

Minutes of the meeting of the Council held on 23rd February 2016 at Pippbrook, Dorking from 7.00pm to 10.03pm

Present: Councillors Margaret Cooksey (Chairman), David Mir (Vice Chairman), Emile Aboud, Tim Ashton, Lucy Botting, Lynne Brooks, Stella Brooks, John Chandler, Stephen Cooksey, Clare Curran, Rosemary Dickson, David Draper, Paul Elderton, James Friend, Paula Hancock, Mary Huggins, Chris Hunt, Duncan Irvine, Howard Jones, Malcolm Ladell, Simon Ling, Tim Loretto, Claire Malcomson, Vivienne Michael, Wayne Monkman, John Muggeridge, Paul Newman, Corinna Osborne-Patterson, Jatin Patel, Paul Potter, Sarah Seed, Philippa Shimmin, Peter Stanyard, Chris Townsend, Clayton Wellman and Charles Yarwood.

35. Minutes

The minutes of the meeting held on 24th November 2015 were confirmed as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.

36. Apologies for Absence

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Mary Cooper, Raj Haque, Santi Mondejar, John Northcott and Michelle Watson.

37. Exclusion of Press and Public

RESOLVED:

That members of the Press and public be excluded from the meeting for the following item of business under Section 100A(4) of the Local Government Act 1972 on the grounds that it involves the likely disclosure of exempt information as defined in paragraph 3 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A of the Act; namely information relating to the financial or business affairs of any particular person (including the authority holding that information) and the public interest in maintaining the exemption outweighs the public interest in disclosing the information.

38. Acquisition of Property Investment

Part II

The Council considered a confidential report recommending the addition of a property investment to the Council's Capital Programme.

RESOLVED:

That the property investment, at a value as detailed in the report submitted, be added to the Council's Capital Programme for 2016/17.

(N.B. Counted vote on the decision of the Council – 26 for, 9 abstention)

39. 2016/2017 Budget and Council Tax Resolution

The Council considered the Executive's recommendations with regards to the 2016/17 Budget and the Council Tax resolutions.

Councillor Lynne Brooks proposed and Councillor James Friend seconded the recommendations as set out on page 2 of the agenda.

The speeches of the Executive Member for Finance and Performance and Leader of the Opposition are set out in Annex 1 to these minutes.

An amended capital programme which took account of the decision taken in respect of the previous item was tabled at the meeting (attached at Appendix 1).

The Council debated the motion in full. A recorded vote was taken in accordance with Standing Order 26.6..

RESOLVED:

- (1) That the proposed budget for 2016/17 be set at £9,971,000.
- (2) That the Band D Council Tax for 2016/17 be set at £163.65, representing a 1.95% increase on 2015/16.
- (3) That the Capital Programme for 2016/17 be approved.

- (4) That the Section 151 Officer's statement concerning the 2016/17 budget and the medium term financial outlook for the Council be noted.
- (5) That Members' Allowances be increased in line with the National Pay Award for staff.
- (6) That the Council Tax resolutions for 2016/17 (as set out at Annex 2 to the minutes) be approved.

N.B. Recorded vote

In favour – 25:

Councillors Emile Aboud, Tim Ashton, Lucy Botting, Lynne Brooks, John Chandler, Clare Curran, Rosemary Dickson, James Friend, Paula Hancock, Mary Huggins, Chris Hunt, Duncan Irvine, Howard Jones, Malcolm Ladell, Simon Ling, Vivienne Michael, David Mir, John Muggerridge, Paul Newman, Corinna Osborne-Patterson, Jatin Patel, Sarah Seed, Peter Stanyard, Chris Townsend and Charles Yarwood.

Against – 10:

Councillors Stella Brooks, Stephen Cooksey, David Draper, Paul Elderton, Tim Loretto, Claire Malcomson, Wayne Monkman, Paul Potter, Philippa Shimmin, and Clayton Wellman.

Abstentions – 1:

Councillor Margaret Cooksey

40. Treasury Management Strategy Report 2016/17 to 2018/19

The Council considered the report set out at pages 51 to 88 of the agenda in respect of the Council's Prudential Indicators for 2016/17 to 2018/19 and the expected treasury operations for that period. It was noted that Council approval of the recommendations in the report was required before the end of the 2015/16 financial year. As the report had not yet been considered by the Audit Committee and this was the last meeting of Council before that date, Councillor Lynne Brooks proposed a revised recommendation for the Council to approve the recommendations as set out in the report subject to any final amendments arising from the Audit Committee's consideration of the report at its meeting on 17th March 2016.

