COTSWOLD DISTRICT COUNCIL

Minutes of a meeting of Council held on Wednesday, 21 February 2024

Councillors present:

Nikki Ind - Chair	Mark Harris – Vice Chair	
Claire Bloomer	Roly Hughes	Lisa Spivey
Ray Brassington	Angus Jenkinson	Tom Stowe
Patrick Coleman	Julia Judd	Jeremy Theyer
Daryl Corps	Juliet Layton	Clare Turner
David Cunningham	Andrew Maclean	Chris Twells
Tony Dale	Helene Mansilla	Michael Vann
Mike Evemy	Mike McKeown	Ian Watson
David Fowles	Dilys Neill	Tristan Wilkinson
Joe Harris	Nigel Robbins	Len Wilkins
Paul Hodgkinson	Gary Selwyn	

Officers present:

Andrew Brown, Democratic Services Business Manager
Angela Claridge, Director of Governance and Development (Monitoring Officer)
Caleb Harris, Senior Democratic Services Officer
Claire Locke, Assistant Director for Property and Regeneration
Ana Prelici, Democratic Services Officer
David Stanley, Deputy Chief Executive and Chief Finance Officer
Robert Weaver, Chief Executive

14 Apologies

Apologies were received from Councillors Gina Blomefield and Jon Wareing.

15 Declarations of Interest

There were none from Members or Officers present.

16 Minutes

The minutes from the Council meeting on 24 January 2024 were considered as part of the document pack.

Councillor Twells noted that a response had not been provided to the supplementary question presented to Councillor Evemy. In response, Councillor Evemy apologised for the delay and confirmed a response would be provided within 24 hours. This response was

subsequently given to Councillor Twells and a copy provided within the Member Questions Annex.

There were no further changes presented.

RESOLVED: That subject to the changes being made, the minutes of the Full Council meeting on 24 January 2024 be approved as an accurate record.

Voting Record

26 For, 0 Against, 5 Abstain, 3 Absent/Did not vote

For	Against	Abstention	Absent/Did not vote
Andrew Maclean		David Cunningham	Gina Blomefield
Angus Jenkinson		David Fowles	Jon Wareing
Chris Twells		Dilys Neill	Tony Slater
Claire Bloomer		Gary Selwyn	
Clare Turner		Jeremy Theyer	
Daryl Corps		Ray Brassington	
Helene Mansilla			
Ian Watson			
Joe Harris			
Julia Judd			
Juliet Layton			
Len Wilkins			
Lisa Spivey			
Mark Harris			
Michael Vann			
Mike Evemy			
Mike McKeown			
Nigel Robbins			
Nikki Ind			
Patrick Coleman			
Paul Hodgkinson			
Roly Hughes			
Tom Stowe			
Tony Dale			
Tristan Wilkinson			

17 Announcements from the Chair, Leader of Chief Executive (if any)

The Chair began announcements by welcoming Members to the Budget meeting and noted that there was likely to be robust debate around the future direction of the Council. However, the Chair reminded Members that the Budget was for the benefit of all residents in the District.

The Chair also apologised to Members for the issues identified with the hardcopy of the papers. It was explained that this was a problem with the external printers used and that printing for Members would soon be brought back in-house.

It was highlighted that the Local Plan Update consultation events were taking place in-person and through the survey online. It was also noted that the Car Parking Survey was still live for the public to engage with.

The Chair also reminded members of the Cirencester Pantry's first anniversary and encouraged Members to attend.

The Chair then explained that the next meeting start time was currently set at 2pm which had been raised as a concern by Members who were also Gloucestershire County Councillors because the County Council's Full Council meeting had been scheduled to start at 10pm on the same day.

The Chair, following consultation with Officers, proposed that the Full Council meeting start time be moved to 6pm. The Vice-Chair then seconded this proposal and was moved to a vote.

RESOLVED: That the start time for the Full Council meeting on 20 March 2024 be moved to 6pm.

