
POLICY AND RESOURCES COMMITTEE**MINUTES****THREE RIVERS DISTRICT COUNCIL**

At a meeting of the Policy and Resources Committee held in the Penn Chamber, Three Rivers, Northway, Rickmansworth, on Monday, 24 January 2022 from 7.30 - 9.15 pm

Present: Councillors Sarah Nelmes, Councillor Dominic Sokalski,

Matthew Bedford, Stephen Cox, Stephen Giles-Medhurst, Paula Hiscocks, Chris Lloyd, Andrew Scarth, Phil Williams, Lisa Hudson (In place of Alex Hayward), Raj Khiroya (In place of Roger Seabourne) and Reed (In place of Debbie Morris)

Officers in Attendance:

James Baldwin
Ray Figg
Geof Muggerridge
Sally Riley
Alison Scott
Joanne Wagstaffe
Sarah Haythorpe
Amy Parmar

External in Attendance:

Councillor Andrew Gallagher (Croxley Green Parish)

PR64/21 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Debbie Morris, Reena Ranger, Roger Seabourne and Alex Hayward with Councillors Ciaran Reed, Lisa Hudson and Raj Khiroya substituting.

PR65/21 MINUTES

The Minutes of the Policy and Resources Committee on 6 December 2021 and the Extraordinary Policy and Resources Committee meeting on 12 January 2022 were agreed and signed by the Chair.

Post meeting note – it was pointed out to the Committee Clerk that the minutes of 6 December 2021 contained an error on Page 4, penultimate line and page 5, third bullet point where it should read “cite” not “sight”. The error has been corrected in the minutes.

PR66/21 NOTICE OF OTHER BUSINESS

The Chair had ruled that the following items of business, which had not been available 5 clear working days before the meeting were of sufficient urgency to be considered by the Committee for the following reasons:

Item 9 – Appointments to Herts Building Control – so that the Council can change its Governance arrangements on HBC.

Item 11 – Recording of meetings – so that the Committee can make a recommendation to Full Council on 22 February and that a policy can be put in place by the Council

Item 19 – Omicron Discretionary Grant Scheme – so that a policy can be agreed by the Council and the grants can be paid to local business within the deadline of 31 March 2022 as until it is agreed we are not able to pay any grants to businesses or publish the scheme online.

PR67/21 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Councillors Lisa Hudson, Raj Khuroya and Phil Williams declared a pecuniary interest in agenda item 19 as they were local business people in the District and would be able to apply for a grant. They would leave the meeting during the consideration of this item.

PR68/21 LOCAL DEVELOPMENT SCHEME

This report sought Members approval of a revised Local Development Scheme to incorporate a further Regulation 18 consultation.

The Director of Community and Environmental Services advised that due to the large number and nature of the public consultation responses it was proposed that there would be a further Regulation 18 Consultation which meant a change to the timetable was needed. Once the Local Plan was submitted to the Planning Inspectorate (PINS) the Council were in their hands regarding how quickly they set up a public inquiry.

Councillor Matthew Bedford moved, duly seconded, the recommendation that the Local Development Scheme be recommended to Council for adoption. By putting in an extra consultation it would delay the overall submission of the plan which may be helpful as the Government appeared to be thinking about whether it was going to reassess its overall framework.

Members raised the following points:

- Asked for clarification on how the Regulation 18 consultation would work and would it be opening back up the comments made on everything that was consulted on before or would there be amendments made.
- Did we know of any sites which did not appear to be in any of the past documentation?
- This report was asking Members to delay the Local Plan again which would make the Council open to developers and believed if the Council did not submit a Local Plan by the end of 2023 the Inspector would step in and take control.
- When would we expect the sub-committee to start meeting.
- The Council had its set of sites but was concerned about potential over development of the Green Belt if all the sites went through. Would this consultation open up more sites in the Green Belt

In response to Members points the Lead Member advised:

- The Council would not be consulting on sites which had already been consulted on. The consultation would be needed if there were changes to sites or additional sites that had not been previously consulted on. The sites were not mentioned at the moment but there may be sites which will come forward which need to be reassessed

- but this will go through the local plan sub-committee process as the first set of sites did. Once they had been through the sub-committee then they would go out for public consultation.
- The Council would be far from alone in not having submitted a plan by the end of 2023. Some other Councils in South West Herts were in the same position and there would be many other Councils in the country in the same position.
 - The sites would come to the Local Plan sub-committee and would be assessed on the same set of criteria as all the current sites. If sites are less inappropriate then it makes sense to consider them. If they were not included under the first process then they would not be included under this next stage.

The Chair advised that the report being presented to the Committee was to agree a revised timetable Local Plan and was not about sites. The sub-committee was looking to start meeting in March.

On being put to the Committee the Chair declared the motion CARRIED the voting being 11 For, 1 Against and 0 Abstentions.

RECOMMEND:

The Local Development Scheme as set out in Appendix 1 of the report be adopted.

PR69/21 ALTERNATIVE GRASSLAND MANAGEMENT UPDATE

The purpose of this report was to provide Members with information following debate on the motion put forward by Councillor Michaels and agreed at the Leisure, Environment and Community Committee of 24 November 2021, regarding alternative grassland management for the benefit of biodiversity.

The report and Appendix C includes potential costs as a minimum, to aid consideration by Policy & Resources Committee.

The Chair advised the Committee that it was being considered moving an amendment to the recommendation as follows:

“Members agree that, subject to the Biodiversity Opportunities Audit report, appropriate budget provision to be made in the forthcoming Council budget for alternative grassland management, acknowledging that there are a variety of options, and that a further report come back to this Committee in March on the options being implemented. A public consultation exercise be undertaken post implementation of the revised regime to assess the impact.”

Councillor Phil Williams, the Lead Member, moved the amended recommendation. They advised that the financial implications of the motion was within the remit of this Committee. They supported the motion but needed to find the best way to achieve what the motion was asking. We needed to obtain specialist advice from experts in grassland management before the motion was implemented. It was important to survey the grassland and find out what flowers, flora and wildlife was there and find the best way to manage it. Before the motion was put forward the Council already had 55% of its available grassland under conservation management regimes, 22% meadow cut and lifted, 22% was cattle grazed and meadow, 8% woodlands and the other 4% of other different things. The Council had already commissioned a biodiversity audit which was undertaken last year over the summer which would be presented to the Committee in March. Should the Committee pass the financial aspect of the motion tonight, without taking into account the biodiversity survey, we would be at risk of lessening the Districts biodiversity not increasing it. The motion proposed depended on resources and the size of the site of grassland needed to be cut with the proposal being all at once, but was this correct? Cutting an entire grassland in one removes valuable food sources for insects, mammals and birds. It is good practise in certain circumstances to leave some grass uncut in the winter so they can feed on this. The Council also needed to deal with thistles, nettles and ragwort which can all be poisonous to animals and difficult to harvest.

Let's wait for the audit and see what the specialists tell us to do, how we do it and when to do it. The type of cutting equipment we require would depend on the size of the grassland and its nature and one size does not fit all. Cut and lift was not for everything. Members were aware of Croxley Common Moor where some of the ant hills were over 600 years old. What would happen if a tractor went over those ant hills? The Council needed to look at this holistically. They urged the Committee to vote for the amendment to the recommendation until all the full facts were presented. This needed to be fact based and science led.

Councillor Stephen Giles-Medhurst seconded the amended recommendation and wished to make clear what the amended recommendation meant. The Council had its budget setting meeting scheduled for 22 February. In order for any of this work to go forward the Council needed to have both capital and revenue funding in the budget. This commitment tonight was to get that funding put in the budget so that this work can go forward. The budget may need to be amended during the course of the financial year but Members needed to bear in mind a report would be coming back to Committee in March on the implementation, including the types of equipment needed and number of staff. We have no other option but to do this if we support biodiversity and saving our planet. There will be some people who don't like the grass not being cut. We will have a post implementation consultation to assess the impact on what we do put into place.