The revised recommendation was seconded by Councillor James Friend.

RESOLVED:

That, subject to the S151 Officer, in consultation with the Chairman of the Council and the Chairman of the Audit Committee, being authorised to make any final amendments following consideration of the recommendations by the Audit Committee:

- (1) The capital expenditure Prudential Indicators and Limits for 2016/17 to 2018/19 contained within Appendix A of the report be agreed.
- (2) The Minimum Revenue Provision (MRP) Statement contained within Appendix A that sets out the Council's policy on MRP be agreed.
- (3) The Treasury Management Strategy 2016/17 to 2018/19 and the Treasury Prudential Indicators contained within Appendix B be agreed.
- (4) The Investment Strategy 2016/17 contained in the Treasury Management Strategy (Appendix B) and the detailed criteria included in Annex B1 be agreed.

41. Chairman's Announcements

The Chairman advised Members that the list of activities and engagements that she had attended on behalf of the Council since the last Council meeting was available in the Members' Room. She reported that the run up to Christmas had been particularly busy, with the Chairman's Carol Concert being well supported and thanked those involved in arranging the event.

On Christmas Day the Chairman had attended two events, firstly a visit to Dorking Hospital to meet patients staying in hospital over the festive period and secondly to the Dorking Christian Centre where a Christmas Lunch was being offered to people who would not be able to provide a similar meal for themselves.

In the past week the Chairman had been present at two of three events arranged to mark the visit of the Princess Royal to Mole Valley. All events attended had been well organised and reflected well upon the district.

Looking forward, the Chairman's Civic Reception would be held on 4th March.

The Chairman also advised Members that at 7.00pm on 1st March the Environment Agency would be providing an update for Members on flooding issues.

42. Petitions

The Council considered a petition which had been submitted by the Dorking Chamber of Commerce under Standing Order 19 in the following terms:

‘The Dorking Chamber of Commerce request that Mole Valley District Council introduce a year long trial of a FREE half Hour in the Council’s car parks.’

Two representatives of the petition signatories, Ms Salmon and Mr Boot, attended the meeting and spoke to Members regarding the reasons behind the submission of the petition. The reason behind the petition was to remove the barriers to shopping and to make it easier for people to spend money in the town rather than using petrol stations or out of town sites with free parking.

The Executive Member for Property and Parking, Councillor Charles Yarwood, thanked Ms Salmon and Mr Boot for presenting and speaking to the petition, and acknowledged the petition and the comments of the signatories.

Councillor Yarwood advised Council that the decision to change car parking charges from the current 1p per minute charge would need careful consideration to understand the impact any changes may have on the town centres and surrounding rural communities. As such Councillor Yarwood proposed the following motion to the Council:-

1. That the Council welcomes the work undertaken by the Dorking Chamber of Commerce and the evolved set of options presented beyond the original implications of their petition.
2. That, following consultation with local residents and community representatives, the Executive of the Council are asked to formally review the options for detailed practical measures that could be introduced in relation to parking charges in Dorking to maintain the character of the market town, to reduce environmental impact, to support the prosperity of both the town centre and our rural economies, to provide overall value for money to local residents and to help residents to access the services they need, in line with the agreed Corporate Strategy and Priorities of the Council.

The motion was seconded by Councillor James Friend.

The Council debated the petition request and the motion in full.

The Chairman thanked the petitioners for attending the meeting.

RESOLVED:

- (1) That the work undertaken by the Dorking Chamber of Commerce and the evolved set of options presented beyond the original implications of their petition be welcomed.
- (2) That, following consultation with local residents and community representatives, the Executive of the Council be asked to formally review the options for detailed practical measures that could be introduced in relation to parking charges in Dorking to maintain the character of the market town, to reduce environmental impact, to support the prosperity of both the town centre and our rural economies, to provide overall value for money to local residents and to help residents to access the services they need, in line with the agreed Corporate Strategy and Priorities of the Council.