Voting Record

20 For, 9 Against, 2 Abstention, 3 Absent/Did not vote

For	Against	Abstention	Absent/Did not vote
Andrew Maclean	Chris Twells	Angus Jenkinson	Gina Blomefield
Claire Bloomer	Daryl Corps	Gary Selwyn	Jon Wareing
Clare Turner	David Cunningham		Tony Slater
Dilys Neill	David Fowles		
Helene Mansilla	Jeremy Theyer		
Ian Watson	Julia Judd		
Joe Harris	Len Wilkins		
Juliet Layton	Nigel Robbins		
Lisa Spivey	Tom Stowe		
Mark Harris			
Michael Vann			
Mike Evemy			
Mike McKeown			
Nikki Ind			
Patrick Coleman			
Paul Hodgkinson			
Ray Brassington			
Roly Hughes			
Tony Dale			
Tristan Wilkinson			

The Leader's announcements began with apologies for absence for the previous meeting of full Council due to Local Government Association business.

It was also announced that the new portrait of King Charles III was hung on the wall of the Chamber and that the wishes of Council would be with the King during treatment for cancer.

The Leader also wished to invite Members to the unveiling of the mosaic at Brewery Court, Cirencester. It was noted that a lot of work had been done to renovate Brewery Court.

The Leader also wished for Members to encourage residents to participate in the Local Plan Update and Cirencester Masterplan consultations. The Leader also asked Members to encourage Town and Parish Councillors to engage with the Town and Parish Forum.

The Chief Executive then spoke and wished to thank officers for their work in compiling the Budget papers ahead of the meeting.

18 Public Questions

The first public question was from Tony Berry to the Deputy Leader and Cabinet Member for Finance. It was reminded that the Council had changed its decision regarding the Kemble Community Gardens from housing to a green space on the basis of the financial implications presented. It was noted that the land value was £0.3 million, and that it was estimated there would be a capital write down of around £1 million. The Deputy Leader was asked if this was included in the budget and if not, why not?

Councillor Evemy noted that this land would part of the Asset Management Strategy which was being compiled. It was noted that the value of the land was dependent on development. The Deputy Chief Executive added that the value had been updated for the 2022/23 accounts following the report presented to Cabinet which agreed the change of purpose. It was noted that the ultimate value would be determined at the point of transaction and this would be clear as part of statement of accounts but would have no direct impact on the Council's revenue budget.

Chris Snowden then asked a question regarding the measurement of climate change actions by local authorities by Climate Change UK and how many had been completed. It was noted that the Council's completed climate change actions were below the average, particularly in areas such as biodiversity. It was asked what steps the Council was taking to improve its performance against these targets. Councillor McKeown answered on behalf of the Cabinet and noted the launch of the internal Climate Board to coordinate specific actions, Cotswold Home Solar initiatives, Electric Vehicle Charging point installation and the Trinity Road Solar PV panels which would help the Council meet its commitment to tackle the climate emergency. However, it was noted that there was more to do to improve the Council's position within the funding constraints.

19 Member Questions

There were no Member Questions.

20 Future of the Old Station and Memorial Cottages, Cirencester

The purpose of the report was to seek agreement and allocation of funding to carry out structural works to rebuild an unstable wall at the Old Station, Cirencester.

The Deputy Leader and Cabinet Member for Finance proposed the recommendations and outlined the following points:

- Full Council was taking this decision as the amount was above £150,000 and not included within the capital budget.
- The historic building became part of Council's assets following the cuts to the railways in the 1960s.
- The condition of the wall required remedial works to make it safe, and following the withdrawal of New Brewery Arts from any further project, it falls to the Council to make the wall safe.

There were questions about in interest in the building other than from New Brewery Arts. The Deputy Leader noted that following the decision, expressions of interest would be sought.

There were assurances given that the work being undertaken was being done in line with the planning permission given and that conservation officers would ensure the work was suitable.

Councillor Joe Harris seconded the recommendations and made the following points:

- Many ideas had come forward for the Old Station but a significant private capital investment was needed to renovate the building which the Council could not provide.
- Finding a future use for the building was key as an empty building remained a financial liability for the Council.

