

# TEWKESBURY BOROUGH COUNCIL

**Minutes of a Meeting of the Executive Committee held remotely on  
Wednesday, 18 November 2020 commencing at 4:00 pm**

**Present:**

Chair  
Vice Chair

Councillor R A Bird  
Councillor J R Mason

**and Councillors:**

G F Blackwell, M Dean, M A Gore, D J Harwood, E J MacTiernan, C Softley, R J Stanley,  
M G Sztymiak and R J E Vines

**also present:**

Councillor K J Cromwell

**EX.45 ANNOUNCEMENTS**

- 45.1 The Chair advised that the meeting was being held under the emergency provisions of the Coronavirus Act 2020 and, specifically, The Local Authorities and Police and Crime Panels (Coronavirus) (Flexibility of Local Authority and Police and Crime Panel Meetings) (England and Wales) Regulations 2020. The meeting was being broadcast live via the internet, it was not being recorded by the Council but, under the usual transparency rules, it may be being recorded by others.
- 45.2 The Chair welcomed the Manager of the Counter Fraud Unit, who was in attendance for Agenda Items 7 – Corporate Enforcement Policy – and 8 – Regulation of Investigatory Powers (RIPA) / Investigatory Powers Act Policies and Councillor Cromwell who, as Chair of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee, was in attendance for Agenda Item 9 – Council Plan Performance Tracker and COVID-19 Recovery Tracker – Quarter One 2020/21.

**EX.46 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

- 46.1 The Committee's attention was drawn to the Tewkesbury Borough Council Code of Conduct which was adopted by the Council on 26 June 2012 and took effect from 1 July 2012.

46.2 The following declarations were made:

<b>Councillor</b>	<b>Application No./Item</b>	<b>Nature of Interest (where disclosed)</b>	<b>Declared Action in respect of Disclosure</b>
M Dean	Item 12 – Wormington Village Hall Grant Update.	Had been involved in discussions about the grant but the area was not in his Ward.	Would not speak or vote and would leave the meeting for the consideration of this item.
M G Sztymiak	Item 13 – Tewkesbury Together 2021.	Was a Member of Tewkesbury Town Council, which was part of Tewkesbury Together, but he was not on the Steering Group or involved with the organisation.	Would speak and vote.

46.3 There were no further declarations made on this occasion.

#### **EX.47 MINUTES**

47.1 The Minutes of the meeting held on 21 October 2020, copies of which had been circulated, were approved as a correct record.

#### **EX.48 ITEMS FROM MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC**

48.1 There were no items from members of the public.

#### **EX.49 EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE FORWARD PLAN**

49.1 Attention was drawn to the Committee's Forward Plan, circulated at Pages No. 6-12. Members were asked to consider the Plan.

49.2 The Head of Corporate Services advised of two amendments which had been made since the publication of the Agenda: the Quarter Two Council Plan performance tracker and COVID-19 recovery tracker would not be considered by the Overview and Scrutiny Committee until its meeting on 12 January so this would go to the February meeting of the Executive Committee and the Money Laundering Policy would not be considered by the Audit and Governance Committee until 24 March so would be considered at the Executive Committee meeting on 31 March 2021.

49.3 Accordingly, it was

**RESOLVED:** That the Committee's Forward Plan be **NOTED**, subject to the following amendments:

- Council Plan Performance Tracker and COVID-19 Recovery Tracker – Quarter Two 2020/21 – to be moved from 6 January 2021 to 3 February 2021 to align with consideration by the Overview and Scrutiny Committee.
- Money Laundering Policy – to be moved from 6 January 2021 to 31 March 2020 to align with consideration by the Audit and Governance Committee which would not make its recommendation until March.

## **EX.50 CORPORATE ENFORCEMENT POLICY**

50.1 The Chair welcomed the Manager of the Counter Fraud Unit to the meeting and in presenting the report, circulated at Pages No. 13-20 which detailed the policy, she explained that it was relatively legislative but was an overarching policy that had been prepared in partnership with One Legal to deliver a prosecution policy. The policy did not go into great detail with regard to each service area as they would all retain their own specific enforcement policies, however, if a member of the public was looking at what the Council could enforce, this explanatory document would cover this and outline the areas where the Council could undertake enforcement action, how it did that and what tests it applied when taking such action.

50.2 Upon being put to the vote, it was

- RESOLVED:**
1. That the Corporate Enforcement Policy be **APPROVED**.
  2. That the Head of Corporate Services, in consultation with the Counter Fraud Unit Manager, the Borough Solicitor and the Lead Member for Corporate Governance, be authorised to approve future minor amendments.

