosemary Dickson, Paul Elderton, James Friend, Paula Hancock, Raj Haque, Phil Harris, Valerie Homewood, Dave Howarth, Chris Hunt, Roger Hurst, Bridget Lewis-Carr, Simon Ling, Tim Loretto, Vivienne Michael, David Mir, Wayne Monkman, John Muggeridge, Iain Murdoch, Paul Newman, John Northcott, Corinna Osborne-Patterson, David Preedy, Caroline Salmon, David Sharland, Philippa Shimmin, Chris Townsend, Charles Yarwood

*Against – 0
Abstentions - 0*

48. Petition

The Council considered a petition which had been received with 1,974 signatures (of which 536 were signatories to the online petition) in the following terms:

'We petition Mole Valley District Council to (as our elected representatives) comply with government 'National Planning Policy Framework' (NPPF) which emphasizes that building on the Metropolitan Green Belt can only happen 'in very exceptional circumstances', and to provide evidence that use of brown field sites across Mole Valley District Council (MVDC) as a whole has been exhausted.'

Members noted that the additional wording from the online e-petition was as follows:

'The pressure for future housing requirement is based on numbers provided in the cancelled South East Plan. We challenge (MVDC) to: 1. Reconsider if these targets are accurate and feasible for Mole Valley given the aged data, the area restrictions (green belt, AONB) and past development. 2. Revisit the availability of brown field sites across the whole district to meet the housing demand. 3. Comply with the obligation to consult with neighbouring authorities such as Effingham to prevent urban sprawl. We ask MVDC to listen to their residents and stand united with Surrey County Councillors who unanimously committed to do all in their power to ensure future development meets local needs and protects the Green Belt.'

A representative of the petition, Mr. McKinney, attended the meeting and spoke to Members regarding the reasons behind the submission of the petition. A map and additional text were also circulated at the meeting for Members to consider.

The Portfolio Holder for Planning, Councillor John Northcott, thanked Mr. McKinney for speaking to the Members of the Council, and acknowledged the petition and comments.

Councillor Northcott explained that all Councillors understood the importance of the Green Belt, and as evidenced by the motion that the Council had passed unanimously in December, all Members were opposed to the pressure that was being placed on the Green Belt by development, and wanted to restrict any such changes to the Green Belt to the very minimum.

A key feature of the Council's planning policies was that development should be directed to the built up areas and this involved the re-use of brownfield sites as a priority. The problem in Mole Valley District was that unlike many Surrey boroughs and districts, there were relatively few such identifiable brownfield sites that were available and deliverable. If there were more, the Council would strongly encourage their development.

The Council was currently undertaking a consultation on the proposals for how Mole Valley District Council should meet its future housing needs and development issues on the sites that have been proposed to the Council. The timing of the petition was helpful in terms of that consultation.

The Council would consider the petition's comments alongside the other consultation responses and discuss them and the other comments when officers had been able to pull together the results of the consultation and present them back to Councillors.

The Chairman thanked the petitioners for attending the meeting and invited them to stay for the remainder of the Part I business should they wish to do so.

49. Recommendations of Committees

i) Audit Committee – 28th November 2013 - Treasury Management Mid Year Monitoring Report 2013/14

Councillor Iain Murdoch, Chairman of the Audit Committee, introduced the item and proposed the recommendations of the Committee as set out on pages 3 and 81 to 96 of the agenda.

RESOLVED: That the Treasury Management Mid Year Monitoring Report 2013-2014 be commended.

ii) Audit Committee – 28th November 2013 – Treasury Management Strategy Report 2014/15 – 2016/17

Councillor Iain Murdoch, Chairman of the Audit Committee, introduced the item and proposed the recommendations of the Committee as set out on pages 3 and 97 to 130 of the agenda.

RESOLVED: That

- (1) the capital expenditure Prudential Indicators and Limits for 2014/15 to 2016/17 be approved.
- (2) the Minimum Reserve Position (MRP) Statement that sets out the Council's policy on MRP be approved.
- (3) the Treasury Management Strategy 2014/15 to 2016/17 and the Treasury Prudential Indicators be approved.
- (4) The Investment Strategy 2014/15 contained in the Treasury Management Strategy and the detailed criteria be approved.

50. Leader's Statement

The Leader began by speaking about the unprecedented severe weather which had been experienced in the past few weeks. He expressed his (and the Council's) sympathy for residents whose homes and businesses had been affected by flooding. Since the last Council meeting, Mole Valley had experienced torrential rain and strong winds which resulted in some residents being evacuated from their homes on Christmas Eve. At that time, Officers and Members went out to offer support to those residents who experienced flooding and a temporary rest centre was set up at the Fairfield Centre. Since then, further flooding has taken place and the River Mole has been on flood warning on several occasions. The situation was being monitored daily, river levels were being closely watched, vegetation had been cut back along ditches and where possible, blockages removed. Mole Valley had worked closely with Surrey County Council to supply skips to flood victims and was speaking regularly with the County Council, the Environment Agency, neighbouring authorities and the emergency services so that the Council was prepared for and could deal with any possible further flooding.

The Leader was delighted by the attendance of Mr Roberts at the meeting and by the support which Mole Valley was able to provide to its partners in the Surrey Fire and Rescue Service.

In Mole Valley, the Council was ensuring that sandbags were in constant supply at both the Curtis Road Depot in Dorking and at the Randalls Road car park in Leatherhead so that the authority could respond promptly to wherever they were needed. Mole Valley's website and social media sites were regularly updated with the latest flooding information from the Environment Agency. In addition, the website provided detailed advice, including health related information, about what to do during and after a flood.

Mole Valley had also been supporting neighbouring authorities during these extremely challenging times by offering sandbags and staff, wherever possible, to help support those districts and boroughs in need of assistance. The Council was also committed to providing ongoing support during the recovery phase; the neighbouring authorities were very appreciative of the support.

