

MID SUFFOLK DISTRICT COUNCIL

Minutes of the meeting of the **MSDC COUNCIL** held in the King Edmund Chamber, Endeavour House, 8 Russell Road, Ipswich on Thursday, 23 February 2023

PRESENT:

Councillor: James Caston (Chairman)
Paul Ekpenyong (Vice-Chair)

Councillors: Oliver Amorowson Gerard Brewster
David Burn Terence Carter
Austin Davies John Field
Julie Flatman Jessica Fleming
Dr Helen Geake Peter Gould
Lavinia Hadingham Matthew Hicks
Barry Humphreys MBE Sarah Mansel
John Matthissen Andrew Mellen
Richard Meyer Suzie Morley
David Muller BA (Open) MCMl Mike Norris
RAFA (Councillor)
Penny Otton Timothy Passmore
Stephen Phillips Dr Daniel Pratt
Harry Richardson Keith Scarff
Andrew Stringer Rowland Warboys
Keith Welham John Whitehead

In attendance:

Officers: Chief Executive (AC)
Deputy Chief Executive (KN)
Deputy Monitoring Officer and Corporate Manager Governance & Civic Office (JR)
Director Corporate Resources (ME)
Corporate Manager Finance, Commissioning & Procurement (MC)
Director Housing (DF)
Director Operations (ME)
Director Assets & Investments (EA)
Director Planning & Building Control (TB)
Director Economic Development & Regeneration (FD)
Regeneration Project Manager (KP)

Apologies:

Rachel Eburne
Kathie Guthrie

DECLARATION OF INTERESTS BY COUNCILLORS

92.1 In accordance with delegated authority, the Monitoring Officer had granted dispensations to all Members in respect of the Budget papers.

92.2 Councillor Mansel declared a non-registerable interest in respect of item 12 as she was an event representative for the park run that takes place on Chilton Fields.

92.3 Councillor Pratt declared a non-registerable interest in respect of item 12 as he is a schoolteacher at Stowmarket High School.

92.4 Councillor Carter declared a non-registerable interest in respect of item 12 as his daughter attends Wood Ley Community Primary School.

MC/22/33 TO CONFIRM THE MINUTES OF THE MEETING HELD ON 26 JANUARY 2023

93.1 Councillor Stringer pointed out that the start time of the meeting was incorrect on the minutes, the Deputy Monitoring Officer agreed that this would be amended.

93.2 Councillor Ekpenyong stated that in paragraph 77.2 the word 'effect' should be amended to 'affect'. This change was agreed.

It was RESOLVED:-

That subject to the above amendments raised by Councillors, the Minutes of the meeting held on 26th January 2023 be confirmed and signed as a true record.

MC/22/34 CHAIRMAN'S ANNOUNCEMENTS

94.1 The Chair referred Councillors to paper MC/22/34 for noting.

94.2 The Chair thanked those Councillors who had purchased tickets for his dinner event at the Officers Mess at Wattisham Flying Station on 4th March.

LEADER'S ANNOUNCEMENTS

95.1 The Leader of Mid Suffolk District Council made the following announcements:

Ukraine one year on

Tomorrow marks the one-year anniversary of Russia's invasion of Ukraine.

Since the war began, thousands of Ukrainians have been killed defending their freedom from Russia's appalling onslaught.

Millions more have been forced from their homes, with many finding refuge in the UK under the Homes for Ukraine Scheme – including nearly 250 here in Mid Suffolk. Tomorrow at 11am there will be a national moment of silence, offering people the chance to pay tribute to the courage of the Ukrainian people and demonstrate the UK's unwavering solidarity with the country. I am sure I speak for all of us at Mid Suffolk District Council when I say we continue to stand with Ukraine.

£2.2m government funding

I am pleased to say Suffolk's district and borough councils, including Mid Suffolk, have secured £2.2m of Government funding to improve the standard of private rented homes in the county. This will tackle poor housing conditions and improve tenants' wellbeing. The funding, from DLUH, will be used to create and support additional roles, offering advice to tenants and landlords, and take enforcement action against those who let poor quality housing. It will also enable the councils to continue working collaboratively, pooling resources to improve the standards of privately rented homes.

