

DURHAM COUNTY COUNCIL

At an **Ordinary Meeting** of the County Council held in the **Remote Meeting - This meeting is being held remotely via Microsoft Teams** on **Wednesday 24 February 2021** at **10.00 am**

Present:

Councillor K Corrigan (Chair) in the Chair

Councillors E Adam, J Allen, J Atkinson, P Atkinson, B Avery, A Bainbridge, B Bainbridge, A Batey, A Bell, D Bell, E Bell, J Bell, R Bell, J Blakey, L Boyd, D Boyes, J Brown, L Brown, J Chaplow, J Charlton, J Clare, J Clark, M Clarke, J Considine, B Coult, P Crathorne, R Crute, M Davinson, S Dunn, S Durham, D Freeman, O Gunn, D Hall, C Hampson, T Henderson, S Henig, D Hicks, J Higgins, A Hopgood, K Hopper, L Hovvels, P Howell, S Hugill, S Iveson, I Jewell, O Johnson (Vice-Chair), P Jopling, C Kay, B Kellett, L Kennedy, A Laing, J Lethbridge, K Liddell, H Liddle, L Maddison, J Maitland, J Makepeace, R Manchester, C Marshall, L Marshall, C Martin, E Mavin, L Mavin, S McDonnell, M McKeon, I McLean, O Milburn, A Napier, J Nicholson, P Oliver, R Ormerod, A Patterson, C Potts, L Pounder, S Quinn, A Reed, G Richardson, J Robinson, S Robinson, J Rowlandson, A Savory, E Scott, P Sexton, K Shaw, A Shield, J Shuttleworth, M Simmons, H Smith, T Smith, J Stephenson, B Stephens, D Stoker, A Surtees, O Temple, K Thompson, F Tinsley, T Tucker, J Turnbull, A Watson, M Wilkes, C Wilson, M Wilson, S Wilson, D Wood, R Yorke and S Zair

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors H Bennett, G Bleasdale, P Brookes, D Brown, J Carr, I Cochrane, S Morrison and A Simpson

1 Minutes

The minutes of the meeting held on 20 January 2021 were confirmed by the Council as a correct record and signed by the Chair.

Councillor Shuttleworth referred to the minute relating to the Members Parental Leave Policy and requested that his objection to the Policy be recorded.

2 Declarations of Interest

Councillor L Brown declared an interest in Agenda Item 7 as a Governor of Elemore Hall School.

Councillor B Coult declared an interest in an amendment to the Budget as a governor of two primary schools.

3 Chair's Announcements

The Chair informed Council that the main focus of the meeting was to set the budget and council tax and given the time it took to conduct remote meetings, sought agreement to waive standing orders to allow for the extension of the meeting should it go beyond 2 and a half hours. **Seconded** by Councillor O Johnson.

Resolved:

That standing orders be waived to allow for the extension of the meeting should it go beyond 2 and a half hours.

4 Leader's Report

The Council noted a report from the Leader of the Council as follows:

- Following the heavy snow and freezing temperatures experienced earlier in the month it was good to see the first signs of Spring appearing in County Durham. The green shoots of recovery could also be seen in the battle against Coronavirus with the County's infection rates continuing to fall and the Government's roadmap out of lockdown giving an indication of how restrictions could be eased in the weeks ahead. On behalf of the Council the Leader thanked communities for everything they were doing to help stop the spread of the virus. It was vital to keep up these efforts to help save lives, protect the NHS and allow us to return to a more normal way of life.
- One of the first changes announced by the Government was the return of all children to school. It was worth highlighting that County Durham schools had remained open during lockdown to educate the children of key workers and those with additional needs. School staff had also been working very hard to assist pupils and parents with home learning. The Leader thanked them all for their amazing efforts and reassured them that the Council would do everything it could to support them in the months ahead.
- News that more than 15 million of the UK's most vulnerable people had received their first dose of the Coronavirus vaccine was most welcome. In County Durham 95% of people aged over 70 had received their first dose along with 82% of clinically vulnerable residents. This week the north-east's third large vaccination centre opened at the Arnison Centre near Durham. This would allow NHS colleagues to vaccinate up to 1,000 people each day and complimented the work already underway at GP surgeries and smaller vaccination centres across the County. The vaccination programme

was a team effort with the NHS working alongside local authorities, the armed forces, emergency services and community volunteers. During the heavy snow the Council's Clean and Green Team assisted GP surgeries by helping to clear paths and car parks to allow appointments to continue.

