

MINUTES OF A MEETING OF THE COUNCIL

HELD ON 21 FEBRUARY 2019 FROM 8.00 PM TO 11.00 PM

Members Present

Councillors: John Kaiser (Mayor), Alistair Auty, Keith Baker, Parry Batth, Laura Blumenthal, Chris Bowring, Rachel Burgess, Jenny Cheng, UllaKarin Clark, Gary Cowan, Andy Croy, Richard Dolinski, Carl Doran, Lindsay Ferris, Guy Grandison, Kate Haines, Mike Haines, Charlotte Haitham Taylor, John Halsall, David Hare, Pauline Helliard-Symons, Emma Hobbs, Tim Holton, Philip Houldsworth, John Jarvis, Clive Jones, Norman Jorgensen, Pauline Jorgensen, Dianne King, Abdul Loyes, Julian McGhee-Sumner, Ken Miall, Philip Mirfin, Stuart Munro, Ian Pittock, Anthony Pollock, Malcolm Richards, Angus Ross, Daniel Sargeant, Imogen Shepherd-DuBey, Rachelle Shepherd-DuBey, Chris Smith, Simon Weeks and Shahid Younis

87. MAYOR'S ANNOUNCEMENTS

The Mayor welcomed Sarah Kerr to her first Council meeting as a Member for Evendons Ward.

The Mayor then presented awards to the following three recipients of the Mayor's Roll of Honour:

John Prior, who was unable to attend the meeting, had been the Chair of Governors at the Addington School for the past ten years and was standing down at the end of the year after 23 year's involvement. John had demonstrated tremendous commitment to the school which had received an unprecedented three outstanding Ofsted assessments.

Gordon Bird had been involved with the Shinfield Players Theatre for 20 years. During that period Gordon had taught acting skills to young people aged 8-18 in the theatre youth groups. This included many disabled and underprivileged children. Gordon had also led the groups to success in international competitions.

Corrisande Bicknell received the award on behalf of the ABC to Read Volunteer Group which supported children in 10 local primary schools through weekly reading sessions. These sessions encouraged the children to read which boosted their communication skills and helped them to gain self-confidence and self-esteem.

88. APOLOGIES

Apologies for absence were submitted from Prue Bray, Graham Howe, Barrie Patman, David Sleight, Wayne Smith, Bill Soane, and Oliver Whittle.

89. MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETINGS

The Mayor addressed the meeting and stated that the Minutes of Council meetings were drafted by Democratic Services staff without interference from Members. In accordance with custom and practice the Minutes were not a verbatim record but provided a sense of the discussions and an accurate record of decisions taken.

The Mayor stated that it was a matter for the Council to agree, by vote, whether or not Minutes provided an accurate record. In line with the Constitution any substantive changes to the accuracy of the Minutes should be proposed via a Motion in writing submitted to the Mayor. Finally, Council meetings were recorded and anyone wanting to hear or see the full discussion and debate could do so.

The Minutes of the Council meeting held on 22 November 2018 and the Extraordinary Council meeting held on 14 December 2018 were confirmed as correct records and signed by the Mayor.

In relation to the Minutes of the Extraordinary Council meeting held on 24 January 2019, Gary Cowan stated that the Minutes did not provide an accurate record of the events at the meeting and felt that additional details should be included. This view was shared by other Members.

The Mayor stated that, as a written Motion with proposed changes to the Minutes had not been submitted, the Council would simply vote on whether the Minutes of the Extraordinary Council meeting held on 24 January 2019 were a correct record of the meeting.

Prior to a vote being held, six Members, in accordance with Rule of Procedure 4.2.15.5, requested that a recorded vote be taken on the proposal.

The voting was as follows:

FOR	AGAINST	ABSTAINED
Alistair Auty	Rachel Burgess	Kate Haines
Keith Baker	Gary Cowan	Mike Haines
Parry Batth	Andy Croy	Tim Holton
Laura Blumenthal	Carl Doran	John Jarvis
Chris Bowring	Lindsay Ferris	John Kaiser
Jenny Cheng	David Hare	Sarah Kerr
UllaKarin Clark	Clive Jones	Ian Pittock
Richard Dolinski	Imogen Shepherd-Dubey	Malcolm Richards
Guy Grandison		Angus Ross
Charlotte Haitham Taylor		Rachelle Shepherd-Dubey
John Halsall		
Pauline Helliard-Symons		
Emma Hobbs		
Philip Houldsworth		
Norman Jorgensen		
Pauline Jorgensen		
Dianne King		
Abdul Loyes		
Julian McGhee-Sumner		
Ken Miall		
Philip Mirfin		
Stuart Munro		
Anthony Pollock		
Daniel Sargeant		
Chris Smith		
Simon Weeks		
Shahid Younis		

The Minutes of the Extraordinary Council meeting held on 24 January 2019 were confirmed as a correct record and signed by the Mayor.

90. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Lindsay Ferris stated that he had recently been appointed as a Non-Executive Director of Loddon Homes.

91. PUBLIC QUESTION TIME

In accordance with the agreed procedure the Mayor invited members of the public to submit questions to the appropriate Members.