Ending rough sleeping

Suffolk's public sector leaders group agreed last week to fund a plan which aims to end rough sleeping in our county by 2027. During the pandemic, 160 people sleeping on the streets were accommodated in Suffolk in six weeks, including 42 in one day, under the Everyone In initiative. We have wanted to build on that work in Suffolk and provide a sustainable solution to the problem and help more people through a preventative approach. £175,000 has been agreed to develop the plans, which include more support for young people leaving local authority care, who are at greater risk of homelessness.

Supported Food Network

And in another great example of the collaborative approach we take in Suffolk, public sector leaders also agreed to fund a new Supported Food Network. It will work with new and existing food outlets, including food banks, providing more stock and ensuring a range of enhanced support is available to meet local needs. It will also focus on early help and prevention, upskilling, and additional support around benefits. SPSL agreed £1.5million funding over three years for this project, led by the Collaborative Communities Board, and I am sure this will build on the outstanding work of food banks, community larders and other charities, helping more people in the cost of living crisis. SPSL had previously pledged £1.8million to the Local Welfare Assistance scheme, which saw more than 7,000 applications for help between October and December last year.

SPSL has also published a report highlighting some of our key achievements in the last two year term. These include:

- Committing £1.3million to tackle gangs, county lines and trafficking.
- Pledging more than £2m championing Suffolk as a place to do business and supporting town centres.
- Investing £756,000 on work to improve the energy efficiency of Suffolk homes
- And £1.5million to support Suffolk's ambition to be net zero by 2030.

Award nominations

I'm delighted to say our council has been shortlisted for five national awards. Our Gateway 14 project, which will bring thousands of jobs to the area, is a well-deserving finalist in the Asset Management & Regeneration category in the iESE Public Sector Transformation Awards 2023.

Our Tree Canopy Survey and Tree Planting strategy has been shortlisted in the Local Government Chronicle awards (in the Technology category) and iESE awards (in the Green Public Services category).

We've also been shortlisted for the national 2023 Smarter Working Live Awards -

which celebrate public sector excellence - for our commitment to staff wellbeing. The council has been recognised in the 'Putting People First' category. And our Local Land Charges department has been shortlisted in the 2023 Land Data Local Land Charges Awards. It is fantastic to see our council being recognised like this, and I'd like to congratulate everyone involved for these achievements.

Suffolk Public Sector Leaders

I've mentioned a couple of points about how we work with Suffolk Public Sector Leaders but I think it's worth just running through a few extra points. Last Friday we held the last SPSL public meeting before the elections in May so I think this is an opportune moment to update you on what we have been doing. We've agreed important financial support for the Collaborative Communities Board and the Housing Board and I am just going to whiz down a few statistics:

£2.35 million to support business and the county's post covid recovery programme of which £1.4 million has been put into the Suffolk inclusive growth investment fund which has supported several projects including the virtual high street, innovate local and innovation labs.

£1.35 million to tackle county lines and criminal exploitation.

£1.5 million to deliver the Suffolk Climate Emergency Plan.

£756,000 to improve the Energy Efficiency of homes

An additional £80,000 for Screen Suffolk following the setup support in 2016.

£500,000 for the County Councils get Suffolk reading initiative.

£500,000 for the Collaborative Communities Board.

£400,000 for Suffolk Family Focus for preventative work to support vulnerable people.

£200,000 for the integrated care academy to support young people and their mental health and one of them for the local welfare assistance scheme to support residents facing financial hardship.

Also £1 million earmarked for Haughley Junction.

£1 million earmarked for housing board and £375,000 earmarked for the waste project.

So that's just a few things that we've been getting up to over the last couple of years, there is an end of term report that's available on the County Councils website and I will include a link to that in my announcements in the minutes.