## **EX.51 REGULATION OF INVESTIGATORY POWERS (RIPA) / INVESTIGATORY POWERS ACT POLICIES**

51.1 The report of the Borough Solicitor, circulated at Pages No. 31-81, provided the Committee with a revised Regulation of Investigatory Powers Act 2000 Surveillance and Covert Human Intelligence Source Policy; and a new Investigatory Powers Act 2016 Acquisition of Communications Data Policy. Members were asked to approve the policies and to authorise the Borough Solicitor to approve future minor amendments in consultation with the Counter Fraud Unit Manager and the Lead Member for Corporate Governance.

51.2 The Counter Fraud Unit Manager advised that the local authority was required to have effective policies to enable Officers to gather intelligence and conduct surveillance in line with the law and the policies appended to the report refreshed

the Council's existing policies. The polices demonstrated the authority's consideration of necessity, proportionality and public interest when deciding on surveillance activity and requests for communication data, as well as demonstrating openness and transparency for its customers. The report also provided an update in relation to the authority's existing authorisation arrangements and the outcome of the recent inspection by the Investigatory Powers Commissioner's Office. In future, the Counter Fraud Unit would be responsible for the annual update, any policy refresh, and inspections.

51.3 Accordingly, it was

**RESOLVED:**

1. That the Regulation of Investigatory Powers Act 2000 Surveillance and Covert Human Intelligence Source Policy be **APPROVED**.
2. That the Investigatory Powers Act 2016 Acquisition of Communications Data Policy be **APPROVED**.
3. That approval of future minor amendments be delegated to the Borough Solicitor, in consultation with the Counter Fraud Unit Manager and the Lead Member for Corporate Governance.

**EX.52 COUNCIL PLAN PERFORMANCE TRACKER AND COVID-19 RECOVERY TRACKER - QUARTER ONE 2020/21**

52.1 The report of the Chair of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee, circulated at Pages No. 82-168, asked Members to review and, if appropriate, take action on the observations of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee following its review of the Quarter One 2020/21 Council Plan performance tracker and COVID-19 recovery tracker information.

52.2 Attention was drawn to the observations made by the Overview and Scrutiny Committee, attached at Appendix 1 to the report, and the Council Plan Performance Tracker, attached to the report at Appendix 2. The Overview and Scrutiny Committee Chair reminded the Executive Committee that the figures were for the first quarter of 2020/21 and, as such, had been wholly affected by the COVID-19 pandemic. This was also the first time the COVID-19 corporate recovery plan performance tracker had been considered by Members and that was attached to the report at Appendix 3. The financial information for the quarter was attached at Appendices 4-7.

52.3 Members had been provided with a summary of the key areas discussed by the Overview and Scrutiny Committee and the Chair of that Committee indicated that it had been the consensus of Members that it was difficult to scrutinise and hold to account actions that had not been progressed given the significant challenges of the COVID-19 pandemic. It had been suggested that there may be a clearer picture at quarter two, however, operationally the Council was now into quarter three and, as a result of the second national lockdown, some areas of the Council were back into response mode. The Head of Corporate Services, when presenting the report, had caveated that both the performance and recovery tracker actions could be impacted by further response work. Some key areas of discussion had included the commercial property investment portfolio in respect of which the Head of Finance and Asset Management had confirmed that, so far, the portfolio was holding up well and none of the tenants had reported any problems which was pleasing to hear; the rural housing needs assessment, during which it had been noted that the Gloucestershire Rural Partnership was being used to assist with the work and clarification would be sought to explain and justify the move in timescales from March 2020 to March 2023; the Joint Core Strategy and questions had been

asked about the implications of the government's White Paper on housing allocations and the duty to co-operate whereby the Head of Development Services had confirmed that work on the Joint Core Strategy would not be stopped because of the White Paper as the evidence work still needed to be undertaken and, whatever the eventual outcome on the reforms, this work was still necessary to inform the Council going forward. She had also stressed that, even if the duty to co-operate was abolished as proposed by the government, it did not mean the Council could stop working with its neighbours as this was actively encouraged to assess the spatial distribution of housing and employment - the message was still very much that Councils must work together and look at wider geographical areas and cross-boundary issues. Finally, in terms of sickness absence, a reduction in the number of days had been noted and it was felt could be partly due to more Officers working from home and feeling that they could continue to work in that way when, ordinarily, they would not have felt able to go into the Office – this needed to be monitored to understand if this was the case and to ensure Officers were supported and felt able to take time off to get better if it was necessary.