- It had been a busy period for the highways team and gritting crews who had worked hard to keep the County's roads safe during the winter weather.
- As well as supporting residents and businesses through the immediate challenges of the pandemic, the only way to ensure the long-term resilience and recovery of communities was to forge ahead with the Council's ambitious regeneration plans. By investing in County Durham and attracting additional investment from partners the Council would help create and safeguard thousands of jobs.
- Cabinet had approved plans to invest a further £5m into the Towns and Villages Investment Plan. The Plan already committed £20m to the County's most disadvantaged communities and the additional £5m would be divided between the 14 Area Action Partnerships for projects identified by local residents following the successful consultation events which were held over the autumn. Towns and Villages were a key part of the Council's regeneration strategy and the Council aimed to ensure that the money spent delivered the best possible outcomes for communities, from improving the quality of housing to revitalising high streets. The long-awaited revamp of Festival Walk in Spennymoor was just one example of a project which had benefitted from Towns and Villages funding. The demolition of the derelict Kwik Save store on the site had commenced which would be replaced by a new town centre car park.
- Also part of the Towns and Villages programme was the Council's £70m five-year plan to build 500 new homes for rent in County Durham at a time when there was a real need for affordable housing. The first phase had been approved by Cabinet which set out plans for 155 new homes on Council owned land in seven locations across the County.
- Work had commenced on a much needed state of the art bus station in the heart of Durham City.
- There was also cause for optimism in Bishop Auckland. After the Council's successful bid to the Government's Future High Street Fund last year the Council had submitted a bid to the Stronger Towns Programme. Bishop Auckland was selected by the Government for this scheme and if the bid was successful funding would be allocated to regeneration projects in the town.
- The Council remained committed to tackling climate change and had strengthened this commitment with a statement of ambitions which outlined how the Council would continue to work towards positive environmental change. Last year the Council's Business Energy Efficiency Project was able to support nearly 100 businesses to make

changes in their operations to reduce carbon emissions. The Council had also planted thousands of new trees across green spaces in County Durham as part of the Forestry Commission's Urban Tree Challenge Fund.

- The Council had successfully hosted the County Durham Environment Awards online to celebrate environmental guardianship and community spirit during the pandemic. The Leader congratulated all of the winners and nominees for the fantastic work they were doing.
- Covid 19 would be with us for a long time to come but County Durham remained very well placed to recover quickly and sustainably. This would require the continued efforts of all communities and the Leader again thanked everyone for what they had done so far. The Leader asked residents to continue following the rules and maintain the hands, face, space guidance.

Councillor A Bell asked whether the Council could assist in fast-tracking the offer of vaccination to school staff. The Leader replied that he would raise this with the Council's Public Health Officers, however the groups for vaccination had been decided nationally.

5 Questions from the Public

There were no questions from the public.

6 Petitions

There were no petitions for consideration.

7 Report from the Cabinet

The Leader of the Council provided the Council with an update of business discussed by Cabinet on 13 January and 10 February 2021 (for copy see file of Minutes).

8 Budget 2021/22 - Report under Section 25 of the Local Government Act 2003 - Report of Interim Corporate Director of Resources

The Council considered a report of the Interim Corporate Director of Resources which provided information on the robustness of the estimates and the adequacy of reserves in the Council's Budget for 2021/22 (for copy see file of Minutes).

Resolved:

That the Council have regard to the statement when approving the budget and the level of Council Tax for 2021/22.

The Chair reminded Council that under Paragraph 14.6 of the Council Procedure Rules a recorded vote was required for each of the budget and council tax items, including the amendments. The voting record would be detailed in the Minutes.

Councillor J Robinson moved that Agenda Item Nos. 9 and 10 be considered together as they were inextricably linked. This was seconded by Councillor A Laing. The Head of Legal and Democratic Services advised Council that the Council Procedure Rules allowed for such a Motion and that it was appropriate to consider both items together. With two items being considered together, the allotted time for the proposer and seconder would double, with Group Leaders each being allotted 10 minutes, Movers 10 minutes, Seconders 6 minutes and other speakers 3 minutes.

Resolved:

That the motion be carried.

- 9 Medium Term Financial Plan 2021/22 to 2024/25 and Revenue and Capital Budget 2021/22**
- 10 Council Tax Setting in Order to Meet the County Council's Council Tax Requirement for 2021/22**

The Council considered reports from Cabinet which detailed budget recommendations for the 2021/22 balanced revenue budget, an outline Medium Term Financial Plan (MTFP(11)) 2021/21 to 2024/25 and a fully funded Capital Programme, and provided financial information and forecasts to enable the Council to calculate and set the Council Tax for 2021/22 (for copies see file of Minutes).