[Suffolk Public Sector Leaders Report 2020-2022](#)

TO RECEIVE NOTIFICATION OF PETITIONS IN ACCORDANCE WITH COUNCIL

PROCEDURE RULES

96.1 None received.

QUESTIONS BY THE PUBLIC IN ACCORDANCE WITH COUNCIL PROCEDURE RULES

97.1 None received.

QUESTIONS BY COUNCILLORS IN ACCORDANCE WITH COUNCIL PROCEDURE RULES

98.1 None received.

MC/22/35 GENERAL FUND BUDGET 2023/24 AND FOUR-YEAR OUTLOOK

99.1 The Chair invited Councillor Whitehead – Cabinet Member for Finance, to introduce report MC/22/35.

99.2 Councillor Whitehead outlined the purpose of the report and **PROPOSED** the recommendations contained within the report, which was **SECONDED** by Councillor Morley.

99.3 Councillor Mellen introduced and **PROPOSED** the amendment from the Green and Liberal Democrat Group, as detailed in the tabled papers. The amendment was **SECONDED** by Councillor Whitehead and accepted by Councillor Morley.

99.4 Councillor Passmore queried how the proposal within the amendment would be targeted and eligibility.

99.5 Councillor Matthissen responded that this had been addressed through the Warmer Homes Scheme.

99.6 The Chair clarified that it would be a Cabinet decision.

99.7 Councillor Fleming questioned whether the content of the amendment presented any concerns or alterations to the budget.

99.8 Councillor Whitehead and the Director of Corporate Resources confirmed that the amendment posed no concerns to them or the budget.

99.9 Councillor Scarff inquired about the continuity of Councillor locality grants due to the merger of different funds and why they were not listed within the budget.

99.10 Councillor Whitehead confirmed that Councillor locality grants were included in the budget and advised that a community development fund had also been allocated for local projects.

99.11 Councillor Field asked for reassurance that there had been no significant

changes to the budget figures since the second quarter.

99.12 Councillor Whitehead confirmed no significant changes, and the Director for Corporate Resources confirmed the budget is in line with the projections from the second quarter.

99.13 Councillor Stringer asked whether Gateway 14 was eligible to pay business rates as it was a freeport.

99.14 Councillor Whitehead responded that although the businesses would not be eligible to pay business rates, the equivalent amount would be allocated by central government.

99.15 Councillor Passmore requested confirmation that sufficient provision existed within the budget for maintenance of the leisure facilities.

99.16 Councillor Whitehead confirmed that there was nothing to indicate otherwise.

99.17 During the debate, Councillors discussed their support for the proposed amendment, funding for training for retrofit work, improvements to the Councils housing stock and staff pay awards. The legacy of the Council was discussed in support of the council tax freeze alongside Council investments, Mid Suffolk Growth, Gateway 14 and the Community grants fund. Digitalisation and the efficient delivery of services to residents was discussed. Support and current investments for leisure centres was also voiced.

In accordance with Council Procedure Rule 19.3, the vote was recorded as follows:

For	Against	Abstain
Oliver Amorowson		
Gerard Brewster		
David Burn		
Terence Carter		
James Caston		
Austin Davies		
Paul Ekpenyong		
John Field		
Julie Flatman		
Jessica Fleming		
Helen Geake		
Peter Gould		
Lavinia Hadingham		
Matthew Hicks		
Barry Humphreys		
Sarah Mansel		
John Matthissen		
Andrew Mellen		
Richard Meyer		

Suzie Morley		
David Muller		
Mike Norris		
Penny Otton		
Timothy Passmore		
Stephen Phillips		
Daniel Pratt		
Harry Richardson		
Keith Scarff		
Andrew Stringer		
Keith Welham		
John Whitehead		
Rowland Warboys		
TOTAL 32		

By a unanimous vote,

It was RESOLVED:

- 1.1 That the General Fund Budget proposals for 2023/24 and four year outlook set out in the report the approved.
- 1.2 That the General Fund Budget for 2023/24 is based on no increase to the Band D Council Tax.
- 1.3 That council ring-fences £2 million from the Strategic Transformation and Infrastructure Reserve and other unspent reserves such as the Strategic Priorities – Housing Reserve to tackle the energy, cost of living and climate crises in Mid Suffolk.