RESOLVED: That Council:
1. APPROVED to carry out the works to rebuild the unstable wall at The Old Station, utilising £158,000 of capital budget from the Asset Management Strategy capital scheme.

Voting Record

31 For, 0 Against, 0 Abstention, 3 Absent/Did not vote

For	Against	Abstention	Absent/Did not vote
Andrew Maclean			Gina Blomefield
Angus Jenkinson			Jon Wareing
Chris Twells			Tony Slater
Claire Bloomer			
Clare Turner			
Daryl Corps			
David Cunningham			
David Fowles			
Dilys Neill			
Gary Selwyn			

Helene Mansilla			
Ian Watson			
Jeremy Theyer			
Joe Harris			
Julia Judd			
Juliet Layton			
Len Wilkins			
Lisa Spivey			
Mark Harris			
Michael Vann			
Mike Evemy			
Mike McKeown			
Nigel Robbins			
Nikki Ind			
Patrick Coleman			
Paul Hodgkinson			
Ray Brassington			
Roly Hughes			
Tom Stowe			
Tony Dale			
Tristan Wilkinson			

21 2024/25 Revenue Budget, Capital Programme And Medium-Term Financial Strategy

The purpose of the report was to present the budget for 2024/25

The Chair introduced this item by reminding Members and the public watching that the Budget Council Protocol was attached to the document pack and would be followed in setting the Council's budget.

The Deputy Leader and Cabinet Member for Finance, Councillor Evemy, was then invited to propose the administration's budget. In doing so, he outlined the following points:

- In this first budget of the second term of the Liberal Democrat administration, the Council would seek to build upon the previous work of investing in the District and rebuilding the Council's finances.
- A number of councils across the country of all political colours such as Birmingham City and Thurrock, had had to declare S.114 notices due to the financial pressures faced. Whilst it was affirmed that Cotswold District Council was not close to a S.114 notice declaration, there was a budget gap over the medium term that needed to be closed.
- In 2026/27 changes to central government funding would add to the pressures faced by the Council and action needed to be taken now.
- Council officers, Publica and Ubico had worked with the administration to reduce the deficit faced and in doing so had had to make difficult choices.
- There would be £1.25 million in savings made to reduce the pressure on reserves, which included £500,000 a year in waste collection changes, and £125,000 through the changes to contact centre opening hours. There would also be £2 million of revenue increases from fees and charges.
- The Council was projecting surpluses in the coming 2 years of £516,000 and £324,000 to replenish the Council's reserves. Furthermore, it was noted at paragraph 6.25 that

allocations from the final local government settlement of £118,000 be allocated to a Workforce Planning Reserve to support the Council's priorities.

- Reserves originating from the sale of housing stock to Fosseway Housing Association in 1997 had been depleted over time and could no longer be relied upon to sustain the Council's finances.
- The Council had removed the need for external borrowing to fund capital programme through the use of the Community Municipal Investment providing capital for the installation of electric vehicle charging points and Solar PV panels for the Council Offices.
- The approach of the Council in the face of financial pressures centred around efficient service delivery, increasing income to compensate for lost funding, utilising external funding and protecting the most poor and vulnerable members in the District.
- The focus on rebuilding the finances was supplemented with the work through council officers such as Crowdfund Cotswolds and the Green Economic Growth strategy which support communities and the local economy.
- The Budget Consultation recorded 542 responses allowed residents to provide their views on the proposals including changes to parking fees which included Sunday charging. It was recognised that whilst the changes to parking may not have been popular, they were necessary as part of the overall budget to sustainably fund services within the District.
- Cabinet had agreed the principle that discretionary services such as garden waste collection needed to be charged on a cost-recovery basis and the increase to £64 per annum for garden waste would achieve this.
- Decisions such as the rise in Council Tax of £5 for a Band D property were made within a challenging environment for residents' finances. It was highlighted therefore that the Council had taken steps to improve the Local Council Tax Support Scheme and Members were encouraged to engage with residents on this.
- Provision of £500,000 had been made for service transitions from Publica to the Council or another shared service model but this would not change service budgets at the time.