In accordance with Council Procedure Rule 35(b) a member of the public spoke in support of the motion.

Members made the following comments:

- Understand about biodiversity, checking the sites first and ordering equipment but these can be done after the motion is passed. We should have already received the costings. The motion was unanimously agreed in November. There was no indication in the costings if we could share equipment, the Parishes were already doing some bailing. Understood there is a budget commitment here but we can all agree to pass this motion tonight.
- Could not understand that a policy which stated we are looking to cut the grass less was going to cost more and wondered why we don't have this equipment if we are cutting the grass already.
- The original motion was passed in November. What the report does was reconfirm that motion was passed and that a recommendation be made from this Committee to make the budget provision which will go to the next Council meeting to allocate the budget.
- Members were not here to debate the motion as the motion was agreed unanimously in November we are here to debate the way forward to implement the motion. When the grass cutting season starts we need to have in place the results of the biodiversity audit, the equipment required and the management plan for it, the Council had already appointed a Biodiversity Officer and were looking to appoint a second officer in order to help manage this. All that was being deferred was the results from the biodiversity audit to be reported to the Committee in March which all Members would have the opportunity to make comments on.

The Head of Community Services advised that the Council were not cutting grass at the moment and would not start in April so there would be no delay. If the recommendation was accepted tonight a paper would be brought back to the March meeting with the biodiversity audit results, an action plan and costs and it would make sense to wait until we have this information. There was more than just cut and lift there were other options which would be put forward on around 60 sites for Members to consider. On the 10 pilot sites it was the intention to continue those for another year.

The Chair advised that the first time the funding could be provided would be the February Council meeting. We use different equipment to cut short grass than we do for long grass.

Until we see the audit we don't know what equipment will be needed and the costings for that equipment.

On being put to the Committee the amended motion was declared CARRIED by the Chair the voting being unanimous.

RECOMMEND:

Agreed that, subject to the Biodiversity Opportunities Audit report, appropriate budget provision to be made in the forthcoming Council budget for alternative grassland management, acknowledging that there are a variety of options; and

RESOLVED:

That a further report come back to this Committee in March on the options being implemented. A public consultation exercise be undertaken post implementation of the revised regime to assess the impact.

PR70/21 EXTENSION OF EXISTING PUBLIC SPACES PROTECTION ORDER WITH RESTRICTIONS FOR DOGS

The Head of Community Services advised that the report requested that the Committee recommend the extension of the Public Spaces Protection Order (PSPO) with restrictions for dogs currently in place throughout the District for a further 3 years following the public consultation.

Councillor Sarah Nelmes moved, seconded by Councillor Chris Lloyd, the recommendation as set out in the report. It had been advised to the Leisure Committee that this was the correct process.

On being put to the Committee the motion was declared CARRIED by the Chair the voting being 11 For, 0 Against and 0 Abstentions. Cllr Hiscocks was absent for the vote.

RECOMMEND:

That approval is given to extend the existing PSPO for a further 3 years and that the current restrictions in the PSPO are maintained.

PR71/21 PERFORMANCE INDICATORS REVIEW

The Chief Executive advised that this report brings forward proposals for new performance indicators which would be implemented from April 2022. Some indicators had been deleted, there were some new indicators and some which were to be changed. It was also proposed to have a new report template for PIs.

On being put to the Committee the recommendation was declared CARRIED by the Chair the voting being 10 for, 0 Against and 0 Abstentions. Cllrs Giles-Medhurst and Hiscocks were absent for the vote.

RESOLVED:

Approved the changes to the Performance Indicators and agree any amendments or further work required.

Agree the new draft format for presenting the Performance Indicators to CMT and members.