MC/22/36 HOUSING REVENUE ACCOUNT (HRA) 2023/24 BUDGET

100.1 The Chair invited Councillor Whitehead – Cabinet Member for Finance, to introduce report MC/22/36.

100.2 Councillor Whitehead detailed the purpose of the report and **PROPOSED** the recommendations contained within the report, which was **SECONDED** by Councillor Hadingham.

100.3 Councillor Mansel referred to section 4.9 with regard to rental income and queried the absence of purchasing tenants under the right to buy scheme. In addition, Councillor Mansel asked whether the figures of new homes reported were net gain or gross within the capital budget.

100.4 Councillor Whitehead responded that there had been approximately 20 purchases from a stock of around 3,000 houses but confirmed that due to the small but dynamic nature of purchases, it was difficult to provide an appropriate estimate. Furthermore, Councillor Whitehead confirmed that the reality of purchases meant that the figures in the capital budget would entail the need for the replacement of houses.

100.5 Councillor Field was concerned about the proposed rent increases and asked whether any other alternatives were considered.

100.6 Councillor Whitehead responded that initial conversations had leaned towards CPI plus 1% increase and that due to benefits raising in line with inflation the raise was considered to be manageable.

100.7 Councillor Carter wondered what the procedure was in situations where the rent increase was not manageable to residents and whether the raise was on balance equitable to the Council should vulnerable residents require further Council interventions as a result, due to the compound impact on stress and mental health.

100.8 Councillor Whitehead appreciated the concerns raised and invited the Director for Housing to respond.

100.9 The Director for Housing revealed that the '*Rent Sense*' software will enable housing officers to predict forthcoming rent arrears and identify struggling residents. Moreover, the Director for Housing explained that due to this optimised process, officers would then be able to concentrate on assisting the identified residents and work with colleagues in Communities and other Housing teams for a better presence for ASB and neighbourhood issues but that Housing solutions also existed for supporting residents to maximise their benefits.

100.10 Councillor Matthissen stated that the charge from the Public Realm team into the HRA was of greater benefit to the general public and questioned whether there were costs that could be charged to the General fund as opposed to the HRA.

100.11 The Director for Housing confirmed the possibility was already being explored and consultations with Operations and Finance were required before a proposal could be brought forward.

100.12 Councillor Scarff requested assurance that the Council would not trigger a governmental repayment with a 4% above base rate interest added in regard to right to buy sales, on pg.99.

100.13 Councillor Whitehead agreed that the disincentive was sufficient enough but invited the Director for Housing to clarify.

100.14 The Director for Housing confirmed a development program to process housing sale receipts but added that as a measure of last resort the Council is able to partner with local housing associations and through that process secure the nomination rights.

100.15 During the debate, concern was expressed about the 7% rent increase in comparison to the freeze on council tax but it was reasoned to be acceptable within the current short-term context.

In accordance with Council Procedure Rule 19.3, the vote was recorded as follows:

FOR	AGAINST	ABSTAIN
Gerard Brewster	Oliver Amorowson	
David Burn	Terence Carter	
James Caston	Austin Davies	
Paul Ekpenyong	John Field	
Julie Flatman	John Matthissen	
Jessica Fleming	Mike Norris	
Helen Geake	Penny Otton	
Peter Gould		
Lavinia Hadingham		
Matthew Hicks		
Barry Humphreys		
Sarah Mansel		
Andrew Mellen		
Richard Meyer		
Suzie Morley		
David Muller		
Timothy Passmore		
Stephen Phillips		
Daniel Pratt		
Harry Richardson		
Keith Scarff		
Andrew Stringer		
Roland Warboys		
Keith Welham		
John Whitehead		
TOTAL 25	TOTAL 7	