91.1 Spencer Deering had asked the Executive Member for Regeneration the following question. Due to his inability to attend a written answer was provided:

Why was all of Denmark Street down to the roundabout at the Dukes Head not re-tarmacked when the regeneration work to the town centre was going on? The road surface is an absolute disgrace and I feel it would lift the look of the town centre nicely. Seems very odd that this opportunity was missed. But I guess as most of the roads in and around Wokingham are terrible it fits in nicely.

Answer

In line with the Town Centre Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) the Council does have aspirations to improve the Public Realm within the town on a number of routes. Market Place has been the start and we were planning to progress the south section of Denmark Street next. However, due to the current level of works being undertaken within the town and the disruption that this and Market Place has had, it has been decided through discussions and agreement with Members to pause these works until the regeneration areas of Peach Place and Elms Field have been completed.

91.2 Martin Branch asked the Executive Member for Planning and Enforcement the following question:

A recent new window next door which overlooks me was stipulated on 22 November 2017 as fixed and obscured to protect me. However, retrospective permission was given omitting the 'fixed' requirement. As a result, I am seriously overlooked upstairs and downstairs including bedroom and bathroom with clear glass and downstairs living room. After complaining, the Council said 'one would have to be 6'2" to be able to view into my home'. To me, this merely exemplifies that one can see into my home.

I have learned that this salient omission of 'fixed' was more likely a mistake rather than a deliberate act. The Council has refused to answer two related questions I put to them and has also refused to answer any further correspondence from me. When will this mistake be rectified?

Answer

I understand that you were given a verbal indication by the Council that a condition would be placed on the planning permission for your neighbour's extension to ensure that the side window would be obscure glazed and non-opening but that the planning permission issued allowed an opening window. I am sorry that this is contrary to what you had expected to happen.

Council Officers have been to the property to check the position. Under normal circumstances, the Council would only restrict the opening of side windows if they are below 1.7m in height from floor level. Having measured your neighbour's property, the roof light in your neighbour's roof slope measures a minimum of 1.78m in height and is angled

in such a way that it does not allow the same views as a normal vertical window. I understand that there is also a distance of approximately 18m between your property and your neighbours and these factors have led the Council to consider that the roof window does not have an unacceptable impact on your property. I understand that you have been advised of the Council's view both verbally and at least twice in writing and, as the Local Government Ombudsman has declined to investigate your complaint, I am sorry but the Council is unable to take any further action.

91.3 Philip Meadowcroft asked the Leader of the Council the following question:

I believe that you and your Executive colleagues, and indeed the Full Council, need to focus on and consider the implications of what was actually said by three eminent Court of Appeal judges in respect of WBC's appeal against a ruling from Reading Crown Court halting this Council's Breach of Enforcement prosecution against eleven defendants associated with Hare Hatch Sheeplands.

At the last Executive Meeting on January 31 Councillor Weeks chose to emphasise the over-arching importance of WBC bringing enforcement action against those who break planning regulations. Quite so, and this is not a matter on which any right-minded person would doubt; it's motherhood and apple pie. But we are now in a position where it is crucial WBC don't merely learn lessons (whether or not from an internal enquiry if such could be credibly undertaken).

As background to my question it is crucial to highlight two key points so clearly made in Lady Justice Hackett's summing up which I personally heard since I attended the entire proceedings:

1. The Court of Appeal was not engaged to conduct a re-run of the prosecution brought by WBC to Reading Crown Court last June. WBC had merely sought to appeal the collapse of the trial at Reading. Councillor Weeks' statement on January 31 that the Court of Appeal had been "inconsistent" with other WBC prosecutions is thus wholly irrelevant to the HHS issue.

2. The "unjust and unfair" verdict against WBC at Reading Crown Court was upheld without any difficulty by the Court of Appeal despite five grounds of appeal presented by WBC's QC because:

a) damning email evidence of the exchanges between Members and Officers over a lengthy period prior to breach of enforcement proceedings being instigated had been presented at Reading Crown Court, and

b) WBC had failed to follow the Code for Crown Prosecutors as shown by email evidence that WBC was planning to benefit from any Proceeds of Crime related to the case. Under the Code, when an LPA acts as a prosecutor it cannot at the same time be a beneficiary. The Court of Appeal found this failure to follow the Code particularly repugnant given that the defendants, if convicted, could have received jail sentences.

We have to thank the Court of Appeal for assembling and documenting in the 60-minute summing up just what went on in WBC's pursuit of the breach of enforcement action. I think it is relevant to let you know that the Court of Appeal judges took particular exception, expressed when the hearing commenced, to the unprofessional presentation of WBC's evidence bundle mentioning that emails were filed "all over the place" and indexing and tabbing "was in a mess".

WBC is now permanently tainted by this affair and the Court of Appeal's decision about WBC is very likely to be quoted in similar future cases in the Crown Court in the UK, the High Court, and the Court of Appeal. That is why you, Councillor McGhee-Sumner, as Leader, need to decide whether you are going to be part of the problem or whether you are going to be the originator of the solution.