PR72/21 APPOINTMENT TO THE HERTFORDSHIRE BUILDING CONTROL BOARD

The Chief Executive advised that HBC was an organisation owned by 8 Hertfordshire Councils and had been in existence since about 2013/14. The purpose of the report was to:

- Appoint the Head of Finance as a Director on the boards of Broste Rivers Ltd and its group companies including Hertfordshire Building Control Ltd.
- Appoint the Shared Director of Finance as the Shareholder in those companies, both appointments being on behalf of the Council.

Councillor Matthew Bedford moved, seconded by Councillor Andrew Scarth, the new appointments as set out in the report.

On being put to the Committee the motion was declared CARRIED by the Chair the voting being 9 For, 0 Against and 1 Abstention. Cllrs Giles-Medhurst and Hiscocks were absent for the vote.

RESOLVED:

That the appointment at Paragraph 3.1 and 3.2 be agreed and apply the usual indemnity for this appointment.

That Hannah Doney, Head of Finance, be appointed as a Director on the Broste Rivers Ltd group (but excluding BIVG) Board to replace the Head of Regulatory Services.

That Alison Scott, Shared Director of Finance, be nominated as the shareholder representative for Broste.

PR73/21 COUNCIL CONSTITUTION AND URGENT DECISIONS

For the P&R Committee to consider the recommendations from the Constitution sub-committee at its meeting held on 6 January 2022 with regard to Rules 11, 14, 15, 18 and 37 of the Council Constitution.

To consider a proposed amendment to the Member Officer protocol.

To consider an amendment to the urgent decisions form made by the Chief Executive in consultation with the Group Leaders which are available to the Chief Executive under Paragraph 8 of Part 3 of the Council Constitution.

To consider requiring the Chief Executive to consult with the Group Leaders 24 hours before making any minor amendment to the Council Constitution and for Paragraph 8 of the Scheme of Delegation to Officers in Part 3 of the Council Constitution to be updated accordingly.

Councillor Ciaran Reed thanked officers for the report which had been perfectly translated into the recommendations before the Committee tonight and thought all parties were happy with the outcome of the meeting and moved the recommendations set out in the report, seconded by Councillor Chris Lloyd.

A Member did not agree with all of the recommendations particularly with the arrangements for questions which reduced time available for large parts of the Council meeting and thought there ought to be some limits on questions to the Leader/Lead Members and did not understand why that had not been addressed.

The Chair advised that the sub-committee did discuss that point at length and it was agreed that Members would be sensible and not to change the rule.

Members had taken the points on board and would be looking to reduce the number of written questions submitted and the number of supplementary questions asked. It was not down to

the Constitution what questions Members can or cannot ask it should be for Members to decide what they would like to ask. There is a balancing act to make and understanding the consequences.

Officers would revisit the wording of Rule 11(5) on the referral of a motion to a Committee and provide any suggested amendments.

On being put to the Committee the motion was declared CARRIED the voting being 11 For, 0 Against and 1 Abstention.

RECOMMEND:

Review of Rule 11 – Notices of Motions

1. That there be no changes to Rule 11 on motions.

Rule 14 – Questions from Members to the Leader/Lead Members and Chairs of Committees

1. That there be no changes to Rule 14

Rule 15 – Questions from the Public

1. Members of the public questions to be submitted 8 working days prior to meeting;
2. Written response to the public questions to be published in summons;
3. A maximum of 5 questions to be allowed for each Full Council meeting (excluding Annual Council) and to be limited to one question per member of the public.

Rule 15 - Petitions

1. Shorten the URL for e-petitions on the Council's e-petition portal;
2. Encourage e-petitions to be created via the Council's e-petition portal;
3. Any e-petition not submitted via the portal must contain sufficient information to allow officers to verify the identity and address of the person who has signed the form;
4. To continue to allow paper petitions to be submitted but to provide a pro-forma to use with details of the information that the Council requires for the paper petition;
5. That the signatures needed to bring forward a petition to remain at 25
6. To review the e-petition guidance and come back to the sub-committee with a revised guidance at a future meeting.