43. Recommendations of Committees

- i) Audit Committee – 26th November 2015 - Treasury Management – Mid-Year Monitoring Report – 2015/16

Councillor Stella Brooks, Chairman of the Audit Committee, introduced the item and proposed the recommendations of the Committee as set out on page 3 of the agenda.

RESOLVED:

That the Treasury Management Mid-Year Monitoring Report 2015/16 be noted.

- ii) Standards Committee – 9th December 2015 - Mole Valley District Council’s Independent Person

Councillor Charles Yarwood, Chairman of the Standards Committee, introduced the item and proposed the recommendations of the Committee as set out on page 3 of the agenda

RESOLVED:

That Bernard Quoroll be added to the list of Independent Persons.

iii) Executive – 1st December 2015 – Community Infrastructure Levy: Draft Charging Schedule

Councillor Sarah Seed, Executive Member for Planning, introduced the item and proposed the recommendations of the Executive as set out on pages 3 to 4 of the agenda

RESOLVED:

- (1) That the draft charging schedule be approved for submission to examination.
- (2) That the draft policies on (i) discretionary relief and (ii) payment by instalments be approved.
- (3) That the supporting evidence documents to accompany the draft charging schedule be approved.

44. Mole Valley District Council Annual Pay Policy Statement for 2016

The Council considered the report set out at pages 127 to 136 of the agenda in respect of the Pay Policy Statement for 2016. The Executive Member for Finance and Performance introduced the report and proposed the recommendation.

RESOLVED:

That the Pay Policy Statement for the financial year 2015/16 be approved.

45. Appointments to Committees

The Council noted the vacancies on the Audit Committee and the Scrutiny Committee and the Leader of the Council's nominee to fill those vacancies.

RESOLVED:

That Councillor Paul Newman be appointed to the Audit Committee and as a substitute member on the Scrutiny Committee.

46. Approval of Councillor Absence

The Council considered the report set out at pages 137 to 138 of the agenda in respect of a request for Council to approve the extended absence of Councillor Santi Mondejar from meetings.

RESOLVED:

That Councillor Santi Mondejar may continue to be absent from meetings until the Annual Meeting of the Council in May 2016.

47. Leader's Statement

The Leader started by thanking Council Officers for their hard work over the past year. The Leader also advised that he was particularly pleased with how the Member Buddy scheme had been taken up and encouraged all Members to take advantage of this initiative if they had not already done so, as positive feedback had been received.

Work of particular note in the past year included the participation in the Infrastructure Needs Assessment, the work on affordable housing, the Corporate Functions Review and also the work of the Environment team to improve recycling rates.

The Leader also thanked the Chief Executive of Surrey County Council for providing Members with an update on the current devolution work being undertaken by local authorities across Surrey and East and West Sussex.

Looking forward, the Leader wished everyone good luck for the forthcoming local elections and also drew attention to the Advisory Poll being held in Dorking on the possibility of establishing a Parish Council in the town.

48. Quarterly Report on Decisions Taken Under Special Urgency Arrangements – 1st January To 31st March 2016

The Council considered the report set out at pages 4 to 5 of the agenda.

RESOLVED:

That the report be noted.

In accordance with Standing Order 14, the meeting concluded at 10.03pm. The following business was not considered at the meeting.

49. Reports of Executive Members

The Executive Member reports would be made available on the Council's website.

50. Questions to Members of the Executive

In accordance with Standing Order 7, the three questions submitted by the deadline but not asked and answered are recorded in Appendix 2 to these minutes with the responses of the Executive Members.

BUDGET SPEECH BY COUNCILLOR LYNNE BROOKES, EXECUTIVE MEMBER FOR FINANCE AND PERFORMANCE

I am pleased to put forward the 2016/17 Budget and Council Tax paper to full council. Despite fiscal pressure, the administration has managed to produce a strong, balanced and value for money budget.

It is therefore proposed that the budget be at a reduced level for next year at £9,971,000, with an increase of 1.95% in band D- this is a significant value for money point, as in withdrawing central grants, a higher council tax increase could have been adopted, but this has not been taken up by careful and considered fiscal planning.

The Standing Budget Panel has reviewed the budget and I thank Councillor Ling for his well observed and balanced comments. The panel observed that the administration was looking at maintaining front line services and that no fiscal policy or adoption of reduced budgets would affect the services offered to the residents. This is an important message and I would emphasise that no services are being adversely affected in this budget going forward.