Councillor McGhee-Sumner: Given the essential background I have presented, here is my question: will you please give urgent consideration to suspending from office all those Members and Officials named and shamed by the Court of Appeal for a series of actions and events of unacceptable culture and practice - such suspensions would only be lifted after the completion of an internal inquiry whose un-redacted report is openly published and fully debated by a Full Council Meeting with contributions from WBC council taxpayers? It is a simple choice and crucial to your standing as a respected and credible Leader of WBC.

Answer

As I am sure you will have heard when my colleague, Simon Weeks, gave his answer to a similar question at the Executive earlier this evening, you will not be surprised by my response.

Wokingham Borough Council is not yet in possession of the Court of Appeal's transcript and therefore not in a position to comment on the details referenced.

However, I would reiterate my point that focussing on the latest in a long line of court processes misses the point that Wokingham Borough Council has, through a long and sustained effort, protected the Green Belt from unlawful development and upheld the integrity of the planning process. There are always lessons that can be learnt and we are looking at those but let us not lose sight of what this was really about – it is stopping illegal development, which we have done successfully.

Once we receive the judgement, have read it and reviewed it with our lawyers, we will be in a better position to make a decision.

Supplementary Question

The lack of a transcript is due to a Ministry of Justice administration problem. But you do have the benefit of WBC's QC, Saira Sheikh, who could brief you fully. She was present for every minute of the court case and she, like I did, took extensive notes and you can be fully acquainted with what they say. The transcript will merely confirm it. I do not think that there are any unusual matters that will arise from it.

You want to wait for that, you say, and I cannot deny you that. But, notwithstanding the botched prosecution, botched by the behaviour and manner adopted by Councillor Kaiser and Councillor Halsall together with the Officers named and shamed, despite being supported by internal and external legal advisers who should have known better. Notwithstanding all that, you do not see any need for Councillors' or Officials' misconduct to be investigated or for any sanction or penalty to be imposed on those involved?

Supplementary Answer

Given the nature of your complaint against the two Councillors it would be completely inappropriate for me, as Leader, having taken advice from our in-house Barrister, to do anything other than wait for the transcript from the Court of Appeal. I agree with you that

the Ministry of Justice is to blame for the delay in receiving this. I have spoken to our in-house Barrister and his view is that nothing untoward has happened in relation to the two Councillors you have mentioned, but we will look at it in detail and we will come back.

91.4 Alison Swaddle asked the Executive Member for Business, Economic Development and Strategic Planning the following question:

I am a member of the Earley and Woodley Town Councils Joint Working Party and we have been working together to protect the area known as Bulmershe Fields which is a Site of Urban Landscape Value (or SULV) from development. In the sites put forward for the Local Plan Update this area has had the category of "Leisure Services" added to the existing "Public Open Spaces" classification. This would mean that, if agreed, development could be carried out on this public space as long as the use is for leisure. Both Town Councils are adamant that this change should not be accepted especially as there is already a "campus" for leisure facilities close by with schools, football pitches and a new Bulmershe leisure centre being built. Will the Executive Member agree with me that this change is inappropriate and will be removed during the review of sites process?

Answer

Bulmershe Field is an important local amenity which is recognised in our planning policies through it being designated as a Site of Special Landscape Importance.

Residents are able to use the open space and there is no intention to change this, or provide any additional facilities. In light of this, I can confirm that the site has been withdrawn from the local plan process.

91.5 Maria Gee asked the Executive Member for Finance and Corporate Resources the following question:

I note that the agenda and documents, page 94, states "The Council's plans to make capital investment of **£484 million** over the next 10 years. Appendix C shows every scheme by asset type." Appendix C, page 12, shows spend of **almost £900m** (£'000 889,365) from 2019/20 to 2028/29. Why are these amounts different?

Answer

Thank you for taking the time to read such a long document, and for your scrutiny of its content. You are indeed correct, the sentence on page 94, below the table, should state £486m over 3 years and not 10 years. This text would then be consistent with the figures presented in the table above that sets out our planned capital investment over the 3 year period 2019 to 2022.

Supplementary Question

Thank you for explaining that this was an error. I am a bit worried about errors in the numbers. In the same Appendix C it shows that expenditure planned for the next four years on the Town Centre Regeneration is over £60m. Yet elsewhere it has been reported that WBC's regeneration project costs £12m. I am wondering whether that £12m is also an error?

Supplementary Answer

I think that the fundamental issue with the Town Centre redevelopment is that there is expenditure prior to the sale of the residential assets and, therefore, the net figures are less than the gross figures. I will look at the detail of what you ask and provide a written answer.

92. PETITIONS

There were no Petitions presented.

93. MEDIUM TERM FINANCIAL PLAN AND ASSOCIATED REPORTS

The Council considered four reports which together comprised a single Agenda item:

- the Housing Revenue Account Budget 2019/22, as set out on Agenda pages 77 to 92;
- the Capital Programme and Strategy 2019, as set out on Agenda pages 93 to 130;
- the Treasury Management Strategy 2019/22, as set out on Agenda pages 131 to 174;
- the Medium Term Financial Plan 2019/22 – Revenue Budget Submission 2019/22, as set out on Agenda pages 175 to 180.