Rule 37 – Application to Committees and Sub-Committees

1. To add Rule 11 to the list of Rules under Rule 37.

Member/Officer Protocol

1. That Member contact details be removed from all published press releases but retain the communications team contact details.

Urgent Decisions and Minor Amendments to the Council Constitution

1. Group leaders to be informed 24 hours prior to any minor changes being made to the Council Constitution by the Chief Executive;
2. That the urgent decision form with the Group Leaders be amended to include a section asking "Why is the urgent decision not able to go through the Committee process."
3. That Part 3, Section 8 be amended accordingly to read:
"Minor Changes to the Council Constitution - to be delegated to the Chief Executive to be advised to the Group Leaders 24 hours before the minor change is made."

PR74/21 COUNCIL/COMMITTEES/SUB-COMMITTEES RECORDINGS

This report was being presented to the Committee with the recommendations of the Constitution sub-committee on the retention of audio meeting recordings and livestreaming recordings both past and in the future.

This follows Council's approval to livestream Part I business at Council/Committees and sub-committees at the meeting on 14 December 2021 subject to the installation of the required equipment.

The Solicitor to the Council advised that the report provided details on the advantages and disadvantages of retaining the recordings and provided recommendations for the Committee to consider. It had transpired on investigation that there was no specific guidance setting out the length of time for which an audio or video recording should be kept so he had put forward a suggestion of 12 months for the recording to be available on the Council website from the date of the meeting, following which recordings of the meetings of Council and its Committees be archived for a period of 6 years and to be destroyed at the end of that period in the absence of any specific reason to retain them.

Councillor Stephen Cox moved, seconded by Councillor Chris Lloyd, that the recordings be retained for 7 years (12 months available on the website) and then archived for 6 years making a total of 7 years.

On being put to the Committee the motion was declared CARRIED by the Chair the voting being 11 For, 0 Against and 1 Abstention.

RECOMMEND:

That recordings of the meetings of council and its committees (so far as they are open to the public) be made available on the council website for a period of 12 months from the date of the meeting, following which, recordings of the meetings of council and its committees be archived for a period of 6 years therefore being retained for a total of 7 years, after which they be destroyed, in the absence of a specific reason to retain them.

PR75/21 SHARED SERVICES

The Chief Executive advised that this report brought forward some proposals for extending the Council's existing shared services. Watford, Three Rivers and St Albans had come together to consider the extension of some existing arrangements and some new arrangements. There were three services in the report being considered legal, procurement and emergency planning. Three Rivers already shared procurement with Watford so that would be an extension of that shared service with St Albans. Emergency planning is currently done by Herts County Council but during the pandemic they withdrew that resource (Watford had also used the service). St Albans had a very good emergency planner and we were all looking to use St Albans. The new service which was being proposed for sharing was Legal which would just build on the existing shared services that we have around Finance, ICT, Pest Control, Environmental Health and Revenue and Benefits.

The proposal before the Committee was to ask for agreement to continue with those discussions and to look at a business case to see if it was worth entering into.

A Member said they could see two Councils working comfortably but would 3 Councils work comfortably? The Chief Executive advised that the key to that would be the structure that was put in place behind the legal service. The current thinking was that we would have a new senior post in Legal to run the service, as it would be split 3 ways, but we would still each retain a Monitoring Officer. The changes would be more around the day to day running of the service. We would have three times the number of staff we have now and this would allow us to increase some of our specialised services which would help with resilience and capacity as all 3 services over time had struggled to recruit. Having a larger service would be more attractive to candidates. The key will be having the right structure in place but we do need to consider the financial implications of that. We do already have a very good legal service this was about resilience going forward.

Councillor Chris Lloyd moved the recommendations set out in the report, seconded by Councillor Raj Khiroya, as it was possible when the business case came back it may not stack up.