Mole Valley was the first Surrey authority to set up a Discretionary Hardship Fund for those residents affected by flooding. In particular, residents could re-claim the Mole Valley element of the council tax bill for their flooded property, subject to certain conditions. It was hoped that this would provide some small comfort for those who had been forced to leave their homes whilst their property was repaired.

The Leader expressed that he was sure all Members would join him in saying that their thoughts, across the chamber, were with those who had been affected by flooding. The Leader also thanked the staff who had been providing support to Mole Valley's communities, much of which had been in the evenings and at weekends. Thanks were also due to all Councillors who had been working hard in their local communities to support their residents at this very difficult time.

The Leader went on to inform Members that despite the aforementioned challenges, a great deal of other positive activity had been going on. The Council's support for young people continued with further Apprenticeships being offered at Mole Valley and a range of activities on offer for half term at Mole Valley's Leisure Centres, the Dorking Halls and the Bfree Youth Cafe in Leatherhead.

The Leader commended the Youth Showcase Awards at Dorking Halls on 31 January. The standard of performance from the very talented singers and dancers had been outstanding, the comperes did an excellent job and the art exhibition was thoroughly enjoyable; Mole Valley really did have some very talented young people. The Leader was equally impressed with the exceptional award winners who beat off some serious competition to win one of seven awards. Anyone who missed out on attending the fantastic evening could log on to Mole Valley's website and watch the YouTube video.

Looking ahead, Mole Valley continued to promote independent living to our older and more vulnerable communities. Mole Valley was developing the Fairfield Centre into a Wellbeing Centre which was another strong example of partnership working, on this occasion with Surrey County Council, the NHS, the Alzheimer's Society and the Council's Telecare Service. Mole Valley was committed to helping residents to access the services they needed and as such the Council was constantly reviewing how it delivered services to ensure that this objective was met, together with the commitment to deliver value for money services. With this in mind, the Council continued to take a hard look at the Pippbrook offices. Some difficult decisions were ahead of Members and the Leader expressed his gratitude to the working party for their continued engagement with the project. The outcome of the final stage of the process would come later in the year, following public consultation and further refinement of the options open to the Council.

The Leader was confident that Mole Valley would continue to rise to the challenges that it was set. Mole Valley was a small but very effective local authority constantly "punching above our weight", totally committed to providing residents with the best possible service at the lowest possible cost.

51. Reports of Portfolio Holders

Councillor Vivienne Michael – Portfolio Holder for Customer Service and Wellbeing

Councillor Michael informed Members that particularly due to the floods the Telecare Team had been working hard, with many staff going above and beyond the call of duty. Communication was crucial at this time; the Council's website had been updated regularly as well as on Facebook and Twitter feeds, and a new platform called StreetLife had also been utilised, meaning that another 900 residents could be reached. A number of Members had also joined. The CSU had also been very busy whilst maintaining a high standard of service.

The Fairfield Centre had been used as a rest centre, a service which was greatly valued by flooded residents. The Centre would be continuing to develop new services in the future when the Wellbeing Centre was launched. Further information about this would be brought before Members at a later date.

The Benefits Team had coped well with the additional pressures from the government's welfare reforms; the team were still exceeding target when assessing new claims within 24 days. In relation to discretionary housing payments since April £65,000 had been committed to the Council's most vulnerable residents.

The Partnerships Team had recently launched a new street dance initiative to encourage wellbeing and fitness in young people in Westcott. A weekly disability golf coaching project was also underway, working with the Queen Elizabeth Training Centre. A 'Get Fit Through Football' project was also just about to be launched for girls at Leatherhead Leisure Centre.

Lastly, the Derek Willott award for work towards tackling anti social behaviour and fly-tipping in local communities had been presented to the Partnerships Team for their work with residents, Surrey County Council and Surrey Police in Fairs Road in Leatherhead; the benefits of the work were still clearly visible.

Councillor James Friend – Portfolio Holder for Environment

Councillor Friend updated Members on the excellent progress with the panel looking at waste and recycling, with recommendations for future targets of reducing residual waste and increase recycling already being proposed by the group. Mole Valley continued to perform very well in its recycling rates and maintained its performance as one of the top three authorities in Surrey; this was an excellent achievement especially as the county of Surrey is one of the best performers nationally.

A new joint waste collection contract was being worked on with neighbouring local authorities with the aim of reducing costs and enhancing innovation and performance, and improving recycling rates even further.

Another new initiative was the hosting of a Waste Volunteer Co-ordinator, paid for by Surrey County Council, whose remit it was to create and develop a network of recycling champions and volunteers within the District and across the County. This was an exciting new approach aimed at working closely with individuals and communities. Mole Valley was also working in partnership with Surrey County Council on a new communications programme aimed at reducing litter in all forms, engaging with key partners such as the Highways Agency and Network Rail; this new campaign would launch at the end of March.

In relation to the Parks department, the grounds maintenance procurement would include an option to deliver verge cutting, which should provide more local control and better co-ordination with other grounds maintenance work.

The official opening of the Cradhurst Recreation Ground would be held on 1st March, and would include a community planting day. Members and the public were encouraged to come along.

A programme to ensure that the District's war memorials were repaired, cleaned and in good condition before the anniversary of the start of the First World War was underway.

Lastly, he advised Members about the consultation taking place on the design of a revamped playground at Cannon Court in Leatherhead; it was hoped that this would be good news for the community at a difficult time and that it would be completed by Easter.

Councillor John Northcott – Portfolio Holder for Planning

Councillor Northcott explained that Mole Valley was more than half way through the eight week public consultation on the Housing and Traveller sites plan. The Planning Policy Team had been working hard on this, for what had been a comprehensive and at times challenging piece of work. So far the team had received more than 1000 representations; a week ago the website pages had received over 12,000 visitors. There had been 16 Road Shows, with one last chance to visit the Road Show which was in Bookham on the 24th February. The Road Show panels would also be on display at the Bookham Vanguard meeting on the 22nd February.