The Mayor reminded Members that a total of 90 minutes would be set aside for the debate.

Julian McGhee-Sumner, Leader of the Council, made a statement on the 2019/20 Budget (attached as an Appendix to the Minutes).

Lindsay Ferris, Leader of the Opposition, then made a Budget statement on behalf of the Liberal Democrat Group (attached as an Appendix to the Minutes).

At the conclusion of his Budget Statement, it was moved by Lindsay Ferris and seconded by Clive Jones that the Medium Term Financial Plan be amended by inserting the Opposition Budget Proposals set out in the Appendix to the Minutes.

Prior to a vote being held, six Members, in accordance with Rule of Procedure 4.2.15.5, requested that a recorded vote be taken on the proposed amendment.

The voting was as follows:

FOR	AGAINST	ABSTAINED
Gary Cowan	Alistair Auty	Rachel Burgess
Lindsay Ferris	Keith Baker	Andy Croy
David Hare	Parry Batth	Carl Doran
Clive Jones	Laura Blumenthal	John Kaiser
Sarah Kerr	Chris Bowring	
Ian Pittock	Jenny Cheng	
Imogen Shepherd-Dubey	UllaKarin Clark	
Rachelle Shepherd-Dubey	Richard Dolinski	
	Guy Grandison	
	Kate Haines	
	Mike Haines	
	Charlotte Haitham Taylor	
	John Halsall	
	Pauline Helliard-Symons	
	Emma Hobbs	
	Tim Holton	
	Philip Houldsworth	

	John Jarvis	
	Norman Jorgensen	
	Pauline Jorgensen	
	Dianne King	
	Abdul Loyes	
	Julian McGhee-Sumner	
	Ken Miall	
	Philip Mirfin	
	Stuart Munro	
	Anthony Pollock	
	Malcolm Richards	
	Angus Ross	
	Daniel Sargeant	
	Chris Smith	
	Simon Weeks	
	Shahid Younis	

On being put to the vote, the amendment was declared by the Mayor to have been lost.

Following the two Budget statements and debate on the proposed amendment, Members discussed the various aspects of the proposed Budget in detail.

At 9.50pm, as the debate was still ongoing, it was moved, in accordance with Rule 4.2.13.11 (g), that the time limit for speeches on the Medium Term Financial Plan item be extended by 30 minutes. This proposal was moved by Keith Baker and seconded by Julian McGhee-Sumner.

On being put to the vote, the Motion was declared by the Mayor to be carried.

93.1 Housing Revenue Account Budget 2019/22

It was proposed by Julian McGhee-Sumner and seconded by Anthony Pollock that the recommendations, set out on Agenda page 77, be approved.

Upon being put to the vote it was:

RESOLVED That the following be approved:

- 1) the Housing Revenue Account budget;
- 2) Council house dwelling rents be reduced by 1% effective from April 2019 in line with the Welfare Reform and Work Act 2015;
- 3) garage rents be increased by 3.70% effective from April 2019 in line with Council fees and charges;
- 4) Shared Equity Rents be increased by 3.27% based on September RPI, effective from April 2019;
- 5) Tenant Service Charges are set in line with estimated costs.
- 6) the Housing Major Repairs (Capital) programme for 2019/20, as set out in Appendix C to the report;

- 7) Sheltered room guest charges be increased from £9.00 per night to £9.50 per night.

93.2 Capital Programme and Strategy 2019/22

It was proposed by Julian McGhee-Sumner and seconded by Anthony Pollock that the Capital Programme and Strategy for 2019/22, as set out on Agenda pages 93 to 130, be approved.

Upon being put to the vote it was:

RESOLVED That:

- 1) the Capital Strategy for 2019/22, as set out in Appendix A to the report, be approved;
- 2) the three year Capital Programme for 2019/22, as set out in Appendix B to the report, be approved;
- 3) the draft Vision for Capital Investment over the next 10 years, as set out in Appendix C to the report, be noted;
- 4) the developer contributions, S106 and Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL), as set out in Appendix D to the report, be approved (noting that the S106 and CIL values are estimated and approval was sought up to the scheme budget);
- 5) the commercial activities of the Council, as set out in Appendix E to the report, be noted.

93.3 Treasury Management Strategy 2019/20 - 2021/22

It was proposed by Julian McGhee-Sumner and seconded by Anthony Pollock that the Treasury Management Strategy for 2019/22, as set out on Agenda pages 131 to 174, be approved.

Upon being put to the vote it was:

RESOLVED That the following be approved:

- 1) Capital Prudential Indicators, 2019/20;
- 2) Borrowing Strategy 2019/20;
- 3) Annual Investment Strategy 2019/20;
- 4) Flexible Use of Capital Receipts Strategy;
- 5) Minimum Revenue Provision (MRP) Policy;
- 6) Treasury Indicators: limits to borrowing activity 2019/20.