There is no doubt that for MVDC to achieve the corporate aims in Environment, Prosperity and community well-being for our residents that we are going to have to look at more sustainability, cost effective approach and looking at income generation from current assets and investment in new ones. Self-sufficiency is the way forward and getting this right is a responsibility for every councillor who wants to leave a legacy for their residents having good services- the responsibility for getting this wrong has huge consequences.

But let me now to turn to some of the questions that arose via scrutiny. I would stress that as noted by the Standing Budget Panel, as we enter a new fiscal- this budget s balanced.

- 1 The capital Budget for Dorking Halls- there has been extensive discussion and no major capital expenditure item has been identified. Of course, Dorking Halls can make bids for capital under £50,000 against the minor works block sum of £800,000 per year, that has not been allocated
- 2 The impact of the NI changes- for MVDC. This is a wider question for all employers/ employees- the new state pension will bring an end to National Insurance rebates for both employers/ employees. The employer will lose a rebate of 3.4%- MVDC has taken account of this £200,000 in the budget. The employees will lose 1.4% rebate. I understand that there is a concern that this deduction against a 1% pay rise will have a negative impact on the staff within MVDC, especially with a recent upturn in staff turnover. This is a factor facing all employers- whether public or private.

The recent corporate review- which has yet to be summarised for reporting to members, highlights that in bench-marking MVDC staff are earning similar levels to other local councils.

If there is a comeback [The Council has a number of HR issues to address, being an average age of 49, succession planning and re-engineering for the future delivery of services, smarter, faster and more efficiently. I do not see an immediate need for concern, but am reassured that these areas are being highly monitored.]

- 3 There was also a question regarding an 8% increase in fees against the 5% quoted- this related to an annual membership charge that the centre agreed to take from £6.00 to £6.50 per annum for ease of use.
- 4 There was an earlier question regarding the lobbying of Central Government regarding the Revenue Support Grant and its withdrawal, which was then reported wrongly by the opposition into the press as Council Tax- rather than business rates. MVDC lobbied strongly with all other Surrey Councils and was part of the submissions that lead to the reversal of the potential for negative RSG. I would like to thank all the work undertaken by our leader and s151 officer in getting this position corrected, both were involved

I therefore recommend this budget for approval by the Council.

BUDGET SPEECH BY COUNCILLOR STEPHEN COOKSEY, LEADER OF THE OPPOSITION

Chairman, can I first thank the Council officers for their valuable assistance in helping my Group to understand this budget and its implications, particularly in the circumstances brought about by the very late change in government grants policy. It is there that I would like to begin to explain our assessment of this budget. This is the first budget that Mole Valley has experienced for many years where all of the responsibility and decision making rests with a single political party. Conservatives now control, and therefore are responsible for, every level of government that affects Mole Valley and this budget is a reflection of policies shared by Conservatives at national and local levels.

Much was made a few weeks ago, about the results of the efforts of local Conservative Council Leaders in persuading their own government to moderate the disastrous provisional grant settlement announced just before Christmas. While the changes are welcome, in reality, they are relatively minimal and any benefits seem not to have been passed on to residents in this budget. Compared to the current year, Mole Valley will still lose government grant of £514,000 next year and £832,000 the following year; there are vague promises of future business rate changes and Mole Valley Council is given the authority to increase Council Tax by more than 3% per year instead of the current 2%. Hardly a massive victory for the local branch of Conservative government.

The result is still 'a pay more for less budget' for everyone involved – for residents and for staff.

Mole Valley is very fortunate in the quality and dedication of its staff at all levels. Five years ago it was a depressing place to work but thanks largely to the policies and practice of our current Chief Executive the whole atmosphere has been transformed into a positive environment where staff are encouraged, and are consequently prepared, very often to give more than should be expected of them. However they have to work regularly with insufficient resources and under an administration policy of keeping wage rises to the lowest possible level.

That policy will take an even more unfortunate turn in this budget because not only are members of staff to be awarded the lowest possible pay rise yet again – just 1%; but the Conservative government is increasing National Insurance contributions for most of them by 1.4% - in other words most Mole Valley staff members can look forward to a decrease in take home pay in the coming year. At a time of national average wage rises of over 2%, this is hardly reward and encouragement from the administration for the good work that they carry out. Add to that the pressures of reduced flexibility,

re-organisations and restructuring – for example the Corporate Functions Review, which provides the bulk of this year's savings, reduces the IT and Democratic Services budgets to unspecified effect, and the review of the economic development function which has abolished Town Centre Management. In truth the administration seems to put the welfare of staff well down its priorities list.