In Leatherhead there was the good news that work had begun on the refurbishment of 68,000 sq ft of offices off Randalls Road, which had been approved by Council in 2012. This indicated growing faith in the recovery of the economy, as well as the strength of Leatherhead as a place to do business.

In Dorking, the scaffolding on the Mullins building was due to come down shortly. The building had been lovingly restored by the new owners and they planned to bring it back to life. This was an important building for the district, not just Dorking. The Planning Team had worked well with the new owners to ensure the work was completed to a high standard.

Members noted that the rewards could be high for those who flout planning regulations. Where this was suspected, the Council needed to act quickly if the integrity of the Council's planning policies was to be maintained. Recently Mole Valley had a notable success against a person who had erected a storage facility including access off the A29 in the greenbelt near Ockley. He lost his appeal against the Council's enforcement action and had now been ordered to remove the building and restore the land. Councillor Northcott expressed his gratitude to Members for agreeing the growth item of £40,000 in next year's budget which would enable Mole Valley to further improve the effectiveness of the compliance and enforcement processes.

Finally, the Planning Peer Review Working Group looking at the outcomes of the review last summer had met twice and a body of work was emerging. Councillor Northcott expressed his thanks to those Members who were helping with this.

Councillor Simon Ling – Portfolio Holder for Finance

Councillor Ling explained that in relation to the budget monitoring for 2013/14, the monthly reports at Months 7, 8 and 9 had indicated a year-end underspend of around £275,000. This was after allowing for the transfer of £300,000 of underspent revenue to capital.

Members noted that with regards to treasury management and investments, the Council's return on investments was £100,000 better than originally estimated for this year following the adoption of new investment policies in Mole Valley's Treasury Management Strategy for 2013/14.

Collection rates on both Council Tax and National Non Domestic Rates were holding up well and in line with targets; a review of Single Person discounts had been undertaken which had resulted in a reduction of around 150 cases; changes to Business Rates were to be implemented in line with the Government's Autumn Statement through a separate report later in the agenda.

Lastly, the recent flooding issues would see the Council submit a claim under the Government's "Severe Weather Recovery Scheme" for costs incurred in dealing with recovery from flood damage.

52. Questions to Members of the Executive

Questions from Members of the Public

The following question was submitted by Mr Stephen Crabtree:

'What allowances have been made for "windfall" sites up to 2026 (as permitted in the NPPF, para 48) when assessing the need for future development sites, up to 2026?'

Councillor John Northcott, Portfolio Holder for Planning, responded as follows:

'Thank you for your question, Mr Crabtree.

In the work that Mole Valley District Council has done to develop the current land allocations consultation a figure of 120 dwellings has been assumed as coming from windfalls.

No windfall sites have been assumed for the first 3 years as this is considered to be included already in the permissions that have been granted. Thereafter an allowance of 60 dwellings per year has been made for the next two years.

The position on what allowance a Council can make on windfalls beyond the first five years of a Local Plan is not clear and we are currently seeking clarification from the Department of Communities and Local Government and the Planning Inspectorate. Depending on what they say, we may be in a position to adjust this figure upwards as part of the ongoing work but for the moment we have used a figure which is based on our understanding of Government guidance and what other authorities have done.

Any increase in the windfall figure would, of course, be reflected in an equivalent reduction in the number of dwellings for which sites need to be identified now.'

Mr Crabtree asked the following supplemental question:

'In the predictions do we take account of the fact that property prices and land prices are going up, therefore encouraging people to make land available, and that obviously there is this trend that Roland mentioned of people becoming homeworkers therefore freeing up office space, and sadly retail space, and retail outlets closing because of internet shopping?'

Councillor Northcott responded as follows:

'I think the answer is not directly, but possibly indirectly. We are heavily influenced by what the Planning Inspectorates not only say to us, but what they say to other Councils when approving, or otherwise, their Core Strategies or Land Allocation Plans. It is something that through time we know we will have to look at again, but what we see elsewhere we believe that our current allowance of 50 dwellings a year is about right, and something which a government inspector is likely to accept. The bigger variable as I said in my answer is what we assume for the years after the five year period, and there could be a significant additional amount of windfall sites, which would reduce the amounts we're looking for in the consultation.'

The following question was submitted by Mrs Carol Jull:

'Are the Council aware of anything that would change the current housing target of 1300 dwellings needed across Mole Valley by 2026, before the end of this planning period – that is before 2026?'

Councillor John Northcott, Portfolio Holder for Planning, responded as follows:

'Thank you for your question Mrs Jull.

Before going into the detail of the response, we believe now that the figure we should be considering is closer to 1100 than 1300 in terms of the gap that needs to be closed to meet the housing figures in the Local Plan. This is the figure built into the consultation document. The Council is well aware of factors that could affect the figure and 1100 is the best estimate we can make at the present time.

In terms of whether there is anything that would change this figure, there are many factors that could have a bearing on what future provision for housing Mole Valley District Council needs to make.

The National Planning Policy Framework indicates that a Council should assess its housing needs objectively and plan accordingly. We have not done that because of the uncertainties around the pressure for housing coming from London and the future of Gatwick airport, seeking instead to make provision for the housing numbers that we have written into our policies already.

And of course, there is always the possibility that new legislation will be introduced that would impact on the numbers.'

Questions from Members of the Council

The following question was submitted by Councillor Stephen Cooksey:

'Would the Leader of the Council please indicate what action has been taken by the Council to implement motion 3/2013 relating to central government and the green belt which was approved by Council at its meeting on 3rd December 2013?'