93.4 Medium Term Financial Plan 2019/22

Following the Budget debate, it was proposed by Julian McGhee-Sumner and seconded by Anthony Pollock that the Medium Term Financial Plan for 2019/22, including the

Revenue Budget Submission for 2019/20 and the Statutory Resolution setting out the 2019/20 Council Tax levels, be approved.

In line with the requirements of the Local Authorities (Standing Orders) (England) (Amendment) Regulations 2014, a recorded vote was taken.

The voting was as follows:

FOR	AGAINST	ABSTAINED
Alistair Auty	Rachel Burgess	John Kaiser
Keith Baker	Gary Cowan	
Parry Batth	Andy Croy	
Laura Blumenthal	Carl Doran	
Chris Bowring	Lindsay Ferris	
Jenny Cheng	David Hare	
UllaKarin Clark	Clive Jones	
Richard Dolinski	Sarah Kerr	
Guy Grandison	Ian Pittock	
Kate Haines	Imogen Shepherd-Dubey	
Mike Haines	Rachelle Shepherd-Dubey	
Charlotte Haitham Taylor		
John Halsall		
Pauline Helliari-Symons		
Tim Holton		
Philip Houldsworth		
John Jarvis		
Norman Jorgensen		
Pauline Jorgensen		
Dianne King		
Abdul Loyes		
Julian McGhee-Sumner		
Ken Miall		
Philip Mirfin		
Stuart Munro		
Anthony Pollock		
Malcolm Richards		
Angus Ross		
Daniel Sargeant		
Chris Smith		
Simon Weeks		
Shahid Younis		

Upon being put to the vote it was:

RESOLVED That:

- 1) the Medium Term Financial Plan (MTFP) 2019/22, including the Budget submission for 2019/20 and the changes put forward at the meeting, be approved;
- 2) the Statutory Resolution that sets out the 2019/20 Council Tax levels, as set out in the revised Appendix A (as tabled at the meeting) be approved;

- 3) in the event that there are any changes to the provisional precept for the Fire Authority or Parishes, arising from the precept setting meetings being held before the end of February 2019, the Deputy Chief Executive (S151 Officer) be delegated authority to enact all relevant changes to the MTFP, Statutory Resolution and Council Tax levels;
- 4) it be noted that, at its meeting on 14th December 2018, Council calculated the following amounts for the year 2019/20 in accordance with regulations made under Section 31B of the Local Government Finance Act 1992, as amended by the Localism Act 2011 and the Local government Finance Act 2012;
- a) 70,176.60 being the amount calculated by the Council (Item T) in accordance with Regulation 31B of the Local Authorities (Calculation of Council Tax Base) Regulations 1992 (as amended by the Localism Act 2011 and the Local Government Finance Act 2012);

b) Part of the Council's area:

Arborfield and	
Newland	1,292.3
Barkham	1,687.1
Charvil	1,411.9
Earley	11,894.1
Finchampstead	5,933.3
Remenham	326.3
Ruscombe	498.8
St. Nicholas Hurst	1,064.4
Shinfield	5,656.8
Sonning	817.6
Swallowfield	1,069.9
Twyford	3,011.8
Wargrave	2,119.6
Winnersh	4,117.7
Wokingham	15,513.8
Wokingham Without	3,232.4
Woodley	10,528.8
	<hr/>
	70,176.6

being the amounts calculated by the Council, in accordance with Regulation 6 of the Regulations, as the amounts of its Council Tax base for the year for dwellings in those parts of its area to which a Parish precept relates;

- 5) the Council Tax requirement for the Council's own purposes for 2019/20 (excluding Parish precepts) is £104,137,162. This includes £7,363,631 in respect of the Adult Social care precept for 2019/20; this is based on a 0.5% increase on the 2018/19 Council Tax;
- 6) the following amounts be now calculated by the Council for the year 2019/20 in accordance with Sections 32 to 36 of the Local Government Finance Act 1992, amended by the Localism Act 2011. However, the precepts shown below for the Parishes of Earley and Winnersh are provisional and are subject to approval at the Parishes annual precept meetings by the end of February 2019. The precept shown

below for the Royal Berkshire Fire Authority is also provisional subject to approval at a meeting of the Fire Authority on 25 February 2019:

£295,419,141	being the aggregate of the amounts which the Council estimates for the items set out in Section 31A(2)(a) to (f) of the Act taking into account all precepts issued to it by Parish Councils
(£186,903,124)	being the aggregate of the amounts which the Council estimates for the items set out in Section 31A(3)(a) to (d) of the Act
£108,516,017	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 31A(4) of the Act, as its Council Tax requirement for the year (Item R)
£1,546.33	being the amount at 3(c) above (Item R), all divided by 1(a) above (Item T), calculated by the Council, in accordance with Section 31B of the Act, as the 'basic amount of its Council Tax for the year (including Parish precepts).
£4,378,855	being the aggregate amount of all special items (Parish precepts) referred to in Section 34(1) of the Act (as per the table below):