In **Moving** adoption of the Cabinet reports, Councillor Henig made a statement on the Budget and Precept for 2021/22, summarised as follows:

The budget had been prepared against a backdrop of significant uncertainty which existed beyond the next financial year as the publication of the government's Comprehensive Spending Review and the implementation of the Fair Funding Review was awaited. It was unknown whether there could be a return to austerity and further cuts, given the scale of public sector borrowing and the impact of the pandemic. There also remained the threat of a large potential cut to the Public Health budget from a new national formula which would hit County Durham harder than any other part of the country.

The report took into account the Local Government Finance Settlement for 2021/22. While the Council had received some additional funding, this was not enough to address needs or to rebalance the cumulative impact of a

decade of austerity. The report provided a comprehensive and detailed overview of the Local Government Finance Settlement impact on the Council, including an analysis of core spending power announcements where additional flexibility on Council Tax increases had been afforded to local government and where the government's much quoted increase in core spending power anticipated a Council Tax increase of just under 5%. A detailed assessment of these announcements was set out in sections 52 to 82 of the report. County Durham's core spending power per dwelling, on the government's own figures, was now below the national average for England as shown in Table 4 in section 73 of the report. Core spending power per dwelling in County Durham was as much as £300 higher in Surrey than in County Durham. Section 76 of the report demonstrated that if Durham was funded at the national average it would have £45m of additional resources next year. The report identified that there would be some one-off funding provided to local government next year, including an additional £15.6m to offset the continuing additional Covid 19 costs, and the sales, fees and charges income guarantee scheme had been extended for three months into 2021/22. The government had also honoured its commitment to increasing funding through the Dedicated Schools Grant for High Needs.

The report set out the financial pressures the Council continued to face which were set out in Table 5 within section 102 of the report and totalled nearly £27m. Key elements included inflation, adult demographic pressures and pressures within Children's Services which impacted on Council's across the north-east. Despite these pressures, and as a consequence of the strong management of Council finances over many years, there was significant investment in frontline services built in-to the budget for next year, and these were detailed from section 107 and in Table 6 of the report. They included the continuation of the £10m worth of investments which were built in-to the budget for 2020/21 including additional investment in highways, clean and safe neighbourhoods and support for work tackling climate change. There was also an additional £5m in the Towns and Villages Initiative and continued investment in providing vital support to low income households which built on the support provided through the Local Council Tax Reduction Scheme where the support available to working age claimants in County Durham was not capped.

The budget also included £88m of new additional Capital schemes, taking the Capital Program to almost £500m over the next four years. New schemes included leisure centre investments, a new school build for Spennymoor, and a rebuild of Belmont Community School and Belmont C of E Primary School. There was additional funding for highways maintenance and support for the Council's new council house building program. The Capital Program, including details of the new additions, were set out in sections 157 to 177 and Table 15 with the updated Capital Strategy and details of individual schemes set out at Appendices 7,8 and 9. When placed

together with the investment in key economic sites, designed to bring more than 30,000 new jobs to the County, this represented the most ambitious plan for County Durham seen in a generation. This was despite the fact that by 31 March 2021 savings totalling more than £240m would have been delivered since 2010.

There were new savings proposals totalling £2.2m next year, which when added to the previously agreed savings of £3.1m would mean that savings targets would total approximately £5.3m next year. There were a further £2.4m of saving plans in place for 2022/23 which were also included in the report. Details of the savings included in the budget next year were set out in sections 179 to 208 with details of individual proposals across the next two years included at Appendix 3. Workforce considerations were set out at sections 234 to 237 and showed that by the end of 2021/22 there will have been a reduction in the Council's establishment of 3,000 posts since 2010, 700 of which had been through the removal of vacant posts.

The updated MTFP model was set out at Appendix 6 and the underpinning assumptions were set out at sections 142 to 146 of the report. There was a balanced position for next year with the use of the Budget Support Reserve of £3.778m required to balance the budget, plus the use of £5m of earmarked reserves to fund the additional investment in towns and villages which had been built in to the budgets next year. Over the last 10 years the Council had utilised £100m of reserves.

The budget had been subject to consultation via AAP's and meetings arranged with trade unions and business rate payers. Corporate Overview and Scrutiny Management Board met on 11 February and their feedback on the budget proposals was set out at sections 88 to 89.

In **Seconding** the reports and recommendations, Councillor Napier, Deputy Leader and Cabinet Portfolio Holder for Finance commended officers for their sterling work in developing the budget proposals and for their professional endeavours in how they had strategically managed the finances of the Council since it became a unitary authority.