A Member was always in favour of a policy which would save our council tax payers money but wondered if this was the first step into a unitary Council and what particular areas do we wish to retain to keep us as an independent Council.

The Chief Executive said this proposal was not about having a unitary Council. It was about building on existing shared services. There was some services the Council had decided not to take part in although Watford were looking at additional shared services. The services we were proposing were already shared or delivered by someone else or we were considering doing for capacity/resilience issues. We have had shared services with Watford since 2008

A Member said that following Covid, emergency planning needed to be much more resilient and the Council needed more focus in this area.

A Member asked about the branding of it and could emails and letterheads have three rivers branding on them. Any letterheads as a minimum would be jointly branded.

Why had the Council chosen to work with those two neighbours and not other Councils? The Chief Executive advised that the conversations came about as we already have a number of Shared Services with Watford and St Albans have some financial difficulties and one of their options was shared services.

On being put to the Committee the motion was declared CARRIED by the Chair the voting being unanimous.

RESOLVED:

Agreed that officers should continue to develop business cases for the initial range of shared services comprising Legal, Procurement and Emergency Planning with the intention that these are implemented between April and September 2022 subject to a satisfactory business case.

Agreed that specific proposals supported by a business case and associated staff communications plans, are to be brought to Policy and Resources for agreement when discussions with neighbouring authorities have concluded.

PR76/21 CIL SPENDING APPLICATIONS

The report sought to allocate a total of £1,623,574 of CIL funding to local infrastructure projects to support growth in Three Rivers.

A Member supported the schemes but had asked where the CIL funding had come from and had found that a large part was from Rickmansworth and Moor Park. They referred to report and the details on what CIL can be spent on and wanted to check that the area was Three Rivers even though the CIL funding might have been raised in a particular Ward.

A Member advised that Rickmansworth was the third highest Ward in raising CIL monies. There are specific types of infrastructure which can be used for this levy.

A Member welcomed the CIL money being spent in South Oxhey despite not being raised there.

On being put to the Committee the motion was declared CARRIED by the Chair the voting being unanimous.

RECOMMEND:

That Members approve CIL funding for the following schemes detailed in Table 1 of this report and summarised in the table below for 2022/2023:

Applicant & Project Name	Infrastructure	CIL Amount
TRDC Leisure Team Denham Way Play Area/ Maple Cross Playing Fields (Appendix 1)	New play area Community pavilion, 3 floodlight tennis courts Outdoor fitness zone MUGA Playing pitch improvements Access pathways Seating formal garden	£347,000
TRDC Leisure Team South Oxhey Playing Fields (Appendix 2)	Tennis Courts AGP Basketball Court Skate/BMX Park Outdoor Gym Pathways	£375,000
HCC Breakspeare School (Appendix 3)	Expansion and relocation of SEND school	£901,574

PR77/21 EXEMPTION FROM PROCUREMENT PROCEDURE RULES - ADDITIONAL RESTRICTIONS GRANT PROJECTS

To advise Members that an exemption to the Procurement process was approved by the Director of Community and Environmental Services and the Chief Executive under the Exceptional Circumstances exemption as permitted by the Council's Constitution.

RESOLVED:

That the exemption be noted.

PR78/21 EXEMPTION FROM PROCUREMENT PROCEDURE RULES - OPEN SPACE, PLAYING PITCH & INDOOR SPORTS SPD

To advise Members that an exemption to the Procurement process was approved by the Director of Community and Environmental Services under the Limited Market exemption as permitted by the Council's Constitution.

RESOLVED:

That the exemption be noted.

PR79/21 FINANCIAL PLANNING - REVENUE SERVICES

The purpose of this report is to enable the Policy and Resources Committee to recommend to the Council the medium term revenue budgets.