The Leader responded as follows:

'At its meeting on 3rd December following its decision to agree the Housing and Traveller Sites Consultation Document, the Council agreed a motion which in summary, emphasised the need to

limit the use of Green Belt land for development to an absolute minimum; to persuade Government that London should meet its own housing requirements and not rely on neighbouring areas to meet any shortfall and that Mole Valley's MPs and County Councillors be invited to support these initiatives.

The Council also agreed to use its influence by working with others to seek changes to national policy so that local planning authorities would have greater discretion to allocate land for the type of housing most required.

Since the motion was agreed the following actions have been taken.

- The motion was reported to the Planning Policy Managers of all the Surrey local planning authorities on 10th January.
- It was subsequently considered by the Surrey Planning Officers Association at its meeting on 24th January as part of a wider paper on the need for Surrey to work together to address common issues including the Duty to Cooperate and the possible implications for Surrey of an under provision of land for new homes in London.
- The motion was drawn to the attention of Sir Paul Beresford at a recent meeting to discuss Green Belt and cross boundary issues with Guildford.
- The Surrey Planning Officers Association has prepared a paper on the strategic planning challenges facing Surrey for the meeting of the Surrey Leaders on 19th February. This refers to the Council's motion as part of the broader debate about the future of the Metropolitan Green Belt which is coming under increasing pressure as a result of local planning authorities being required to meet housing targets. It is being proposed that all the Surrey Councils are represented at a facilitated workshop that will allow a debate about the key strategic issues facing Surrey, including the concerns and issues raised in the Council's motion.

A meeting of Surrey Planning Portfolio Holders will be hosted by Guildford Borough Council on 26th February when there will be a further opportunity to raise the Council's motion.

Mole Valley District Council is taking a leading role in the debate about the future of the Green Belt in Surrey and we will continue to use the opportunities open to us to promote the objectives of the motion and, with other Surrey districts, boroughs and the County Council agree a way forward to safeguard the Green Belt in the face of pressures from London and other drivers of housing demand.'

Councillor Stephen Cooksey asked for a hard copy of the letter and a written answer.

Councillor Margaret Cooksey submitted the following question:

'Whilst recognising the initiative to raise independent funding, would the appropriate Portfolio Holder explain why, and by whom, a decision was taken to give the Dorking Halls database to an independent organisation based in Yorkshire, allowing cold calling to users of the Halls asking them to join a lottery at a cost of £2.00 per week.

Could the Portfolio Holder indicate if this is a Dorking Halls lottery as indicated during the phone call, or is it part of a national scheme? In either case what are the statistical chances of winning any money on this lottery?

Could the Portfolio Holder also tell us how many people have signed up and what percentage of the database that is, and have there been people who have complained about being upset having received the call?'

Councillor Charles Yarwood responded as follows:

'The Lottery idea was suggested by The Dorking Halls Manager following discussion about it at a venue managers network. Another venue manager had been doing this for a few years and received over £100k per year through this lottery. This was the rationale for initially exploring the idea, which was approved by the Portfolio holder. The Finance Department and Legal Services team have been involved in the process of considering the lottery company, website, agreement, other documentation and data protection issues.

People on the Dorking Halls database, are being contacted about the lottery. This work is being undertaken on our behalf by a team working for the lottery company. The data is only being used by them for this purpose and will then be destroyed. Out of courtesy everyone was contacted in advance to give them the option to let us know if they did not want their information to be passed on. This was done by email for all customers who had provided an email address and by post for all those for whom we did not have an email address.

The lottery is run by a company called The Giant Cash Bonanza Society. The Society is licensed and inspected by the Gambling Commission and promotes a lottery that raises money for lots of different good causes, including a wide range of charities, community groups, sports organisations and a few other theatre venues (6 known).

No statistical information is available for the chances of winning money, which varies week by week. There are over 1,500 cash prizes per year.

In addition to cash prizes Dorking Halls offers 10 prizes of tickets and memberships each month, which are only for its own members. If 200 Dorking Halls customers join the lottery, they would each have a 60% chance of winning one of these prizes over the course of the year.

Of the money paid in by DH customers 40% goes into the prize fund and towards the costs of administering the lottery with 60% coming to the Halls

The work of contacting people is still in its early stages and about 70 people have signed up so far. There are a number who have been sent information to consider, who will need to be called back, and there are still several thousand yet to be contacted.

Only one complaint has been received; and that from a member of this chamber.

Notice of this initiative was posted on MOSS in mid December.'

Councillor Margaret Cooksey asked the following supplementary question(s):

'To start with I would like to know where the Portfolio Holder got the information that there had been no other complaints other than by me, because I was told there had been a considerable number and I was given information about those complaints, so, if I can get that information the Portfolio Holder should be able to get that information. I thank the Portfolio Holder for the answer and ask as a supplementary is the Portfolio Holder monitoring the activity as a result of the decision to take part in this lottery? If he is, why are letters going out with the Dorking Halls Manager's signature but without an address or a date? The letter indicates that you will only get the complimentary tickets if information is received within seven days of receipt of the letter. The letter has no date. There is no address on the letter. Does the Portfolio Holder agree with putting this sort of pressure on supporters of the Halls? Does he think that this kind of letter is enhancing the reputation of the Halls or Mole Valley District Council?'

Councillor Charles Yarwood confirmed that the scheme would need to be constantly monitored, and that he would respond to the rest of Councillor Cooksey's questions in writing.

53. Motions

Motion 1/2014

The following motion was proposed by Councillor David Preedy and seconded by Councillor Simon Ling, which had been reworded from the original version circulated on the Council agenda:

'Future of Headley Court

'This Council has a proud record of supporting the Defence Military Rehabilitation Centre at Headley Court, including the grant of the Freedom of Mole Valley in 2010 and the Military Covenant signed there in 2013. We recognise the development of the DMRC into a world-class centre of excellence, based in part on the facilities in the Help for Heroes Rehabilitation Centre opened in 2010 following £8.5m raised by public subscription.