This was a comprehensive and thorough report which clearly set out the uncertainty that existed beyond the next financial year as a result of a further delay to the Comprehensive Spending Review and the Fair Funding Review. After a decade of austerity, which had placed immense pressure on local services, the Council had been placed in the situation of responding to the unprecedented challenges of supporting residents in communities and businesses through the pandemic. The Council had received one-off Coronavirus funding of £15.6m to cover the costs the Council would continue to incur in 2021/22 but Covid costs were difficult to accurately determine at this stage. The Council would face additional costs and loss of income from

the pressures on the sustainability support for good social care, waste disposal and refuse collection, lost income from leisure, car parking, theatres, planning fees and building control, all of which needed to be taken into consideration when setting the budget.

Decisions taken in previous years to protect frontline service delivery and the strong financial management of the Council over many years had enabled the Council to rise to these challenges despite the unfair and disproportionate cuts in funding faced over many years. By the end of this MTFP planning period the forecast cuts would be nearer to £290m and by the end of next year around 3,000 posts will have been lost from the Council based on current savings plans.

Durham was the 48th most deprived local authority area in the country out of 151 upper-tier authorities, yet affluent areas such as Surrey received more funding than Durham, which was neither right nor fair. Due to the deprivation challenges faced Durham should be funded above the national average. Against this backdrop the Council had nevertheless managed its finances prudently and effectively. This budget and the overall position in terms of the Council's finances was testament to all officers employed by the Council and also to the Members of the Council of all political persuasions, Cabinet and Scrutiny. It was a budget that included prudent Council Tax increases, resisting the Chancellors call to increase Council Tax by 5% next year.

The budget was predicated on a 2.99% Council Tax increase which was below the amount many authorities would need to increase their Council Tax by and below the level recommended by the Government. It included a prudent use of reserves to balance the budget and to fund the additional investment in towns and villages and built on the utilisation of around £100m of reserves which had been used over the last ten years to balance the budget and fund redundancies and early retirements.

The Deputy Leader commended the proposals set out in the report and in doing so, in light of the significant uncertainty that existed beyond the next financial year, noted that there were undoubtedly significant financial challenges to come.

Councillor R Crute, Chair of Corporate Overview and Scrutiny Management Board informed Council that there had been two scrutiny meetings to consider the budget. The ability to scrutinise the budget had again been hampered by the late publication of the Financial Settlement. The Corporate Overview and Scrutiny Management Board had reviewed the budget setting process, the Local Government Financial Settlement and its impact on the Council, the MTFP, savings and investment proposals.

Overall, the Management Board was very concerned about the high degree of uncertainty that existed beyond the next year in the context of the large national deficit and the potential for further austerity for local government as a result. There remained ongoing concern that the Council may lose significant Public Health funding as a consequence of the Fair Funding Review and the potential impact this could have on the ability to fund services. Members supported the approach taken by Cabinet in terms of the Medium Term Financial Planning assumptions. The Management Board highlighted the need for a fairer and longer-term funding settlement from Government received in good time and also the need to lobby Government further on the Council's funding position. The Board also highlighted the importance of maintaining a healthy financial position through strong budget management and maintaining prudent levels of reserves.

Referring to specific savings and investment proposals Members made a range of specific comments which were set out at paragraphs 88 to 89 of the budget report. These included concerns about base budget pressures affecting Adults and Children's Social Care and that the funding from Government covered these areas adequately. The proposed investment plans were welcomed, including those in relation to libraries, welfare assistance and the Towns and Villages Investment Plan. The Management Board thanked Cabinet, all Members and officers for their work in producing the report.

An amendment was **Moved** by Councillor Shuttleworth, **Seconded** by Councillor Shield as follows:

The Council, in respect of the Cabinet's 2021/22 Budget and MTFP(11) to consider the following amendment to the 2021/22 budget and MTFP plans:

(a) Durham County News – Cease Publication

Cease entirely the publication of Durham County News from April 2021. This produces an annual saving of £196,000.

(b) Communication and Marketing Teams – Staffing Reductions

Reduce the staffing in the Communications and Marketing team to one press officer and two Assistants from 1 October 2021, allowing sufficient time for the appropriate restructuring to take place. This would produce a saving of £818,000 in 2021/22 and an additional saving of £818,000 in 2022/23.