The Deputy Leader concluded by thanking officers for their work on the Budget and commended it to Members.

The Chair then invited the seconder of the budget Councillor Spivey to speak. Councillor Spivey made the following points:

- The Council's work for core and discretionary services within the District against the backdrop of uncertainty around central government funding and economic volatility.
- The Council's ambition was to deliver more than the core statutory services.

Councillor Stowe then reserved his right to speak until later in the debate.

Councillor Maclean was then invited to respond to the Budget on behalf of the Green Group. Councillor Maclean started by thanking the Deputy Chief Executive and officers who had worked hard on the Budget and made the following points:

- The Green Group would have liked to have seen more resources for Council priorities particularly the climate change crisis.
- Central government reductions to Council grants and the lack of reform for Council Tax had left local government in a difficult financial situation.

- The more affluent residents should carry more of the burden of increase but the rise in Council Tax proposed was the best that could be done within the remit of the District Council.
- The Green Group would support the Budget.

The Chair then invited Councillor Stowe as Leader of the Conservative Group to propose their amendment which was then circulated in the room.

Once it had been circulated, Councillor Stowe then spoke to the amendment which read as follows:

The proposed introduction of charging for parking on Sundays from April 1st, 2024 is cancelled.

The £105,000 projected income currently budgeted is covered by assuming a 12 month freeze in members allowances (subject to consultation with the Council's Independent Remuneration Panel) saving £33,236 and £71,764 allocated from the additional unexpected "windfall" £118,000 from increased central government funding.

The following points were made by Councillor Stowe:

- The Deputy Chief Executive had confirmed the amendment was viable.
- Market town centres across the district relied upon car parking and increases would affect them disproportionately without other means of transport.
- The proposed increases in parking charges would lead to potential reductions in tourism which would be damaging for businesses in the District.
- The amendment would seek to reduce the impact on towns by cancelling Sunday charging proposes and supporting businesses in the Cotswold.
- The proposed rise in Member Allowances was not appropriate given the state of the Council's financial position.

David Fowles as Deputy Leader of the Conservative Group then seconded the amendment and made the following points:

- Market towns should be supported.
- The rise in parking charges would cause disruption as residents park elsewhere to avoid the higher charges.
- The amendment, whilst a small adjustment, would provide a benefit to residents and businesses within the District.

The Chair then invited Members to ask any questions of clarification.

It was stated by the administration that the amendment proposed was similar to previous criticisms made by the opposition on parking and the actions from the Conservative-controlled County Council.

It was noted that the money given to Members were allowances for their work and not a salary.

There were various comments around how the financial challenges had presented difficult choices for the Council and higher parking charges would only be paid by those who could afford to have a car which was seen as being equitable.

It was stated that there were mixed views about the rises and that there would be some residents who would find the increases difficult.

The Chair then handed over to the Chief Executive to present the views of the Council's Deputy Chief Executive and S.151 Officer.

It was confirmed by the Chief Executive that the S.151 Officer was content with the amendment and satisfied that it was arithmetically correct and received in line with the Budget Council Protocol provisions. It was also stated that the amendment would not alter the revenue budget for 2024/25 other than set out in the proposal.

The Chair initially moved to the adjournment to discuss proposals, but following interventions from Group Leaders, it was felt that the adjournment was not necessary. The Chair therefore decided to continue with the session.

The Chair then asked Deputy Leader as the proposer of the Budget if the administration had accepted the amendment and it was confirmed that it had not been accepted.

The Chair then moved to the debate on the amendment.

It was stated that a number of towns had a low vacancy rate which was felt to be something not affected by the increase in car parking charges.

It was noted that some residents assume that the charges would apply on Sunday.

Councillor Stowe in summing up the debate on the amendment made the following points:

- The use of the word salary was because Councillors receive taxpayers money into their accounts and are taxed upon it.
- Some residents were not affluent despite owning a car and higher parking charges would affect them.

The Deputy Leader then responded to the amendment and made the following points:

- The introduction of Sunday charging for all car parks would standardise charging across car parks.
- Sunday trading in 2024 was as normal as other day but the parking provision for worshippers was recognised.
- In the current financial position, the charges could not easily be avoided.