We understand that the Ministry of Defence will shortly be deciding on the future role of Headley Court and that the complete closure of the establishment is being seriously considered. Local residents are concerned that complete closure would potentially leave the buildings derelict. Broader concerns are the potential loss of expertise if some experienced personnel should decide not to relocate elsewhere and the redundancy of expensive purpose-built facilities.

This Council calls on the Minister to work with local representatives to ensure that all efforts are made to explore alternative uses for the facilities at Headley Court, including for civilian uses, before any decision may be made to close the establishment. It also asks the local Members of Parliament to lobby the Minister in support of this approach.'

The Council resolved to take the motion on the night.

Members debated the motion in full.

RESOLVED: That the motion be accepted.

Note: At this point all those Members who declared pecuniary interests in the following item withdrew from the meeting.

54. Urgent Item – Business Rates Local Discount Schemes

The Council considered the urgent report circulated separately to the agenda, in respect of the approval of a Local Discount Scheme for Retail Properties, in accordance with guidance issued by the Department for Communities and Local Government, and a local scheme for Reoccupation Relief for qualifying retail premises.

Councillor Simon Ling proposed and Councillor Chris Townsend seconded the recommendations set out in the report.

Members raised some issues relating to the wording of the schemes, as well as what communications with local businesses was being planned so that they knew to apply for such relief. Officers informed Members that the scheme before them in the report was based on guidance that had been issued so far by the government, but that processes and procedures would be refined.

RESOLVED: That

- 1) a Local Discount Scheme for Retail Properties with a rateable value of £50,000 or less in accordance with the guidance issued by the Department for Communities and Local Government and detailed in this report be approved; and
- 2) a local scheme for Reoccupation Relief for qualifying retail premises be approved.

PART 6

MEMBERS' ALLOWANCES SCHEME

2014/2015

MOLE VALLEY DISTRICT COUNCIL

MEMBERS' ALLOWANCES SCHEME, APPROVED DUTIES FOR TRAVELLING AND SUBSISTENCE ALLOWANCES

This scheme is the Mole Valley District Council Members' Allowances Scheme, and shall have effect from 1st April 2014.

1. Basic Allowance

A basic allowance shall be paid to each Councillor as set out in Appendix 1.

2. Special Responsibility Allowances

- (1) A special responsibility allowance shall be paid to those councillors specified in Appendix 1 to this Scheme who hold the special responsibilities in relation to the authority.
- (2) Subject to paragraph 5, the amount of each such allowance shall be the amount specified against that special responsibility in that schedule.
- (3) No such allowance shall be payable if such a payment would be contrary to a provision made by or under any enactment.

3. Renunciation

A Councillor may, by notice in writing given to the Corporate Head of Service with responsibility for Democratic Services, elect to forego any part of his/her entitlement to an allowance under this Scheme.

4. Part-year Entitlements

If a Member becomes entitled to a basic or special responsibility allowance during a year, the Member will be entitled to a payment of such part of the allowance proportional to the number of days during which he/she has been entitled to receive the allowance in that year.

5. Travelling Allowances

Travelling allowances shall be paid in the amounts set out in Appendix 2 in respect of the approved duties set out in Appendix 3.

6. Subsistence Allowances

Subsistence allowances are payable as set out in Appendix 4

7. Claims and Payments

- (1) Claims for travelling allowance should be made monthly and in any case no later than 90 days after the expense has been incurred.
- (2) Payments shall be automatically paid in respect of basic and special responsibility allowances on 25th of each month or on the preceding working day if the 25th is a weekend or public holiday.
- (3) In the main, all allowances and expenses will be paid in the year in which they are incurred.

BASIC ALLOWANCE AND SPECIAL RESPONSIBILITY ALLOWANCES

1. Basic Allowance

A basic allowance of £4,098 from 1st April 2014 shall be paid to each Member per annum and shall be paid in 12 equal instalments.

2. Special Responsibility Allowances

(a) The following are specified as the special responsibilities in respect of which special responsibility allowances are payable, and the amounts of those allowances:

Member	Amount per Annum 2014/2015 £
Chairman of the Council	2,400
Vice-Chairman of the Council	900
Leader/Executive Leader	6,500
Portfolio Holders	If 4 or less Portfolio Holders – all to share £15,000 If 5 Portfolio Holders each to receive £3,000 If 6 Portfolio Holders each to receive £3,000 If 7 Portfolio Holders each to receive £3,000 If 8 or 9 Portfolio Holders – all to share £21,000 (these figures do not include the Leader of the Council who receives a separate allowance)
Leader of the Opposition	3,500
Deputy Leader of the Opposition	500
Chairman of Development Control	2,400
Chairman of Scrutiny	2,000
Chairman of Audit	2,000
Chairman of Licensing	250
Chairman of Standards	500

Any leader of a group who does not receive an allowance by virtue of being Leader of the Council or Leader of the Opposition shall receive an allowance of £500 per annum.

If a Member is entitled to receive more than one Special Responsibility Allowance (SRA) by virtue of the positions held, they are entitled to claim all applicable SRAs.

(b) A Co-optee's allowance of £400 per member is to be paid to the two independent members and the Parish Council representative on the Standards Committee.

3. Carer's Allowance

The following are specified as Carer's Allowances in respect of which Carer's allowances are payable in certain circumstances and the amounts of those allowances:

- a) Childcare allowance (on production of child's birth certificate indicating a child or children under 14 years of age) £500 single
- b) Other Dependant's Allowance (to be agreed between the Corporate Head of Service with responsibility for Democratic Services) £500 single

APPROVED RATES FOR TRAVELLING ALLOWANCES**1. Cars/Private Transport**

Up to 1,500 cc	45p per mile
Over 1,500 cc	45p per mile

Motor Cycles	24p per mile
--------------	--------------

Pedal Cycles	20p per mile
--------------	--------------

The driver of a car shall be paid 5p per mile extra in respect of each additional passenger (which is the maximum allowed by HMRC).