TOTAL REVENUE SAVING – 2021/22 - £1,014,000 with an additional £818,000 saving in 2022/23

The revenue savings identified above to be invested as follows:

(a) Members Neighbourhood Budget

Increase the Members Neighbourhood Budget revenue element by £4,600 per member to £10,000 – an additional cost of £579,600 in 2021/22.

(b) Highways Capital Programme

Utilise the remaining 2021/22 revenue saving of £434,600 to finance prudential borrowing of £8.7 million to augment the Highways capital programme to address the condition backlog

The 2022/23 revenue saving of £818,000 to be utilised to reduce the savings shortfall in that year and protect front line services.

For the Amendment

Councillors Avery, A Bainbridge, B Bainbridge, A Bell, R Bell, Freeman, Henderson, Hicks, Hugill, Jopling, Liddell, Maddison, Makepeace, Martin, McDonnell, Oliver, Ormerod, Reed, S Robinson, Richardson, Rowlandson, Savory, Sexton, Shield, Shuttleworth, Thompson, Watson and Zair.

Against the Amendment

Councillors Adam, Allen, J Atkinson, P Atkinson, Batey, D Bell, E Bell, J Bell, Boyd, Boyes, J Brown, Chaplow, Clare, Clark, Clarke, Considine, Corrigan, Crathorne, Crute, Davinson, Dunn, Gunn, Hall, Hampson, Henig, Higgins, Hopper, Hovvels, Iveson, Jewell, Johnson, Kay, Kellett, Kennedy, Lethbridge, Laing, Liddle, Maitland, Manchester, C Marshall, L Marshall, Milburn, McKeon, McLean, Napier, Patterson, Potts, Pounder, Quinn, J Robinson, Shaw, H Smith, T Smith, Stephens, Stephenson, Surtees, Tinsley, Tucker, Turnbull, C Wilson, M Wilson, S Wilson, Wood and Yorke.

Abstentions

Councillors Blakey, L Brown, Charlton, Coult, Hopgood, E Mavin, L Mavin, Nicholson, Scott, Simmons, Temple and Wilkes.

The amendment was **Lost**.

An amendment was **Moved** by Councillor R Bell, **Seconded** by Councillor Rowlandson as follows:

The Council, in respect of the Cabinet's 2021/22 budget and MTFP 11 to consider:

**Investment
Regeneration (Car Parks)**

Introduce free parking in all council car parks for one year from 1st April 2021, at an estimated cost of £700,000 funded by a one-off contribution from the £15.6 million Covid Support Grant provided from Central Government.

For the Amendment

Councillors Avery, A Bainbridge, B Bainbridge, R Bell, L Brown, Charlton, Coult, Durham, Freeman, Henderson, Hicks, Hopgood, Hugill, Jopling, Liddell, Maddison, Makepeace, Martin, E Mavin, L Mavin, McDonnell, Nicholson, Oliver, Ormerod, Reed, Richardson, S Robinson, Rowlandson, Savory, Scott, Sexton, Shield, Shuttleworth, Simmons, Stoker, Temple, Thompson, Watson, Wilkes and Zair.

Against the Amendment

Councillors Adam, Allen, J Atkinson, P Atkinson, Batey, D Bell, E Bell, J Bell, Boyd, Boyes, J Brown, Chaplow, Clare, Clark, Clarke, Considine, Corrigan, Crathorne, Crute, Davinson, Dunn, Gunn, Hall, Hampson, Henig, Higgins, Hopper, Hovvels, Iveson, Jewell, Johnson, Kay, Kellett, Kennedy, Lethbridge, Laing, Liddle, Maitland, Manchester, C Marshall, L Marshall, Milburn, McKeon, McLean, Napier, Patterson, Potts, Pounder, Quinn, J Robinson, Shaw, H Smith, T Smith, Stephens, Stephenson, Surtees, Tinsley, Tucker, Turnbull, C Wilson, M Wilson, S Wilson, Wood and Yorke.

Abstentions

None

The amendment was **Lost**.

An amendment was **Moved** by Councillor Hopgood, **Seconded** by Councillor Martin as follows:

The Council, in respect of the Cabinet's 2021/22 Budget and MTFP(11) to consider the following motion to amend to the 2021/22 budget and MTFP plans:

Towns and Villages Member and AAP Allocations

Top slice £1.26 million from the £4.2 million allocation to AAP's from the Towns and Villages Reserve and provide a £10,000 allocation to each County Councillor to invest in line with the same criteria set out for AAP spending in support of the Towns and Villages initiative. This would reduce the amount available to AAP's but would still result in an allocation of £0.210 million to each AAP instead of £0.300 million.