By a vote of 25 for and 7 against,

It was RESOLVED:

- 1.1 That the HRA Budget proposals for 2023/24 set out in the report be approved.
- 1.2 That an increase of 7% for council house rents, equivalent to an average rent increase of £6.16 for social rent and £9.03 for affordable rent, a week be implemented.
- 1.3 That the CPI increase of 10.1% in garage rents, equivalent to an average rent increase of £4.86 or £4.91 (private rental), a month be implemented.
- 1.4 That an increase of 7% for sheltered housing service charges, equivalent to £10.83a month, be implemented.
- 1.5 That an increase for sheltered housing utility charges, equivalent to £27.93 a month (30% for heating and 62% for water), be implemented.
- 1.6 That in principle, Right to Buy (RTB) receipts should be retained to enable continued development and acquisition of new council dwellings.

The meeting was adjourned between 7.05pm and 7.12pm.

Councillor Welham left the meeting at 7.05pm.

MC/22/37 CASE FOR A NEW JOINT DEPOT

101.1 The Chair invited Councillor Gould – Cabinet Member for Assets and Investments, to introduce report MC/22/37.

101.2 Councillor Gould outlined the purpose of the report and **PROPOSED** the recommendations contained within the report, which was **SECONDED** by Councillor Fleming.

101.3 Councillor Mansel questioned the title of the item and queried the adequacy of recommendation 4.2 against recommendation 4.1, as site disposal was not a foregone conclusion. In addition, Councillor Mansel hoped that any site development would facilitate cyclists and pedestrians.

101.4 Councillor Gould gave assurances that the latter point would be taken onboard and reiterated the inceptive and non-prescriptive nature of the proposal and recommended provisions.

101.5 The Chair asked whether the clarification of “**Any** capital receipts” was an acceptable amendment to the recommendation.

101.6 Councillor Gould and Councillor Fleming accepted the amendment.

101.7 Councillor Amorowson questioned further phrase construction within the recommendations.

101.8 Councillor Gould dismissed pedantic alterations.

101.9 Councillor Field requested clarity of ongoing costs or savings to the project and requested assurance that any future savings would not be misused.

101.10 Councillor Gould clarified potential operational savings estimated at £75-150,000 but invited the Director for Assets and Investments to respond.

101.11 The Director for Assets and Investments reported the net impact as £13,000 per annum as a best case scenario and £163,000 worst case scenario, due to the cost of borrowing.

101.12 Councillor Matthissen asked how the different sites were chosen.

101.13 The Director for Assets and Investments explained featured sites were where services utilised the Council’s existing depots, as the report looked for an equivalent premise.

101.14 Councillor Field expressed concern about the land value estimations and potential excess funds.

101.15 The Director for Assets and Investments confirmed that no palaces will be built, and that current provisions are based on a fully serviced site.

101.16 The Chair advised the Council that the focus should be on whether the total amount was sufficient, and not delve into individual estimations.

101.17 Councillor Mellen asked whether the financial commitment would irrevocably tie the Council down to a single future depot, and whether staff travel distances had been considered.

101.18 Councillor Gould confirmed that the proposal was non-binding, and that the issues of travel distances would be explored when the business case developed.

101.19 Councillor Warboys inquired whether the provision of household recycling depots would also be under consideration.

101.20 Councillor Gould replied that it was a matter for the County Council.

101.21 Councillor Stringer asked for suggestions not be ruled out at this stage of the proposal, such as sloped or split level disposals sites and joint household waste services, and highlighted the need for connectivity and access.

101.22 Councillor Gould responded that the Council would need to remain focused on the proposal's objective but not at the expense of a very good idea.

101.23 Councillor Amorowson questioned the impact on employment.

101.24 Councillor Gould clarified that operational pressures may entail a net increase in employment and that the Council is sensitive to the issue.