	2019/20			2018/19			Council Tax Increase
	TAX BASE	PARISH PRECEPT	PARISH BAND D	TAX BASE	PARISH PRECEPT	PARISH BAND D	
		£	£		£	£	
Arborfield and Newland	1,292.3	105,020	81.27	1,272.4	100,231	78.77	3.17
Barkham	1,687.1	54,858	32.52	1,594.4	50,318	31.56	3.04
Charvil	1,411.9	48,684	34.48	1,409.7	47,070	33.39	3.26
Earley	11,894.1	881,817	74.14	11,842.5	859,700	72.59	2.14
Finchampstead	5,933.3	153,698	25.90	5,769.5	139,638	24.20	7.02
Remenham	326.3	24,919	76.37	320.0	24,076	75.24	1.50
Ruscombe	498.8	33,725	67.61	496.8	35,500	71.46	(5.39)
St. Nicholas Hurst	1,064.4	41,600	39.08	1,058.1	40,000	37.80	3.39
Shinfield	5,656.8	412,500	72.92	5,371.7	356,144	66.30	9.98
Sonning	817.6	37,187	45.48	815.3	36,280	44.50	2.20
Swallowfield	1,069.9	20,530	19.19	1,041.4	19,984	19.19	0.00
Twyford	3,011.8	85,360	28.34	3,004.9	81,645	27.17	4.31
Wargrave	2,119.6	184,373	86.98	2,110.3	175,660	83.24	4.49
Winnersh	4,117.7	137,314	33.35	4,011.3	113,760	28.36	17.60
Wokingham	15,513.8	853,332	55.00	15,052.5	809,335	53.77	2.29
Wokingham Without	3,232.4	180,409	55.81	3,179.5	163,673	51.48	8.41
Woodley	10,528.8	1,123,528	106.71	10,318.8	1,101,119	106.71	0.00
Total / Average	70,176.6	4,378,855	62.40	68,669.1	4,154,134	60.49	3.15

£1,483.93	being the amount at 3(d) above less the result given by dividing the amount at 3(e) above by the amount at 1(a) above, calculated by the Council, in accordance with Section 34(2) of the Act, as the basic amount of its council tax for the year for dwellings in those parts of its area to which no special items relates.
-----------	--

7) That it be noted that for the year 2019/2020 the Police and Crime Commissioner for the Thames Valley has issued a precept 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. The Royal Berkshire Fire and Rescue Authority is due to approve its precept on 25th February 2019, and their provisional precept has been used below.

8) 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 2019/2020 for each part of its area and for each of the categories of dwellings.

SUMMARY OF COUNCIL TAX 2019/20

Valuation Bands

	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H
Wokingham Borough Council	989.29	1,154.17	1,319.05	1,483.93	1,813.69	2,143.45	2,473.22	2,967.86
Thames Valley Police Authority	137.52	160.44	183.36	206.28	252.12	297.96	343.80	412.56
Royal Berkshire Fire Authority	44.19	51.55	58.92	66.28	81.01	95.74	110.47	132.56

Aggregate of Council Tax Requirement for each Parish and the Borough for each part of the Council's area:

	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H
Arborfield and Newland	1,043.47	1,217.38	1,391.29	1,565.20	1,913.02	2,260.84	2,608.67	3,130.40
Barkham	1,010.97	1,179.46	1,347.96	1,516.45	1,853.44	2,190.42	2,527.42	3,032.90
Charvil	1,012.28	1,180.99	1,349.70	1,518.41	1,855.83	2,193.25	2,530.69	3,036.82
Earley	1,038.72	1,211.83	1,384.95	1,558.07	1,904.31	2,250.54	2,596.79	3,116.14
Finchampstead	1,006.56	1,174.31	1,342.07	1,509.83	1,845.35	2,180.86	2,516.39	3,019.66
Remenham	1,040.20	1,213.57	1,386.93	1,560.30	1,907.03	2,253.76	2,600.50	3,120.60
Ruscombe	1,034.36	1,206.76	1,379.15	1,551.54	1,896.32	2,241.11	2,585.90	3,103.08
St. Nicholas Hurst	1,015.34	1,184.57	1,353.79	1,523.01	1,861.45	2,199.90	2,538.35	3,046.02
Shinfield	1,037.90	1,210.89	1,383.87	1,556.85	1,902.81	2,248.78	2,594.75	3,113.70
Sonning	1,019.61	1,189.54	1,359.48	1,529.41	1,869.28	2,209.14	2,549.02	3,058.82
Swallowfield	1,002.08	1,169.10	1,336.11	1,503.12	1,837.14	2,171.17	2,505.20	3,006.24
Twyford	1,008.18	1,176.21	1,344.24	1,512.27	1,848.33	2,184.39	2,520.45	3,024.54
Wargrave	1,047.28	1,221.82	1,396.37	1,570.91	1,920.00	2,269.09	2,618.19	3,141.82
Winnersh	1,011.52	1,180.11	1,348.69	1,517.28	1,854.45	2,191.62	2,528.80	3,034.56
Wokingham	1,025.96	1,196.95	1,367.94	1,538.93	1,880.91	2,222.89	2,564.89	3,077.86
Wokingham Without	1,026.50	1,197.58	1,368.66	1,539.74	1,881.90	2,224.06	2,566.24	3,079.48
Woodley	1,060.43	1,237.17	1,413.90	1,590.64	1,944.11	2,297.59	2,651.07	3,181.28