For residents, this budget promises very little in terms of improving services and resolving long standing problems in service delivery. At last, there is a recognition that the traffic congestion problem in Dorking must be tackled and the proposed £40,000 contribution to help deal with this issue is to be welcomed. However, any progress is dependent on a £60,000 County Council contribution and I am aware that senior highways officers are suggesting that the study that this £100,000 may finance, will take more than 2 years to complete and there is no guarantee of further finance to implement any recommendations that it produces. Conservative control of national government, the County Council and Mole Valley Council can offer no better than this, when the frustrations of residents, business and visitors grows greater with every day that passes. Action is required now not in 3 years' time.

Service provision will remain at best at a standstill. Yet residents are painfully aware that many services have been allowed to deteriorate to a point where they are hardly fit for purpose. Examples -In the planning area, Mole Valley has been unable to recruit a permanent Chief Planning Officer for over 2 years and there seems little prospect of this happening in the foreseeable future. Planning enforcement continues to lack the resource to make it meaningful and is now regarded by most residents as something that no longer functions effectively, with all the consequences that follow from that. Parking enforcement, although not quite so under-resourced, is a matter of concern to residents who see illegally parked vehicles flouting regulations almost on a daily basis. Despite hollow words of concern about the future of our town centres, this budget incorporates the loss of Town Centre Management with no effective replacement for the services provided by Town Centre Managers and the administration has made no visible progress in protecting local independent retailers or encouraging new business. Leatherhead might eventually be helped by the transformation project if the funding for the next stage becomes available but

there is little here for Dorking. Residents desperately in need of service improvements will find no comfort from this budget.

The situation is equally concerning when looking at the performance of contractors, where it appears always to be quality that loses out to cost cutting. Last year Mole Valley took over grass verge cutting and some vegetation control from the County Council in circumstances where residents believed that no-one could provide a worse service than that previously undertaken by the County— well Mole Valley did just that – and despite some improvements late in the year residents been driven to despair by the lack of quality in delivery. Readers of 'Streetlife' will, in recent weeks have seen just how disappointed many users are in the services provided at Dorking Sports Centre - the consequence of a contract hailed as a major achievement by the administration because of the financial benefits that it brought to the Council. There is nothing in this budget to suggest improvement to these services and no hint that contract bids will be dealt with any differently in the future.

So for residents, it is a 'pay more for less budget' – the Council Tax constraints applied by national government in the Coalition years have been firmly replaced by the Conservative government's expectations that Council Tax will rise year on year despite continuing low levels of inflation. Almost 2% in this budget and the prospect of over 3% next year – all for services where quality is sacrificed time and again in the quest to reduce costs regardless of the consequences.

It can be no surprise then, that once again fees and charges are on the rise – and the policy to increase them by 5% a year, continues, even though inflation levels remain at less than 1%. So, year after year, regardless of Council Tax increases, we see a relentless surge in fees and charges imposed by this Council for the services that residents can often not do without. Some examples. In 2013 the burial fee for an adult in the Council cemetery was £710 – this budget raises that cost to £827; the letting fee for an adult games pitch with changing facilities was £78.80 – this budget raises it to £87; the hire fee for the Grand Hall at Dorking Halls was £990 – this budget raises it to £1,208; the fee for a half-load refuse collection was £61 – this budget raises it to £76; the cost of removal of fly tipping from private land was £160 – this budget raises it to £190 at a time when demand is bound to increase significantly as a consequence of that other Conservative policy of reducing Community Recycling Centre opening hours. Huge increases for residents over a four year period for essential services which in many cases they have no alternative other than to accept.

The Capital budget could spark a whole debate of itself but suffice it to say that the budget that the Council is now asked to approve marks a very significant policy change which has received no discussion or debate in the public arena. Almost ten years ago in 1997 Mole Valley Council became debt free in what the then Conservative administration claimed to be a significant turning point for the District. This capital budget reverses that decision and turns Mole Valley back into a borrowing authority in order to implement the proposed capital programme. A year ago the Council had money in the bank with which to undertake the Meadowbank Football Ground project which it promised to have up and running by July this year. Having failed in that objective the only way that it will now be able to fund that project, as a consequence of this budget, is by borrowing. A major policy change but one that currently lacks any detailed processes or procedures to give confidence in its application.