2. Public Transport

Any journey made by public transport will be paid on production of receipts/tickets. Rail travel will be paid on the basis of standard class fare or any available cheap rate.

LIST OF APPROVED DUTIES FOR THE PURPOSE OF TRAVELLING ALLOWANCES

1. Attendance at meetings of the Council and the Executive, Committees, Sub-Committees, Task Groups and other such working groups.
2. Attendance at conferences/seminars/training courses related to the role of Members and any other meeting authorised by the Council.
3. Attendance at meetings of the Local Government Association, Surrey Local Government Association, the South East England Regional Assembly, other similar regional and national bodies and Committees, sub-committees and other groups that a member might be appointed to.
4. Attendance at meetings of Surrey County Council, its Committees, sub-committees and other working groups that a member might be appointed to.
5. Attendance at meetings as a Chairman or Vice-Chairman or other with officers in preparation for Committee meetings.
6. Attendance at meetings of any body to which the Member has been appointed by the Council, with the exception of governing bodies of schools and charities.
7. Attendance at other meetings or organisations authorised by the Corporate Head of Service with responsibility for Democratic Services.
- 8.

RATES FOR SUBSISTENCE ALLOWANCES

1. The rate of subsistence allowances shall not exceed:
 - (a) In the case of an absence, not involving an absence overnight, from the usual place of residence;
 - (i) of more than 4 hours before 11.00 am (breakfast allowance), 4.92
 - (ii) of more than 4 hours, including the period between 12 noon and 2.00 pm (lunch allowance), £6.77
 - (iii) of more than 4 hours, including the period 3.00pm to 6.00pm (tea allowance) £2.67
 - (iv) of more than 4 hours ending after 7.00pm (evening meal allowance) £8.38
2. Other costs necessarily incurred by Members will be reimbursed on the production of a receipt.

Councillor Simon Ling, Portfolio Holder for Finance

The Portfolio Holder for Finance, Councillor Simon Ling, explained that he was pleased to present a balanced budget for Mole Valley District Council for 2014/15. Members noted that there was a small purely indicative change to the figures in the 2015/16 column at Appendix B of the report on page 35. A revised version of Appendix B was included in the report at page 54.

Councillor Ling began by outlining various sources of funding for the Council; the Revenue Support Grant from central government was to reduce next year by 25% (or £400k) from current levels and it was expected that the grant would disappear for good in a few years time. Instead, there was the New Homes Bonus and retention of non domestic or 'business rates' available to the Council.

The New Homes Bonus had been introduced previously for a six year period until 2016/17; as there was no guarantee that the scheme would be continued after 2016/17 it had been decided that a fund should be created using the bonus receipts in order to draw down a maximum £1m annually for use as part of the Council's budget funding. It was expected that this would be continued for at least the seven year term of the current Medium Term Financial Strategy.

With regards to business rates, the government permitted authorities to retain a proportion of the collected tax, but at the same time the authority had to accept the risk of reductions. The Portfolio Holder explained that the ratings system was not ideal, and that there were still many appeals pending from the last rating revaluation exercise in 2010. Funding was very uncertain, and the Council's 2014/15 budget was set prudently at the government baseline. The total funding from the three aforementioned sources for the coming year was expected to be nearly £3.5m, around 3% higher than the current year. The government intended to encourage local Councils to maximize housing and business development in their areas, which for Mole Valley could be difficult with 75% of the district being green belt.

The funding source with the greatest percentage loss over the past few years was not government grants but the income from investment reserves; in 2008 the base rate was over 5% but now stood at 1/10th of that, with yields from financial deposits also having reduced. Members had agreed in the previous year to amend the Council's Treasury Management Strategy to allow for a larger range of investments. Councillor Ling was pleased to report that the Council's income from this source was set to increase next year by 50% (or £150k).

Council Tax rates in Mole Valley were almost the lowest rate across Surrey, with Mole Valley receiving in the current year around £154.50 for an average Band D property. Government policy in recent years had offered Councils who didn't raise Council Tax a freeze grant. This year the grant was an equivalent of a 1% rise in Council Tax for a period of two years.

Councillor Ling explained that there were a number of disadvantages which could accrue from accepting the freeze grant; the amount was not in the control of the Council, it was only temporary and furthermore after the two year period Mole Valley's Council Tax base would not have increased at all, whilst the general level of prices would have increased by the level of inflation that had occurred in that period; this could potentially be 4% or more at current rates.

Under present regulations, Mole Valley could not make that sort of increase in Council Tax without a referendum; it was proposed that the freeze grant be rejected and Council Tax be increased by 1.9%, bringing the rate to just under £157.50 for a Band D property. This decision was material in helping towards the Council's priority of ensuring that Mole Valley had an ongoing sound financial base with which to deliver services.

The sum total of all funding sources for 2014/15 was expected to be £10,064,000, which was £379k higher than 2013/14. However, this had not resulted in a reduction in the Council's quest for savings; Councillor Ling explained that this was for a number of reasons. Firstly, inflation would cost the Council an additional £255k next year, including an increase to staff of 1.4%, with a minimum increase of £505.00 per year in order to stay in line with other Surrey authorities, to assist lower paid staff and reduce the chances of senior staff moving elsewhere. Secondly, known and

additional expenditure and income losses would cost the Council an additional £490k in 2014/15. Thirdly, a few welcome budget increases would amount to £78k; these various increases would total at £823k which was £444k more than the funding increase; savings needed to be found to cover the gap.

The very successful retendering of the Dorking Sports Centre would produce an additional £442k of income in 2014/15, but officers had not stopped there; through careful monitoring of the financial outcomes of the previous and current years (both of which were under spending), the Finance Officers had been able to identify budget savings of £324k that had already been actioned without a reduction in service levels.