For the Amendment

Councillors Avery, A Bainbridge, B Bainbridge, R Bell, L Brown, Charlton, Coult, Freeman, Henderson, Hopgood, Hugill, Jopling, Liddell, Maddison, Makepeace, Martin, E Mavin, L Mavin, McDonnell, Nicholson, Ormerod,

Reed, Richardson, S Robinson, Rowlandson, Savory, Scott, Sexton, Shield, Shuttleworth, Simmons, Stoker, Temple, Tucker, Thompson, Watson, Wilkes and Zair.

Against the Amendment

Councillors Adam, Allen, J Atkinson, P Atkinson, Batey, D Bell, E Bell, J Bell, Boyd, Boyes, J Brown, Chaplow, Clare, Clark, Clarke, Considine, Corrigan, Crathorne, Crute, Davinson, Dunn, Gunn, Hall, Hampson, Henig, Higgins, Hopper, Hovvels, Iveson, Jewell, Johnson, Kay, Kellett, Kennedy, Lethbridge, Laing, Liddle, Maitland, Manchester, C Marshall, L Marshall, Milburn, McKeon, McLean, Napier, Patterson, Potts, Pounder, Quinn, J Robinson, Shaw, H Smith, T Smith, Stephens, Stephenson, Surtees, Tinsley, Turnbull, C Wilson, M Wilson, S Wilson, Wood and Yorke.

Abstentions

None

The amendment was **Lost**.

An amendment was **Moved** by Councillor Coult, **Seconded** by Councillor E Scott as follows:

The Council, in respect of the Cabinet's 2021/22 Budget and MTFP(11) to consider the following motion to amend to the 2021/22 budget and MTFP plans:

School Repairs – Invest an additional £10 million to reduce the repairs backlog in Schools

To augment the capital programme for school capitalised maintenance repairs by £10 million in 2021/22. This investment would require a £0.5 million increase in the prudential borrowing budget for 2022/23. This will increase the savings shortfall in 2022/23 from £6.3 million to £6.8 million which will be addressed as part of the development of MTFP(12) and the 2022/23 budget.

For the Amendment

Councillors Avery, A Bainbridge, B Bainbridge, R Bell, L Brown, Charlton, Coult, Freeman, Henderson, Hopgood, Hugill, Jopling, Liddell, Maddison, Makepeace, Martin, E Mavin, L Mavin, McDonnell, Nicholson, Oliver, Ormerod, Reed, Richardson, S Robinson, Rowlandson, Savory, Scott, Shield, Shuttleworth, Simmons, Stoker, Temple, Tucker, Thompson, Watson, Wilkes and Zair.

Against the Amendment

Councillors Adam, Allen, J Atkinson, P Atkinson, Batey, D Bell, E Bell, J Bell, Boyd, Boyes, J Brown, Chaplow, Clare, Clark, Clarke, Considine, Corrigan, Crathorne, Crute, Davinson, Dunn, Gunn, Hall, Hampson, Henig, Higgins, Hopper, Hovvels, Iveson, Jewell, Johnson, Kay, Kellett, Kennedy, Lethbridge, Laing, Liddle, Maitland, Manchester, C Marshall, L Marshall, Milburn, McKeon, McLean, Napier, Patterson, Potts, Pounder, Quinn, J Robinson, Shaw, H Smith, T Smith, Stephens, Stephenson, Surtees, Tinsley, Turnbull, C Wilson, M Wilson, S Wilson, Wood and Yorke.

Abstentions

Paul Sexton

The amendment was **Lost**.

An amendment was **Moved** by Councillor Wilkes, **Seconded** by Councillor L Brown as follows:

The Council, in respect of the Cabinet's 2021/22 Budget and MTFP(11) to consider the following motion to amend to the 2021/22 budget and MTFP plans:

Rights of Way and Nature Reserves - additional three year investment

To invest £0.250 million in each of 2021/22, 2022/23 and 2023/24 to provide an additional staffing resource (x2 officers - £60,000) and repairs budgets (£190,000) for the Rights of Way team each year.

In addition, to set aside a one off £0.250 million budget to be invested in Nature Reserves.

The total £1 million invested over the three year period to be financed in 2021/22 from general contingencies – a forecast sum of circa £0.350 million – with the 2022/23 and 2023/24 costs be met from an Earmarked Reserve that will be created at the end of 2021/22 either from in year underspends or from a top slice of General Reserve.