Aggregate of Council Tax Requirements for each part of the Council's area:

	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H
Arborfield and Newland	1,225.18	1,429.37	1,633.57	1,837.76	2,246.15	2,654.54	3,062.94	3,675.52
Barkham	1,192.68	1,391.45	1,590.24	1,789.01	2,186.57	2,584.12	2,981.69	3,578.02
Charvil	1,193.99	1,392.98	1,591.98	1,790.97	2,188.96	2,586.95	2,984.96	3,581.94
Earley	1,220.43	1,423.82	1,627.23	1,830.63	2,237.44	2,644.24	3,051.06	3,661.26
Finchampstead	1,188.27	1,386.30	1,584.35	1,782.39	2,178.48	2,574.56	2,970.66	3,564.78
Remenham	1,221.91	1,425.56	1,629.21	1,832.86	2,240.16	2,647.46	3,054.77	3,665.72
Ruscombe	1,216.07	1,418.75	1,621.43	1,824.10	2,229.45	2,634.81	3,040.17	3,648.20
St. Nicholas Hurst	1,197.05	1,396.56	1,596.07	1,795.57	2,194.58	2,593.60	2,992.62	3,591.14
Shinfield	1,219.61	1,422.88	1,626.15	1,829.41	2,235.94	2,642.48	3,049.02	3,658.82
Sonning	1,201.32	1,401.53	1,601.76	1,801.97	2,202.41	2,602.84	3,003.29	3,603.94
Swallowfield	1,183.79	1,381.09	1,578.39	1,775.68	2,170.27	2,564.87	2,959.47	3,551.36
Twyford	1,189.89	1,388.20	1,586.52	1,784.83	2,181.46	2,578.09	2,974.72	3,569.66
Wargrave	1,228.99	1,433.81	1,638.65	1,843.47	2,253.13	2,662.79	3,072.46	3,686.94
Winnersh	1,193.23	1,392.10	1,590.97	1,789.84	2,187.58	2,585.32	2,983.07	3,579.68
Wokingham	1,207.67	1,408.94	1,610.22	1,811.49	2,214.04	2,616.59	3,019.16	3,622.98
Wokingham Without	1,208.21	1,409.57	1,610.94	1,812.30	2,215.03	2,617.76	3,020.51	3,624.60
Woodley	1,242.14	1,449.16	1,656.18	1,863.20	2,277.24	2,691.29	3,105.34	3,726.40

94. CONTINUATION OF THE MEETING

At this point in the meeting, 10.20pm, in accordance with Procedure Rule 4.2.12 (m) the Council considered a Motion to continue the meeting beyond 10.30pm for a maximum of 30 minutes to enable further business on the Agenda to be transacted. This was proposed by the Mayor and seconded by Julian McGhee-Sumner.

Upon being put to the vote, the Motion was declared by the Mayor to be carried.

95. TREASURY MANAGEMENT - MID YEAR REPORT 2018/19

The Council considered the Treasury Management Mid-Year Report for 2018/19, as set out on Agenda pages 181 to 206. The report gave details of Treasury Management operations during the first six months of the 2018/19 Municipal Year.

The report stated that, as at September 2018, the Council was forecast to exceed its investment return budget and there had been no external loans taken out in the first six months of 2018/19. It also confirmed that there had been no breaches of the Treasury Management Strategy in the first six months of the year.

It was proposed by Anthony Pollock and seconded by Chris Smith that the recommendations set out on Agenda page 181, be approved.

Upon being put to the vote it was:

RESOLVED that:

- 1) the Treasury Management Mid-Year Report for 2018/19 be approved;
- 2) the actual 2018/19 Prudential Indicators, as set out in the report, be noted.

96. COUNCIL TAX REDUCTION SCHEME 2019 / 2020

The Council considered a report, set out at Agenda pages 207 to 212, which gave further consideration to the adoption of a Localised Council Tax Reduction Scheme. The matter was considered initially at the Extraordinary Council meeting on 24 January 2019. Following that meeting, the Leader of the Council requested that the scheme approved by the Council be brought back for further consideration. In line with the Council's Constitution, 14 Members had signed a Motion to rescind the original decision.

The amended scheme, set out in the report, addressed concerns expressed by Members at the previous meeting, for example the way in which child maintenance income was considered.

It was proposed by Lindsay Ferris and seconded by David Hare that the report be amended by adding a second recommendation in relation to the establishment of a Safety Net Fund, as follows:

"That Council agree:

- 1) the proposed Council Tax Reduction Scheme for 2019/20;
- 2) to set up a Safety Net Fund in the sum of £100k to support vulnerable residents who may not be able to afford even the reduced Council Tax they are expected to pay."

Julian McGhee-Sumner stated that he accepted the proposed amendment.