101.25 Councillor Fleming confirmed that the District Councils already work closely with the County Council in respect of household waste management and commented that this needed to be discussed at the Suffolk Waste Partnership level to enable all partners to work together.

101.26 Councillors debated the matter. The need for adequate facilities was agreed. Concern was voiced towards coverage, clustering services, and staff travel, whilst it was reasoned that the proposal was for financial provisions and did not bind the Council to a specific option.

By a unanimous vote,

It was RESOLVED:

- 1.1 That £6m is added to the Council's Capital Programmes from 23/24 budget year to deliver improved depot facilities.**
- 1.2 Any Capital receipts from the disposal of existing depot sites will be added to the capital programme in later years.**

Councillor Phillips left the meeting at 7.55pm.

MC/22/38 STOWMARKET, HEALTH, EDUCATION AND LEISURE FACILITIES (SHELF) UPDATE

102.1 The Chair invited Councillor Richardson – Cabinet Member for Economic Growth to introduce report MC/22/38.

102.2 Councillor Richardson outlined the purpose of the report and **PROPOSED** the recommendations contained within the report, which was **SECONDED** by Councillor Flatman.

102.3 Councillor Pratt asked what considerations have been put in place to preserve the current habitat and whether a biodiversity net gain of 10% was enforceable.

102.4 Councillor Richardson acknowledged that the technical detail being asked would not be available until later in the planning process but would take note of the questions.

102.5 The Project Regeneration Manager explained that discussions are underway in conjunction with the Public Realm team and ecologists, and confirmed that all hedgerows on the school site would be kept and further information would be provided when it became available.

102.6 Councillor Stringer questioned whether the planning application was singular or split up.

102.7 REAL Consulting representative Alan Hepburn confirmed there would be one application submitted including both sites.

102.8 Councillor Carter requested confirmation on whether the parking and drop-off areas of the high school would be sold for housing and if access to current onsite bungalow would be levelled. In addition, Councillor Carter inquired into the financial robustness of the application, whether measures were in place for parental access to school drop-off areas, and why the leisure centre had not been incorporated into the application.

102.9 Councillor Richardson clarified that the enabling land mentioned by Councillor Carter was subject to agreements of disposal with the department for education but that they would defer to officers on whether that agreement had been reached as they anticipated that this would answer some of Councillor Carter's queries. Councillor Richardson disclosed that conversations had begun on the management of travel and traffic flows, and the decision not to include the leisure centre was based on the sizeable scope and scale of the project.

102.10 Councillor Carter further inquired about future of the wellness centre should the leisure centre be lost.

102.11 Councillor Richardson informed the Council that occupancy would still need to be addressed with service levels agreements but that the wellness centre would be able to operate as a standalone hub should the situation arise.

102.12 Councillor Amorowson asked whether information could be provided about the areas of wellness and education.

102.13 Councillor Richardson refuted the relevance of the request but believed wider reading on the subject matter was available, only not to hand.

102.14 Councillor Mansel asked about the overall timeline and whether it would be phased.

102.15 Councillor Richardson answered that it was all tentative at this stage, but that timeline details would be provided should the application return to Council as a full business case.

102.16 Councillor Pratt conveyed concerns from a constituent that the Council would restrict their bar license.

102.17 Councillor Richardson reassured Councillor Pratt that no intention existed.

102.18 Councillor Amorowson conveyed concerns from resident dog walkers in Chilton about possible field restrictions.

102.19 Councillor Richardson deferred to the Director for Economic Development & Regeneration.

102.20 The Director for Economic Development & Regeneration gave reassurances that planned site use was not intended to be at the detriment of other site users, and that ongoing correspondences would continue with users.

102.21 Councillor Carter asked whether expansionary plans meant access issues to the current facilities for less-abled residents would be neglected.

102.22 Councillor Richardson commended the rejuvenation of the leisure centre and signposted suggested improvements towards the Communities department.