The Shared Director of Finance advised that the report included the budget monitoring information for the period to November 2021. The Council continued to work hard on finding efficiencies within budgets to offset the impact of the pandemic and where these are ongoing they had been reflected in the Medium Term Financial Plan. Inflation continued to be a concern with the pay award for 2021/22 yet to be settled and the public sector pay freeze abandoned by the Chancellor. There had been a delay to business rate reform this year and fair funding which had improved our business rates position.

Members raised the following points:

Within the fees and charges there is an additional bench at Chorleywood House to be included within the memorial bench policy which they were happy to support as it was more in keeping with the Chorleywood House grounds.

Referred to pre application fees of £145.20 and felt this should be rounded up to £150. The Member felt we could change these fees as they do not come under statutory guidance and that we should be increasing them.

The Finance Manager advised that these were the current fees and for all planning fees there was no proposed increase.

The Director of Community and Environmental Services advised these were the current fees. With pre application fees we were always quite careful not to see these go above a full planning application fee as it could put people off using the service and lose us the opportunity to help people with their applications. A marginal increase could be included as they did not have any issues with that if agreed by Members.

A Member raised concern about the proposal to increase garden bin charges and wondered if the increases could instead be put on other fees/charges.

The Lead Member advised that there had been a lot of financial pressures on this service including costs for HGV drivers, pay award and the spend on diesel and were all factors in the increase of costs and the reality all Councils were facing.

The Chair advised the Committee were not putting forward these recommendations tonight. This will come forward in the budget for Council in February.

The Director of Community and Environmental Services said providing the Garden Waste service did not give the Council cost recovery yet. The charge was very low when compared to other authorities. We have been increasing the number of people using the service consistently over the last few years as it was a very highly regarded service.

RESOLVED:

That the report be noted.

PR80/21 FINANCIAL PLANNING - CAPITAL STRATEGY AND THE TREASURY MANAGEMENT POLICY

The purpose of this report is to enable the Policy and Resources Committee to recommend to Council its capital strategy and treasury management policy over the medium term (2022-25). This report is the second of three that is covered under the recommendations report at Item 18.

The Director of Finance advised that in terms of capital strategy the key changes were set out at Point 2.10.

RESOLVED:

That the report be noted.

PR81/21 FINANCIAL PLANNING - RECOMMENDATIONS

This report enabled the Committee to make its recommendations on the Council's Revenue and Capital budgets and Treasury Management Policy for the period 2022-25 (medium term) to Council on 22 February 2022.

This report set out all the recommendations for the committee

Councillor Dominic Sokalski moved, seconded by Councillor Matthew Bedford, the recommendation at 9.2 of the report.

On being put to the Committee the motion was declared CARRIED by the Chair the voting being unanimous.

RECOMMEND:

Noted that the Administration will publish its final recommendations on Financial Planning 2022/23 to 2024/2025 five working days prior to the Council meeting on 22 February 2022 and present them at this meeting.

Councillors Hudson, Khiroya and Williams left the meeting.

PR82/21 OMICRON DISCRETIONARY GRANT SCHEME

The Shared Director of Finance advised that this report had two parts to it. The first part to agree the principles for the discretionary grants scheme with the proposals reflecting those used in previous Covid discretionary grants schemes and the second part was to formally agree the policy for the statutory grant scheme which we had no choice over as it is set by Government.

On being put to the Committee the vote was declared carried by the Chair the voting being 9 For, 0 Against and 0 Abstentions.

RESOLVED:

- (a) Approved the principles for distribution of the grant set out at Appendix 1
- (b) Delegate to the Director of Finance approval of the final grant policy and allocation of the residual ARG funding.
- (c) Approved the statutory grant policy set out at Appendix 2 to implement the national scheme.

Councillors Hudson, Khiroya and Williams returned to the meeting.

PR83/21 WORK PROGRAMME

To receive the Committee's work programme. An additional item would be added to the March meeting on the biodiversity audits.

RESOLVED:

That the work programme be noted.

CHAIRMAN