Anthony Pollock stated that, due to the improvements to the scheme set out in the report, it was likely that a Safety Net Fund would only be called upon in extremis.

Chris Smith apologised for any distress caused to vulnerable residents over the past month and confirmed that the development of future Council Tax Reduction Schemes would be the subject of detailed cross party scrutiny.

Andy Croy stated that there were still issues of concern in the amended scheme, such as the disregard of Carers' allowances, which should be addressed in the development of the scheme for 2020/21.

It was proposed by Julian McGhee-Sumner and seconded by Pauline Jorgensen that the recommendation set out in the report, as amended, be approved.

Upon being put to the vote it was:

RESOLVED that:

- 1) the proposed Council Tax Reduction Scheme for 2019/20 be approved;
- 2) a Safety Net Fund in the sum of £100k be set up to support vulnerable residents who may not be able to afford even the reduced Council Tax they are expected to pay.

97. TIMETABLE OF MEETINGS

The Council considered the proposed Timetable of Meetings for the 2019/20 Municipal Year, as set out on Agenda page 271.

It was proposed by Julian McGhee-Sumner and seconded by John Halsall that the 2019/20 Timetable of Meetings be approved.

Upon being put to the vote it was:

RESOLVED: That the Timetable of Meetings for the 2019/20 Municipal Year, as set out on page 271 of the Agenda, be approved.

98. CHANGES TO THE CONSTITUTION

The Council considered a report, set out on Agenda pages 213 to 270, relating to changes to the Constitution as recommended by the Constitution Review Working Group.

Gary Cowan expressed concern about the proposed changes to Section 3.5.4.2 “Debating a Petition at a Council meeting” in relation to the 10 day deadline for the submission of a Motion linked to a petition.

Keith Baker stated that the proposed changes to Section 3.5.4.2 would increase transparency and openness. Councillor Baker felt that petitioners would be able to work with a nominated Member to amend the submitted Motion to reflect the Council debate.

Lindsay Ferris commented that the 10 day deadline could be given further consideration by the Constitution Review Working Group but the proposed changes relating to petitions should be implemented. If the changes did not make the process more effective, further amendments could be considered as necessary at a later date.

Andy Croy expressed concern that petitioners were generally not aware of the Council’s rules and procedures and it was important to ensure that they were given control over the Motion to be considered by Council.

Carl Doran expressed concern that the proposals relating to Section 6.3.29 “Call-In” could introduce a lengthy delay in the process for holding the Executive to account.

Chris Bowring stated that the Council’s Constitution was evolving over time. If any of the proposed changes did not achieve their stated aims, the issue/s could be given further consideration by the Constitution Review Working Group before discussion and agreement at full Council.

It was proposed by Julian McGhee-Sumner and seconded by Chris Bowring that the recommendations set out in the report be approved.

Prior to a vote being held, six Members, in accordance with Rule of Procedure 4.2.15.5, requested that a recorded vote be taken on the proposal.

The voting was as follows:

FOR	AGAINST	ABSTAINED
Keith Baker	Gary Cowan	Rachel Burgess
Parry Batth		Andy Croy
Laura Blumenthal		Carl Doran
Chris Bowring		John Kaiser
Jenny Cheng		

UllaKarin Clark		
Richard Dolinski		
Lindsay Ferris		
Guy Grandison		
Charlotte Haitham Taylor		
John Halsall		
David Hare		
Pauline Helliard-Symons		
Tim Holton		
Philip Houldsworth		
John Jarvis		
Clive Jones		
Norman Jorgensen		
Pauline Jorgensen		
Sarah Kerr		
Dianne King		
Abdul Loyes		
Julian McGhee-Sumner		
Ken Miall		
Philip Mirfin		
Stuart Munro		
Anthony Pollock		
Malcolm Richards		
Angus Ross		
Daniel Sargeant		
Imogen Shepherd-Dubey		
Rachelle Shepherd-Dubey		
Chris Smith		
Simon Weeks		
Shahid Younis		

Upon being put to the vote it was:

RESOLVED: That the following changes to the Constitution, as recommended by the Constitution Review Working Group, be approved:

- 1) that Section 4.2.9.7 “Asking the question at the meeting (Council) and Section 5.4.31 “Asking the question at the meeting (Executive) be amended as set out in Paragraph 1 of the report;
- 2) that Section 4.2.11 “Motions on Notice” be amended as set out in Paragraph 2 of the report;
- 3) that Section 3.5.4.2 “Debating a Petition at a Council meeting” be amended as set out in Appendix 1 to the report;
- 4) that Sections 6.3.29 “Call-In” and 6.3.36 “Dispute” be amended as set out in Appendix 2 to the report;
- 5) that Section 8.4 “Licensing and Appeals Committee Procedure Rules be amended as set out in Appendix 3 to the report;

- 6) that Section 11 “Officers” be amended as set out in Appendix 4 to the report;
- 7) that Sections 1.6.4 Authentication of Documents” and 13.3.3.2 Table – Acceptance of Tenders and Signing Contracts” be amended as set out in Paragraph 7 and Appendix 5 to the report.