These savings had allowed the Council to start the minor capital works which needed to be undertaken every year. These works were paid for out of the Council's capital budget at a cost of £800k per year, for which there was no source of funding other than the revenue budget. Due to severe constraints, Mole Valley had not been able to start this process previously; however, in 2014/15 the Council was able to make a start on this work, and had allowed for a transfer of £320k from revenue to capital which balanced the budget proposals for 2014/15.

The Portfolio Holder concluded with a few words on other items in the capital budget, the majority of which were pre-approved capital projects. It was the expectation that any new projects would be self-financing through increased income or enabling developments. However, it was proposed that annual capital block funds for items such as disability adaptations, affordable housing and S106 projects be continued. Despite the funding and revenue transfer, capital reserves were expected to reduce by around £2.4m in 2014/15. At the end of 2013/14 the Council's general revenue reserves that were not specifically earmarked were expected to have risen to £3,027,000, and capital reserves by £12, 838,000.

The Portfolio Holder concluded that should the proposed budget recommendations for 2014/15 be approved by the Council, the revenue reserves would remain unchanged and Mole Valley's capital reserves amount to £10,476,000 at the end of 2014/15. Councillor Ling expressed his belief that the proposals were for a sensible, practical and prudent budget and were in accordance with the Council's corporate plan and priorities.

Councillor Charles Yarwood, Portfolio Holder for Communities and Assets

Councillor Charles Yarwood, Portfolio Holder for Communities and Assets, was pleased to co-present the Council's 2014/15 budget and corporate plan. The corporate plan was in its fourth and final year and had undergone a light-touch refresh to ensure it remained relevant to the Council and its communities. The three main areas of Access to Services, Environment and Value for Money had not changed, as well as the ten priorities included within. However, it had been recognised that the impact of flooding in Mole Valley had been significant, and a new priority had been added to reflect the work with partners and residents in response to flooding.

The plan continued to set out important actions to be progressed over the year, along with performance indicators for key areas of work such, such as the roll out of welfare reforms, development of the Family Support Programme, the preparation of the draft housing and traveler sites plan and development of a joint waste collection project.

Councillor Yarwood concluded that the budget proposals before Members reflected the priorities and service provision, whilst protecting the scope and level of the Council's services at current levels.

Councillor David Preedy, Leader of the Opposition

Councillor David Preedy, as Leader of the Opposition, explained that in general the Liberal Democrat Group supported the proposed budget for 2014/15 but also hoped to provide constructive criticism with regards to the Executive's recommendations.

Budgetary constraints on the Council meant that there was not a great deal that Mole Valley could do differently; two years ago the Liberal Democrat Group asked for a review of the Medium Term

Financial Strategy, and now that this had been completed there was a clearer indication of what the Council's financial situation was; looking past 2014/15, it was clear that 2015/16 would be tougher still.

The Council was to an extent constrained by central government; the Executive had agreed the budget recommendations to Council at its meeting on 4th February 2014 without knowing the threshold for a referendum on Council Tax rises; Councillor Preedy accepted that the Liberal Democrat Group would have faced the same constraints.

Councillor Preedy expressed some concerns regarding the price increases for users of the Dorking Sports Centre and asked that this be monitored closely. The unnecessary slack in many department budgets had also been noted; Councillor Preedy congratulated Officers in tightening the budget monitoring procedures and adjusting to more regular budget reporting.

The dilapidations and futures of both Pippbrook House and the main offices at Pipbrook were also of concern; the importance of regular maintenance of assets by the Council was emphasised and the transfer of money from the revenue to capital reserves welcomed by the Group.

It was suggested that planning enforcements continue to be focused upon and more in-house expertise be encouraged; the legal costs to defend planning decisions was a matter which the Liberal Democrat Group felt needed strict monitoring, due to the recent announcement regarding the cost of defending the decision on the Cherkley Court being higher than Members had anticipated. The need to help businesses recover and grow in the District was also mentioned.

Members noted that Mole Valley had a relatively low level of deprivation and unemployment, but that those residents who needed extra help from benefits must be supported through the changes to the welfare system. The Citizens Advice Bureau did a great deal of work with vulnerable residents, and the Council was not meeting their full grant request in 2014/15. The Leader had indicated that the work of the CAB would be looked at as part of the remit of the Wellbeing Working Group, and the Leader of the Opposition hoped that this would be examined properly.

MOLE VALLEY DISTRICT COUNCIL

COUNCIL TAX RESOLUTION 2014/15

1. That it be noted that on 18th February 2014 the Council calculated the 2014/15 Council Tax Base

(a) for the whole Council area as: **38,631** equivalent Band D properties

[Item T in the formula in Section 33(1) of the Local Government Finance Act 1992, as amended (the "Act")]

(b) for dwellings in those parts of its area to which a Parish precept relates: 8,415 equivalent Band D properties

2. The Council calculated that the Council Tax requirement for the Council's own purposes for 2014/15 (excluding Parish precepts) is £6,083,224.

3. That the following amounts be calculated for the year 2014/15 in accordance with Sections 32 to 36 of the Act:

- (a) **£43,108,400** **the Council's estimated gross expenditure** - being the aggregate of the amounts that the Council estimates for the items set out in Section 32(2)(a) to (e) of the Act.
- (b) **£33,044,400** **the Council's estimated gross income** - being the aggregate of the amounts that the Council estimates for the items set out in Section 32(3)(a) to (c) of the Act.
- (c) **£10,064,000** **the Council's estimated net expenditure or "budget requirement"** - being the amount by which the aggregate at 3(a) above exceeds the aggregate at 3(b) above, calculated by the Council, in accordance with Section 32(4) of the Act
- (d) **£3,980,776** **the Council's central government funding (revenue support grant, new homes bonus grant and council tax freeze grant) plus retained business rates plus interest on investments plus surplus on the Collection Fund** - being the aggregate of the sums which the Council estimates will be payable for the year into its general fund in respect of government grant, retained non domestic rates, new Homes Bonus and interest on investments, increased by the amount of any sums which the Council estimates will be transferred in the year from its Collection Fund to its General Fund in accordance with Section 97(4) of the Local Government Finance Act 1988 (Council Tax surplus).
- (e) **£6,083,224** **the Council's Council Tax Requirement** – being the amount at 3c above, less 3d above, in accordance with s31A of the Act, as amended by the Localism Act 2011
- (f) **£157.47** **the average band D Council Tax** - being the amount at 3(c) above less the amount at 3(d) above, divided by the amount at 1(a) above, calculated by the Council, in accordance with Section 33(1) of the Act, as the basic amount of its council tax for the year.
- (g) **£182,379** **the sum of the parish precepts set by the thirteen Parish Councils** - being the aggregate amount of all special items referred to in Section 34(1) of the Act.