Chairman – this is a Conservative budget which combines national and local Conservative policies. It offers no improvement in services, it offers no encouragement to loyal and hard-working members of staff and it increases taxes and charges for residents. It is indeed a 'pay more for less budget' and one that I and my colleagues will vigorously oppose.

MOLE VALLEY DISTRICT COUNCIL
COUNCIL TAX RESOLUTION 2016/17

1. That it be noted that on 23rd February 2016 the Council calculated the 2016/17 Council Tax Base
 - (a) for the whole Council area as **39,884** 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: **8,717** equivalent Band D properties
2. The Council calculated that the Council Tax requirement for the Council's own purposes for 2016/17 (excluding Parish precepts) is **£6,527,017**.
3. That the following amounts be calculated for the year 2016/17 in accordance with Sections 32 to 36 of the Act:
 - (a) **£43,673,800** **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) **£33,702,800** **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) **£9,971,000** **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) **£3,443,983** **the Council's central government funding (revenue support grant, transitional grant and new homes bonus grant) plus retained business rates plus interest on investments plus balance 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 or decreased by the amount of any sums which the Council estimates will be transferred in the year to or 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) **£6,527,017** **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) **£163.65** **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) **£223,087** **the sum of the parish precepts (excluding grant) 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 2016/17 for each part of its area and for each of the categories of dwellings.
6. The statutory basis of the 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 2016/17 are detailed below and total **£223,087** with an average Band D Council Tax figure of **£25.59** for 2016/17. A grant of **£11,781** has been allocated from MVDC to compensate Parishes for reductions in the tax base due to the Council Tax Support Scheme.

Surrey County Council

9. Surrey County Council met on 9 February 2016 and set a Band D Council Tax of **£1,268.28**, an increase of **3.98%** over the previous year.

Surrey Police & Crime Commissioner

10. The Surrey Police & Crime Commissioner has set a Band D Council Tax of **£220.19**, an increase of **1.99%** over the previous year.

COUNCIL TAX RESOLUTION - TABLE (1) COUNCIL TAX SCHEDULE

Precepting authority	Valuation bands							
	A £	B £	C £	D £	E £	F £	G £	H £
Surrey County Council *								
- core spending	829.26	967.47	1,105.68	1,243.89	1,520.31	1,796.73	2,073.15	2,487.78
- funding adult social care	16.26	18.97	21.68	24.39	29.81	35.23	40.65	48.78
Total Surrey County Council	845.52	986.44	1,127.36	1,268.28	1,550.12	1,831.96	2,113.80	2,536.56
Surrey Police	146.79	171.26	195.72	220.19	269.12	318.05	366.98	440.38
Mole Valley District Council	109.10	127.28	145.47	163.65	200.02	236.38	272.75	327.30
TOTAL NON PARISH	1,101.41	1,284.98	1,468.55	1,652.12	2,019.26	2,386.39	2,753.53	3,304.24
Parish of:	A £	B £	C £	D £	E £	F £	G £	H £
Abinger	1,117.37	1,303.60	1,489.83	1,676.06	2,048.52	2,420.97	2,793.43	3,352.12
Betchworth	1,115.51	1,301.43	1,487.35	1,673.27	2,045.11	2,416.94	2,788.78	3,346.54
Brockham	1,110.05	1,295.06	1,480.07	1,665.08	2,035.10	2,405.11	2,775.13	3,330.16
Buckland	1,129.43	1,317.67	1,505.91	1,694.15	2,070.63	2,447.10	2,823.58	3,388.30
Capel	1,120.55	1,307.31	1,494.07	1,680.83	2,054.35	2,427.86	2,801.38	3,361.66
Charlwood	1,134.05	1,323.06	1,512.07	1,701.08	2,079.10	2,457.11	2,835.13	3,402.16
Headley	1,125.89	1,313.54	1,501.19	1,688.84	2,064.14	2,439.43	2,814.73	3,377.68
Holmwood	1,118.39	1,304.79	1,491.19	1,677.59	2,050.39	2,423.18	2,795.98	3,355.18
Leigh	1,116.59	1,302.69	1,488.79	1,674.89	2,047.09	2,419.28	2,791.48	3,349.78
Mickleham	1,120.55	1,307.31	1,494.07	1,680.83	2,054.35	2,427.86	2,801.38	3,361.66
Newdigate	1,109.57	1,294.50	1,479.43	1,664.36	2,034.22	2,404.07	2,773.93	3,328.72
Ockley	1,116.11	1,302.13	1,488.15	1,674.17	2,046.21	2,418.24	2,790.28	3,348.34
Wotton	1,108.43	1,293.17	1,477.91	1,662.65	2,032.13	2,401.60	2,771.08	3,325.30