For the Amendment

Councillors Avery, L Brown, Charlton, Coult, Freeman, Henderson, Hopgood, Hugill, Jopling, Liddell, Maddison, Makepeace, Martin, E Mavin, L Mavin, McDonnell, Nicholson, Oliver, Ormerod, Reed, S Robinson, Rowlandson, Savory, Scott, Shield, Shuttleworth, Simmons, Stoker, Temple, Thompson, Watson, Wilkes and Zair.

Against the Amendment

Councillors Adam, Allen, J Atkinson, P Atkinson, Batey, D Bell, E Bell, J Bell, Boyd, Boyes, J Brown, Chaplow, Clare, Clark, Clarke, Considine, Corrigan, Crathorne, Crute, Davinson, Dunn, Gunn, Hall, Hampson, Henig, Higgins, Hopper, Hovvels, Iveson, Jewell, Johnson, Kay, Kellett, Kennedy, Lethbridge, Laing, Liddle, Maitland, Manchester, C Marshall, L Marshall, Milburn, McKeon, McLean, Napier, Patterson, Potts, Pounder, Quinn, Richardson, J Robinson, Shaw, H Smith, T Smith, Stephens, Stephenson, Surtees, Tinsley, Turnbull, C Wilson, M Wilson, S Wilson, Wood and Yorke.

Abstentions

Councillors A Bainbridge, B Bainbridge, R Bell and Tucker.

The amendment was **Lost**.

Votes were then taken on the main Motions which were the recommendations contained within the reports.

Medium Term Financial Plan 2021/22 to 2024/25 and Revenue and Capital Budget 2021/22.

For the Motion

Councillors Adam, Allen, J Atkinson, P Atkinson, Batey, D Bell, E Bell, J Bell, Boyd, Boyes, J Brown, Chaplow, Clare, Clark, Clarke, Considine, Corrigan, Crathorne, Crute, Davinson, Dunn, Gunn, Hall, Hampson, Henig, Higgins, Hopper, Hovvels, Iveson, Jewell, Johnson, Kellett, Kennedy, Lethbridge, Laing, Liddle, Maitland, Manchester, C Marshall, L Marshall, Milburn, McKeon, McLean, Napier, Patterson, Potts, Pounder, Quinn, J Robinson, Savory, Shaw, H Smith, T Smith, Stephens, Stephenson, Surtees, Tinsley, Turnbull, Watson, C Wilson, M Wilson, S Wilson, Wood and Yorke.

Against the Motion

Councillors Avery, A Bainbridge, B Bainbridge, R Bell, L Brown, Charlton, Coult, Freeman, Henderson, Hoggood, Liddell, Maddison, Makepeace, Martin, E Mavin, L Mavin, McDonnell, Nicholson, Oliver, Ormerod, Reed, Richardson, S Robinson, Rowlandson, Scott, Sexton, Shield, Shuttleworth, Simmons, Temple, Thompson and Wilkes.

Abstain

Councillors Jopling and Tucker

Resolved:

That the report and its recommendations be adopted in full.

Council Tax Setting in Order to Meet the County Council's Council Tax Requirement for 2020/21

For the Motion

Councillors Adam, Allen, J Atkinson, Batey, D Bell, E Bell, J Bell, Boyd, Boyes, J Brown, Chaplow, Clare, Clark, Clarke, Considine, Corrigan, Crathorne, Crute, Davinson, Dunn, Gunn, Hall, Hampson, Henig, Higgins, Hopper, Hovvels, Iveson, Jewell, Johnson, Kellett, Kennedy, Lethbridge, Laing, Liddle, Maitland, Manchester, C Marshall, L Marshall, Milburn, McKeon, McLean, Napier, Patterson, Potts, Pounder, Quinn, J Robinson, Shaw, H Smith, T Smith, Stephens, Stephenson, Surtees, Tinsley, Turnbull, Watson, C Wilson, M Wilson, S Wilson, Wood and Yorke.

Against the Motion

Councillors Avery, A Bainbridge, B Bainbridge, R Bell, L Brown, Charlton, Coult, Freeman, Henderson, Hopgood, Jopling, Liddell, Maddison, Makepeace, Martin, E Mavin, L Mavin, McDonnell, Nicholson, Oliver, Ormerod, Reed, Richardson, S Robinson, Rowlandson, Savory, Scott, Sexton, Shield, Shuttleworth, Simmons, Temple, Thompson, Tucker and Wilkes.