The Chair then moved to the vote on the amendment, proposed by Councillor Stowe and seconded by Councillor Fowles.

Voting Record

8 For, 23 Against, 0 Abstentions, 3 Absent/Did not vote

Council
21/February2024

For	Against	Abstention	Absent/Did not vote
Chris Twells	Andrew Maclean		Gina Blomefield
Daryl Corps	Angus Jenkinson		Jon Wareing
David Cunningham	Claire Bloomer		Tony Slater
David Fowles	Clare Turner		
Jeremy Theyer	Dilys Neill		
Julia Judd	Gary Selwyn		
Len Wilkins	Helene Mansilla		
Tom Stowe	Ian Watson		
	Joe Harris		
	Juliet Layton		
	Lisa Spivey		
	Mark Harris		
	Michael Vann		
	Mike Evemy		
	Mike McKeown		
	Nigel Robbins		
	Nikki Ind		
	Patrick Coleman		
	Paul Hodgkinson		
	Ray Brassington		
	Roly Hughes		
	Tony Dale		
	Tristan Wilkinson		

The amendment was lost.

The Chair then returned Council to the substantive budget and sought questions of clarification.

There was a question regarding paragraph 3.3 of page 134 regarding value for money around performance measurement techniques regarding investments. The Deputy Chief Executive confirmed that Arlingclose Treasury Management provided quarterly benchmarking data against other Arlingclose clients and that Audit and Governance Committee received regular updates on this performance.

There was a question about the performance criteria for treasury investments listed on page 136 of the pack. The Deputy Chief Executive explained that Arlingclose benchmarking showed groups of investments but may not show individual investment performance. It was confirmed that further information could be made available as part of the Audit and Governance Committee Treasury Management reports and/or the Cabinet Financial Performance reports.

There were no further questions on the substantive budget, and the Chair invited Councillor Stowe to speak as the Conservative Group Leader who had reserved his right to respond to the budget. Councillor Stowe thanked officers for producing the budget and made the following points:

- The Council was facing a serious financial situation and the proposals were seen as an ‘emergency budget’ which would affect residents of the district.

- The previous spending conducted by the administration had meant that the Council needed to make difficult decisions.
- Table 1 – Core Spending Power on page 58 of the pack showed that the core spending power of the Council had increased by £639,000 leaving aside the geopolitical and other macro-economic headwinds facing the Council, residents and businesses.
- The decision to withdraw council services from the Publica partnership remained a material and significant risk to the Council finances in light of the indicative costs rising to £500,000 from the original figure of £200,000 within the Publica Review report presented to Full Council in November 2023. There were also concerns around the final costs given the costs for HR and legal consultants needed and the pension cost settlement for Council staff.
- There was concern that the Budget had not set out savings from the transition of services back to the Council.
- The Council Priorities Reserve and the use of these funds would need to be carefully managed against any new programmes.
- The planned capital programme borrowing required by 2026/27 of over £4 million would need to be scrutinised and opened to challenge by Members.
- Member Allowances would rise and there would be a backdated uplift following the freeze that had taken place for 2023/24 financial year.
- The residents and businesses of the District would now need to pick up the burden given the position of the Council's finances.

Council noted the increase in demands from local authorities across the UK and the pressure this had put on Council finances.

It was stated that longer-term local government settlements were required for all councils and that short-term settlements from central government did not allow for sufficient financial planning.

It was noted that there was some capital spending available to improve discretionary services such as leisure centres.

It was welcomed at 1.13 of Annex A that a purchasing consortium for energy with other local councils had been achieved to reduce energy costs.

The Deputy Leader as proposer of the Budget then summed up the budget and thanked Members for the debate and discussion on the budget:

- There was agreement with the comments around Council Tax reform which was seen as long overdue from central government.
- Comments around financial management were not recognised, and all spending decisions were open and done properly.
- Comments around the spend on consultants did not recognise the expertise needed to support officers on work like the Local Plan Update.
- On the Publica transition, it was recognised that the reserves were based on indicative costs but that these would become clearer to Council.