102.23 The Chair requested a proposer and seconder to extend the meeting in accordance with the guillotine rule.

102.24 Councillor Richardson **PROPOSED** the extension of the meeting, **SECONDED** by Councillor Flatman.

102.25 By a majority vote, it was agreed to extend the meeting.

It was RESOLVED:

That the time of the meeting be extended to allow for the remaining items on the agenda to be completed.

102.26 Councillors debated the matter. Concern was raised about parking spaces and connectivity. Conversation was held on the equivalent financial equity of rural leisure centres. Points were made towards nutritional improvements and dining space support for the school.

By a unanimous vote,
It was RESOLVED:

- 1.1 That Council notes the work and progress made on the scheme to date, including extensive public engagement, design and cost planning and scheme viability.**
- 1.2 To also note the future gateways for decision making for the scheme including bringing the full business case, funding strategy and optimal operating model to Cabinet and Council later this year for a formal decision.**
- 1.3 To approve the recommendations endorsed by Cabinet to submit a full planning application and develop detailed designs for the scheme.**
- 1.4 To approve a further spend of £250,000 from the Growth and Efficiency fund to enable the works outlined in 3.3 to progress.**

Councillor Hicks and Councillor Otton left the meeting at 8.24pm.

EXCLUSION OF THE PUBLIC (WHICH TERM INCLUDES THE PRESS)

As Members had completed their discussion of Item MC/22/37 - Case for a New Joint Depot and Item MC/22/38 - Stowmarket, Health, Education and Leisure Facilities (Shelf) Update, the Chair refrained from going into closed session.

RESTRICTED APPENDIX - CASE FOR A NEW JOINT DEPOT (EXEMPT INFORMATION BY VIRTUE OF PARAGRAPH 1 OF PART 1)

As Members had completed their discussion of paper MC/22/37 - Case for a New Joint Depot, the Chair refrained from going into closed session.

RESTRICTED APPENDIX - STOWMARKET HEALTH, EDUCATION AND LEISURE FACILITIES SCHEME (EXEMPT INFORMATION BY VIRTUE OF PARAGRAPH 1 OF PART 1)

As Members had completed their discussion of paper MC/22/38 - Stowmarket, Health, Education and Leisure Facilities (Shelf) Update, the Chair refrained from going into closed session.

RE-ADMITTANCE OF THE PUBLIC (WHICH TERM INCLUDES THE PRESS)

N/A

MC/22/39 JOINT CAPITAL, INVESTMENT AND TREASURY MANAGEMENT STRATEGIES 2023/24

103.1 The Chair invited Councillor Muller – Co-Chair of the Joint Audit and Standards Committee, to introduce report MC/22/39.

103.2 Councillor Muller detailed the purpose of the report and **PROPOSED** the recommendations contained within the report, which was **SECONDED** by Councillor Caston.

103.4 Councillor Davies requested information on progress on the ESG benchmarks.

103.5 The Director for Corporate Resources apologised and stated that this would be followed up.

103.6 Councillors debated the matter. Continued fossil fuel investment against the previously carried Climate emergency motion was discussed.

By a vote of 20 for, 7 against and 1 abstention,

It was RESOLVED:

- 1.1 **The Joint Capital Strategy for 2023/24, including the Prudential Indicators, as set out in Appendix A.**
- 1.2 **The Joint Investment Strategy for 2023/24, as set out in Appendix B.**
- 1.3 **The Joint Treasury Management Strategy for 2023/24, including the Joint Annual Investment Strategy as set out in Appendix C.**
- 1.4 **The Joint Treasury Management Indicators as set out in Appendix D.**
- 1.5 **The Joint Treasury Management Policy Statement as set out in Appendix G.**
- 1.6 **The Joint Minimum Revenue Provision Statement as set out in Appendix H.**
- 1.7 **That the key factors and information relating to and affecting treasury management activities set out in Appendices E, F, and I be noted.**

COUNCILLOR APPOINTMENTS

108.1 There were no Councillor appointments.

MOTIONS ON NOTICE

109.1 None received.

The business of the meeting was concluded at 8.44pm.

.....
Chair