Abstentions

None

Resolved:

That the following be adopted:

- (a) It be noted that the council tax base 2021/22 for:
 - (i) the whole council area is 141,623.2 Band D equivalent properties [Item T in the formula in Section 31B of the Local Government Finance Act 1992 (as amended)] and
 - (ii) dwellings in those parts of its area to which a parish precept relates is set out in the attached Appendix 3.
- (b) The Council Tax Requirement for the Council's own purposes for 2021/22 (excluding Parish precepts and the Charter Trustees for the City of Durham) is £241,266,451.
- (c) Agree the following amounts in accordance with Sections 30 to 36 of the Act being the:

- (i) aggregate of the gross expenditure 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 is £1,227,548,929;
 - (ii) aggregate of the gross income which the council estimates for the items set out in Section 31A(3) of the Act is £972,548,478;
 - (iii) amount by which the aggregate at (c) i) above exceeds the aggregate at (c) ii) above 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] is £255,000,451;
 - (iv) amount at (c) iii) above (Item R), all divided by Item T ((a) i) above), in accordance with Section 31B of the Act as the basic amount of its council tax at Band D for the year (including parish precepts) is £1,800.56;
 - (v) aggregate amount of all special items referred to in Section 34 (1) of the Act: (total of all parish precepts including Charter Trustees) is £13,734,000;
 - (vi) amount at (c) iv) above less the result given by dividing the amount at (c) v) above by Item T ((a) i) above), in accordance with Section 34(2) of the Act, as the basic amount of its Council Tax at Band D for the year for dwellings in those parts of its area to which no Parish precept relates is £1,703.58;
- (d) It be noted that for 2021/22, the County Durham and Darlington Fire and Rescue Authority has recommended the following amounts be in the precept issued to the County Council, in accordance with Section 40 of the Act, as shown in the table below:

COUNTY DURHAM AND DARLINGTON FIRE AND RESCUE AUTHORITY

A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H
£	£	£	£	£	£	£	£
71.70	83.65	95.60	107.55	131.45	155.35	179.25	215.10

- (e) It be noted that for 2021/22, the Durham Police, Crime and Victims' Commissioner has recommended that the following

amounts be in the precept issued to the County Council, in accordance with Section 40 of the Act, as shown in the following table:

DURHAM POLICE, CRIME AND VICTIMS' COMMISSIONER

A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H
£	£	£	£	£	£	£	£
153.49	179.08	204.66	230.24	281.40	332.57	383.73	460.48

- (f) That the Council, in accordance with Sections 30 and 36 of the Local Government Finance Act 1992 (as amended) hereby sets the aggregate amounts shown in the tables below as the amounts of council tax for 2021/22 for each part of its area and for each of the categories of dwellings.

DURHAM COUNTY COUNCIL

A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H
£	£	£	£	£	£	£	£
1,027.75	1,199.05	1,370.34	1,541.63	1,884.21	2,226.80	2,569.38	3,083.26

DURHAM COUNTY COUNCIL – ADULT SOCIAL CARE

A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H
£	£	£	£	£	£	£	£
107.97	125.96	143.96	161.95	197.94	233.93	269.92	323.90

AGGREGATE OF COUNCIL TAX REQUIREMENTS (excluding Parish, Town Council and Charter Trustees)

A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H
£	£	£	£	£	£	£	£
1,360.91	1,587.74	1,814.56	2,041.37	2,495.00	2,948.65	3,402.28	4,082.74

- (g) The Council has determined that its relevant basic amount of council tax for 2021/22 is not excessive in accordance with principles approved under Section 52ZB Local Government Finance Act 1992 (as amended) and that the increase in council tax is not excessive in accordance with the principles approved

under Section 52ZC Local Government Finance Act 1992 (as amended).

- (h) As a billing authority, the council has not been notified by County Durham and Darlington Fire and Rescue Authority and Durham Police, Crime and Victims' Commissioner, as major precepting authorities, that their relevant basic amount of council tax for 2021/22 is excessive and that the billing authority is not required to hold a referendum in accordance with Section 52ZK Local Government Finance Act 1992 (as amended).
- (i) The Council set a 0% discount for Second and Empty Furnished Homes, in accordance with Section 11A (3) of the Act.
- (j) The Council set a 0% discount for dwellings defined in classes C or D, in accordance with Section 11A (4A) of the Act.
- (k) The Council set premium charges for long term empty homes, in accordance with Section 11B (1b) of the Act: 100% premium for properties which have been empty between two and five years and 200% premium for properties empty for longer than five years.
- (l) The Chief Executive be instructed to publish a notice in accordance with Section 38 (2) of the Act, relating to the amounts of council tax set.
- (m) The Chief Executive be instructed to publish a notice in accordance with Section 11A (6) and 11B (6) of the Act, relating to the discount set.

11 Questions from Members

There were no questions from Members.