The Chair then moved to the vote on the substantial budget proposed by Councillor Evemy and seconded by Councillor Spivey.

Council
21/February2024

RESOLVED:

That Council APPROVED:
1. the Medium-Term Financial Strategy set out in Annex B
2. the Savings and Transformation items for inclusion in the budget, set out in Annex C
3. the Council Tax Requirement of £6,596,721 for this Council
4. the Council Tax level for Cotswold District Council purposes of £153.93 for a Band D property in 2024/25 (an increase of £5)
5. the Capital Programme, set out in Annex D
6. the Annual Capital Strategy 2024/25, as set out in Annex E
7. the Annual Treasury Management Strategy and Non-Treasury

Management Investment Strategy 2024/25, as set out in Annex F
8. the Strategy for the Flexible use of Capital Receipts, as set out in Annex H
9. the balances and reserves forecast for 2024/25 to 2027/28 as set out in Section 6 of the report.
10. the Council Tax Support scheme recommended by Cabinet summarised in paragraphs 7.29 and 7.30 of this report

Voting Record

23 For, 8 Against, 0 Abstentions, 3 Absent/Did not vote

For	Against	Abstention	Absent/Did not vote
Andrew Maclean	Chris Twells		Gina Blomefield
Angus Jenkinson	Daryl Corps		Jon Wareing
Claire Bloomer	David Cunningham		Tony Slater
Clare Turner	David Fowles		
Dilys Neill	Jeremy Theyer		
Gary Selwyn	Julia Judd		
Helene Mansilla	Len Wilkins		
Ian Watson	Tom Stowe		
Joe Harris			
Juliet Layton			
Lisa Spivey			
Mark Harris			
Michael Vann			
Mike Evemy			
Mike McKeown			
Nigel Robbins			
Nikki Ind			
Patrick Coleman			
Paul Hodgkinson			
Ray Brassington			
Roly Hughes			
Tony Dale			
Tristan Wilkinson			

22 Council Tax 2024/25

The purpose of the report was to set the Council Tax for 2024/25

The Deputy Leader and Cabinet Member for Finance introduced the report and made the following points:

- This report following the previous vote was to set the whole of the Council Tax alongside the other precepting authorities including Gloucestershire County Council and the Town and Parish Councils.
- Page 191 of the pack showed the Council Tax setting for Town and Parish Councils.

Councillor Wilkinson seconded the report and made the following points:

- Councils in financial difficulty such as Birmingham City Council were required under the S.114 notice to substantially increase Council Tax and cut jobs.
- Whilst Council Tax rises were difficult to implement, it would help to provide the local services needed and avoid more difficult measures in the future.

It was noted by Council that this report was in many respects a formality to agree the overall Council Tax levels.

The Chair then moved to the vote on the report recommendations proposed by Councillor Evemy and seconded by Councillor Wilkinson.

RESOLVED: That Council AGREED

1) for the purposes of the Local Government Finance Act 1992 Section 35(2), there are no special expenses for the District Council in 2024/25;

2) it be noted that, using their delegated authority, the Deputy Chief Executive calculated the Council Tax Base for 2024/25:

(a) for the whole Council area as 42,855.33 [item T in the formula in Section 31B of the Local Government Finance Act 1992, as amended (the "Act")]; and

(b) for dwellings in those parts of its area to which a Parish Precept relates as in the attached Schedule 1.

3) the Council Tax requirement for the Council's own purposes for 2024/25 (excluding Parish Precepts) is £153.93.

4) the following amounts be calculated for the year 2024/25 in accordance with Sections 31 to 36 of the Act:

(a) £47,469,352 being the aggregate of the amounts which the Council estimates for the items set out in Section 31A (2) of the Act, taking into account all precepts issued to it by Parish Councils and any additional special expenses.

(b) £36,246,995 being the aggregate of the amounts which the Council estimates for the items set out in Section 31A (3) of the Act.

(c) £11,222,349 being the amount by which the aggregate at 4(a) above exceeds the aggregate at 4(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 in the formula in Section 31B of the Act).