4. To note that Surrey County Council and Surrey Police Authority have issued precepts to the Council in accordance with Section 40 of the Local Government Finance Act 1992 for each category of dwellings in the Council's area as indicated in the table below.

5. That the Council, in accordance with Sections 30 and 36 of the Local Government Finance Act 1992, hereby sets the aggregate amounts shown in the tables below as the amounts of Council Tax for 2014/15 for each part of its area and for each of the categories of dwellings.

Council Tax Schedule 2014/15	Band A £	Band B £	Band C £	Band D £	Band E £	Band F £	Band G £	Band H £
Surrey County Council	797.22	930.09	1,062.96	1,195.83	1,461.57	1,727.31	1,993.05	2,391.66
Surrey Police	141.12	164.64	188.16	211.68	258.72	305.76	352.80	423.36
Mole Valley	104.98	122.48	139.97	157.47	192.46	227.46	262.45	314.94
Total Non Parish	1,043.32	1,217.21	1,391.09	1,564.98	1,912.75	2,260.53	2,608.30	3,129.96
Parish Councils								
Abinger	1,058.20	1,234.57	1,410.93	1,587.30	1,940.03	2,292.77	2,645.50	3,174.60
Betchworth	1,054.18	1,229.88	1,405.57	1,581.27	1,932.66	2,284.06	2,635.45	3,162.54
Brockham	1,051.60	1,226.87	1,402.13	1,577.40	1,927.93	2,278.47	2,629.00	3,154.80
Buckland	1,062.64	1,239.75	1,416.85	1,593.96	1,948.17	2,302.39	2,656.60	3,187.92
Capel	1,056.16	1,232.19	1,408.21	1,584.24	1,936.29	2,288.35	2,640.40	3,168.48
Charlwood	1,064.32	1,241.71	1,419.09	1,596.48	1,951.25	2,306.03	2,660.80	3,192.96
Headley	1,066.90	1,244.72	1,422.53	1,600.35	1,955.98	2,311.62	2,667.25	3,200.70
Holmwood	1,062.88	1,240.03	1,417.17	1,594.32	1,948.61	2,302.91	2,657.20	3,188.64
Leigh	1,058.98	1,235.48	1,411.97	1,588.47	1,941.46	2,294.46	2,647.45	3,176.94
Mickleham	1,056.58	1,232.68	1,408.77	1,584.87	1,937.06	2,289.26	2,641.45	3,169.74
Newdigate	1,050.04	1,225.05	1,400.05	1,575.06	1,925.07	2,275.09	2,625.10	3,150.12
Ockley	1,057.72	1,234.01	1,410.29	1,586.58	1,939.15	2,291.73	2,644.30	3,173.16
Wotton	1,050.64	1,225.75	1,400.85	1,575.96	1,926.17	2,276.39	2,626.60	3,151.92
	2013/14			2014/15				
Parish Councils	Tax Base	Precepts £	Council Tax Band D (£)	Tax Base	Precepts £	Council Tax Band D (£)	Increase / (Decrease) (£)	
Abinger	889.40	19,700	22.14	927.30	20,700	22.32	0.18	
Betchworth	504.40	7,418	14.67	508.70	8,275	16.29	1.62	
Brockham	1,219.70	14,827	12.15	1,229.60	15,295	12.42	0.27	
Buckland	293.40	7,800	26.55	288.70	8,375	28.98	2.43	
Capel	1,653.50	30,600	18.54	1,586.90	30,600	19.26	0.72	
Charlwood	952.50	29,411	30.87	952.10	29,985	31.50	0.63	
Headley	323.80	10,800	33.39	333.60	11,800	35.37	1.98	
Holmwood	404.40	11,300	27.90	398.90	11,700	29.34	1.44	
Leigh	429.40	10,149	23.67	428.40	10,049	23.49	(0.18)	
Mickleham	218.10	4,300	19.71	216.60	4,300	19.89	0.18	
Newdigate	810.00	8,500	10.53	830.90	8,400	10.08	(0.45)	
Ockley	411.90	9,000	21.87	411.40	8,900	21.60	(0.27)	
Wotton	302.90	3,007	9.90	301.70	3,300	10.98	1.08	
Grant		10,700			10,700			
Total	8,413.40	177,512		8,414.80	182,379			

Background

6. The statutory basis of the above calculations is the Local Government Finance Act 1992 with subsequent amendments in the Localism Act 2011 and the Council Tax (Demand Notices) (England) Regulations 2011, which came into effect from 1 April 2012.

7. The precept levels of other precepting bodies have been received. These are detailed below.

Parish Councils

8. The Parish Council Precepts for 2014/15 are detailed above and total £182,379 with an average Band D Council Tax figure of £21.66 for 2014/15.

Surrey County Council

9. Surrey County Council met on 11 February 2014 and set a Band D Council Tax of £1,195.83, an increase of 1.99% over the previous year.

Surrey Police Authority

10. Surrey Police Authority has set a Band D Council Tax of £211.68, an increase of 1.99% over the previous year.