* The council tax attributable to Surrey County Council includes a precept to fund adult social care.

COUNCIL TAX RESOLUTION - TABLE (2) PARISH YEAR ON YEAR COMPARISON

Parish Councils	2015/16			2016/17			Council Tax Increase £
	Tax Base	Precept & CTSS Grant £	Council Tax Band D £	Tax Base	Precept & CTSS Grant £	Council Tax Band D £	
Abinger	927.60	23,000	23.31	944.00	24,000	23.94	0.63
Betchworth	527.20	10,770	19.35	536.20	11,900	21.15	1.80
Brockham	1,255.60	16,645	12.42	1,252.70	17,295	12.96	0.54
Buckland	295.70	9,482	27.00	295.90	13,193	42.03	15.03
Capel	1,661.20	38,400	21.96	1,667.80	49,800	28.71	6.75
Charlwood	1,000.10	32,525	30.78	1,016.00	51,568	48.96	18.18
Headley	343.60	13,500	37.08	346.40	13,500	36.72	-0.36
Holmwood	416.90	10,500	23.13	417.20	11,500	25.47	2.34
Leigh	439.70	10,749	22.77	438.10	10,749	22.77	0.00
Mickleham	226.50	4,600	18.72	227.70	6,900	28.71	9.99
Newdigate	847.90	9,000	9.81	844.00	10,963	12.24	2.43
Ockley	431.70	10,000	21.69	423.40	10,000	22.05	0.36
Wotton	307.90	3,500	10.53	307.40	3,500	10.53	0.00
	8,681.60	192,671		8,716.80	234,868		

Note: Figures include grant from MVDC to compensate Parishes for reductions in tax base through CT Support Scheme

CAPITAL PROGRAMME 2016/17 - 2018/19

	Budget Manager	2015/16 Updated Capital Programme £000	2016/17 Capital Programme £000	2017/18 Capital Programme £000	2018/19 Capital Programme £000
MAJOR PROJECTS					
1. CAPITAL PROJECTS					
Emergency Accommodation (Phase 2)	Alison Wilks		300		
Property Investment	Paul Brocks		8,600		
Clare & James House	Paul Brocks	3,420			
Pippbrook HQ refurbishment	Paul Brocks	4,500			
Meadowbank, Dorking - regeneration	Richard Burrows	4,100			
HOPE Springs Eternal (HLF funded)	Paul Anderson	928			
Leatherhead Youth Football Club	Paul Brocks	920			
Leatherhead High Street (Developer Contributions)	Jack Straw	353			
Ashted Village Centre	Jack Straw	49			
Carbon Reduction Project	Paul Brocks	300			
KGV Playing Fields Improvements	Paul Anderson	100			
Pippbrook House	Paul Brocks	201			
2. CAPITAL BLOCK SUMS					
Disability Adaptations	Richard Haddad	500	500	500	500
Affordable Housing	Alison Wilks	735	735	500	500
S106 Projects	Jack Straw	30	250	250	250
Community Grants	Patrick McCord	127	50	74	74
Playground Refurbishment	Paul Anderson	127	60	60	60
Capitalised salaries	Phil Mitchell	473	477	487	497
Telecare Equipment	Tim Ward	151			
Dial-A-Ride Vehicle Replacement	Tim Ward	200			
Property Projects	Paul Brocks	150			
TOTAL MAJOR PROJECTS		17,364	10,972	1,871	1,881
MINOR CAPITAL PROJECTS		1,834	700	700	700
TOTAL CAPITAL		19,198	11,672	2,571	2,581
Reserves					
		<u>1.4.2015</u>	<u>1.4.2016</u>	<u>1.4.2017</u>	<u>1.4.2018</u>
Usable reserves for capital programme funding - includes capital receipts and revenue contributions towards Minor Works		£14,947	£9,822	£9,311	£10,690