(d) £261.87 being the amount at 4(c) above (Item R), all divided by Item T (1(a) above), 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 and Special Expenses);

(e) £4,625,628 being the aggregate amount of all special items (Parish Precepts and Special Expenses) referred to in Section 34(1) of the Act as per the attached Schedule 2.

(f) £153.93 being the amount at 4(d) above less the result given by dividing the amount at 4(e) above by Item T(2(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 Parish Precept or special item relates;

(g) the amounts shown in Schedule 2 being the amounts given by adding to the amount at 4(f) above, the amounts of the special item or items relating to dwellings in those parts of the Council's area shown in Schedule 2 divided in each case by the amount at 2(b) above, calculated by the Council, in accordance with Section 34(3) of the Act, as the basic amounts of its Council Tax for the year for dwellings in those parts of its area to which one or more special items relate;

(h) the amounts shown in Schedule 3 being the amounts given by multiplying the amounts at 4(f) and 4(g) above by the number which, in the proportion set out in Section 5(1) of the Act, is applicable to dwellings listed in a particular valuation band divided by the number which in that proportion is applicable to dwellings listed in valuation Band D, calculated by the Council, in accordance with Section 36(1) of the Act, as the amounts to be taken into account for the year in respect of categories of dwellings listed in different valuation bands;

5) it be noted that for the year 2024/25 the Gloucestershire County Council and the Police & Crime Commissioner for Gloucestershire 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 below:

Valuation Band	*Gloucestershire County Council*	*Police and Crime Commissioner*
	£	*£*
A	*1,066.55*	*205.39*
B	*1,244.30*	*239.62*
C	*1,422.06*	*273.85*
D	*1,599.82*	*308.08*
E	*1,955.34*	*376.54*
F	*2,310.85*	*445.00*
G	*2,666.37*	*513.47*
H	*3,199.64*	*616.16*

6) the Council, in accordance with Sections 30 and 36 of the Local Government Finance Act 1992, hereby sets the aggregate amounts shown in Schedule 4 as the amounts of Council Tax for the year 2024/25 for each part of its area and for each of the categories of dwellings.

7) the Council's basic amount of Council Tax for 2024/25 is not excessive in accordance with principles approved under Section 52ZB Local Government Finance Act 1992.

8) the following Council/Publica Officers: Deputy Chief Executive, Group Manager – Resident Services, Director of Governance and Development, Legal Executive, Business Manager – Operational Services, Revenues Manager, Revenues Lead and Court Officer be authorised to:

(a) collect and recover any National Non-Domestic Rates and Council Tax; and

(b) prosecute or defend on the Council's behalf or to appear on its behalf in proceedings before a magistrate's court in respect of unpaid National Non-Domestic Rates and Council Tax.

Voting Record

24 For, 7 Against, 0 Abstentions, 3 Absent/Did not vote

For	Against	Abstention	Absent/Did not vote
Andrew Maclean	Chris Twells		Gina Blomefield
Angus Jenkinson	Daryl Corps		Jon Wareing
Claire Bloomer	David Fowles		Tony Slater
Clare Turner	Jeremy Theyer		

David Cunningham	Julia Judd		
Dilys Neill	Len Wilkins		
Gary Selwyn	Tom Stowe		
Helene Mansilla			
Ian Watson			
Joe Harris			
Juliet Layton			
Lisa Spivey			
Mark Harris			
Michael Vann			
Mike Evemy			
Mike McKeown			
Nigel Robbins			
Nikki Ind			
Patrick Coleman			
Paul Hodgkinson			
Ray Brassington			
Roly Hughes			
Tony Dale			
Tristan Wilkinson			

23 Notice of Motions

No motions had been received for this session of Full Council.

24 Matters exempt from publication

Council did not enter private session.

25 Exempt Annex for Agenda Item 9

Council did not enter private session to consider the annex within the meeting.

26 Next meeting

The next meeting was confirmed to be on 20 March at the amended time of 6pm.

The Meeting commenced at 6.00 pm and closed at 8.06 pm

Chair

(END)