Agenda Item 17 – Questions remaining to be asked**1. QUESTION TO THE EXECUTIVE MEMBER FOR PROPERTY AND PARKING FROM COUNCILLOR STEPHEN COOKSEY**

“At the meeting of the Council Executive on 9th February it was reported in the Business and Monitoring Report (page 12) that 'The full costs relating to the management and development of these properties (Claire House and James House) will be assessed and included in a proposal to Council'. I asked when that report would be presented to Council and was told that it would be presented to the next meeting (23rd February). This report does not appear in the papers circulated for consideration by that meeting of Council. In view of this would the Executive Member indicate why he provided inaccurate information in answer to the question and when this proposal will be forthcoming?”

RESPONSE FROM COUNCILLOR CHARLES YARWOOD:

“Plans for the management of the redevelopment of the Claire House and James House site will be put to members in the summer, following the same timeline for the adoption of the Transform Leatherhead masterplan.”

2. QUESTION TO THE EXECUTIVE MEMBER FOR ENVIRONMENT FROM COUNCILLOR CLAYTON WELLMAN

“Do you support the restrictions on opening hours and charging about to be imposed by the County Council on the CRC facility at Ranmore Road?”

RESPONSE FROM COUNCILLOR JAMES FRIEND:

“I thank the Member for their question, which I answer in the Executive Member’s absence. Community Recycling Centres are, of course, run by Surrey County Council.

I do not envy Surrey County Council in their prioritization of resources across key areas such as roads maintenance, social care delivery and Community Recycling Centres. I note we might be classed as a competitor to the Community Recycling Centres through our Bulk Waste collection scheme.

As some members will have heard through the briefing given on 23rd February 2016 by the Chief executive of Surrey County Council, at Mole Valley District Council we are looking to work in partnership with Surrey County Council through devolution of local service delivery and I still hope that officers will be able to include Community recycling Centres in that approach at some point going forward either directly or potentially through the Surrey Waste Partnership.

The response to the question has to be in the context of our own council’s agreed priorities including delivering value for money to taxpayers and protecting our local environment.

The details of any changes to the two Community Recycling Centres in Mole Valley are still unclear. I have asked the Executive Member for Environment to write to the Leader of Surrey County Council and the Cabinet Member, Michael Goodman, to get that clarity.

I am keen that we ensure that any changes are well researched, for example setting out the usage by half hour period during summer and winter periods. Any changes need to be proportionate in incentivising the most appropriate consumer behaviours – reducing, reusing and recycling domestic waste and ensuring effective and legal disposal of commercial waste.”

3. QUESTION TO THE EXECUTIVE MEMBER FOR TOWN CENTRES FROM COUNCILLOR CLAIRE MALCOMSON

“With the suggestion that Transform Leatherhead may include the building of a new cinema in the centre of town, what is intended to be done to protect the listed building Leatherhead Theatre, which survives mainly on showing films. More than a porch is needed to secure its future?”

RESPONSE FROM COUNCILLOR HOWARD JONES:

“It is important to note that the Transform Leatherhead Master Plan at this stage sets out a broad template for a visionary change in the quality and range of facilities and public realm in

the town centre. It is still too early to say exactly what elements of the Master Plan may or may not ultimately find their way in to the eventual regeneration programme. A cinema is currently included as a possible element in response to the feedback received during the extensive public consultations received to date where many people have been telling us that the nearest modern cinema facilities are too far away to offer a convenient and local comfortable entertainment experience. Of course, any existing businesses in Leatherhead keen to respond to what the market seems to be saying could do so at any point, the theatre included.

The Church Street gateway into Leatherhead has been identified in the Master Plan as an important leisure zone within Leatherhead Town Centre. It offers both the theatre as a multi use entertainment venue and a good range of restaurants serving the growing evening economy. The theatre will therefore occupy a prominent position within an enlivened, high quality leisure area where people will want to visit to make use of the range of food and drink, leisure and entertainment on offer.

The Council's commitment to Leatherhead through the Master Plan should give the theatre confidence in the future and allow it to develop its own ways to capitalise on the positive changes that are taking place."