52.4 During the brief discussion which ensued, a Member thanked the Overview and Scrutiny Committee for its thorough questioning of the performance information and particularly for its queries regarding the Planning White Paper – she felt it was helpful to note that the Council would still need to work across boundaries to resolve issues so the duty to co-operate would never be completely abolished.

52.5 Accordingly, it was

**RESOLVED:** That the Overview and Scrutiny Committee's comments on the Council Plan Performance Tracker and COVID-19 Recovery Tracker for Quarter One of 2020/21 be **NOTED**.

### **EX.53 FINANCIAL UPDATE - QUARTER TWO 2020/21**

53.1 The report of the Head of Finance and Asset Management, circulated at Pages No. 169-194, highlighted a projected year-end deficit on the revenue budget and detailed the expenditure to date against both the capital programme and the approved reserves. Members were asked to consider the financial performance information for the second quarter of 2020/21.

53.2 Members were advised that this was the first report in the new format which forecasted to the year-end and it was hoped it would provide a more meaningful quarter end report. In addition, the Committee was advised that the report before it had been prepared prior to the latest lockdown so the information contained therein was likely to change as costs rose and income fell. The current year-end deficit was £329,000 which combined the impacts of COVID-19 with normal activities and additional grant funding from the government.

53.3 The Head of Finance and Asset Management drew particular attention to the surplus on employee costs of £642,401 which had been generated through staff vacancies across all services. COVID-19 meant there had been a delay to recruitment from the end of March, which may have left a greater number of posts open than normal, however recruitment processes were operating again with all remaining vacant posts in Development and Corporate out for recruitment. The Council had separately identified where costs had been incurred as a direct response to the COVID-19 pandemic with the aim being to demonstrate to central government the impact on the Council's revenue position and that, without additional financial support, those costs would have a significant impact on the reserves held by the Council. Those areas that had been identified included the Council's contractual requirement with Places Leisure, the purchase of 115 laptops to ensure staff could work from home effectively, the additional costs incurred by

Ubico as it responded to the COVID-19 pandemic and a significant increase in demand on services particularly supporting vulnerable people in the Borough whether that was residents who were shielding, those finding themselves homeless or those who were facing unemployment and required financial support. The deficit on income had been attributed to the COVID-19 pandemic and had resulted in planning income expected to be under budget by £276,000 including planning fees, land charges and street naming and numbering; £248,000 of lost income from car parks as all charges were suspended during the lockdown period; £69,000 of lost income from rental income since some businesses were closed during the lockdown period; £42,000 lost income on trade waste during the first half of the year as a significant number of customers businesses were closed and their accounts were suspended during the lockdown period; £33,000 budget deficit on licensing, particularly around lost renewals on vehicle and taxi licences as well as premises licences; £47,000 budget deficit on the recovery of housing benefit overpayments and, as the Courts had been closed, there had been no revenue from Council Tax summons which amounted to a £100,000 loss; and a potential £214,000 budget deficit on One Legal fees as third party clients had been focussed on response to the pandemic rather than day to day business requiring legal support – One Legal had originally anticipated significant growth during the financial year but the pandemic had not made that possible. Appendix A to the report attached a summary position for each Head of Service which showed the current variance against their budget. The government had allocated £1,247,602 of un-ringfenced additional funding in 2020/21 to support the Council's spending pressures and this had not been directly allocated to individual service areas but would be kept as additional general funding to support the Council's overall budget. The government was also providing revenue contributions to cover lost income which would help improve the revenue position. In terms of COVID-19 business grants, the local authority had been asked to administer the distribution of those grants the details of which were set out at Paragraph 2.5 of the report. Further schemes were likely to be announced if Tewkesbury Borough was moved into a higher COVID tier level so the Council would continue to inform and update Members on the COVID response, including the financial implications, on a quarterly basis. Based on the quarter two forecast, the Council was in a good position with only a relatively modest deficit forecast and it would benefit from a significant business rates collection fund surplus in the current year which could be used to meet that deficit. The balances remaining from the collection fund surplus would be allocated to reserves to meet the significant financial costs of balancing future year budgets. The capital budget position was shown at Appendix B and this currently set out an underspend against the profiled budget of £69,094. The reserves position was provided at Appendix C and showed a summary of the current usage of available reserves, and Appendix D attached the mid-year treasury management report.

53.4 Accordingly, it was

**RESOLVED:** That the financial performance information for the second quarter of 2020/21 be **NOTED**.

#### **EX.54 CORPORATE PEER CHALLENGE - FINAL REPORT AND ACTION PLAN**

54.1 The report of the Chief Executive, circulated at Pages No. 195-218, attached the final report and action plan following the Council's corporate peer challenge. The Committee was asked to recommend to Council that the peer review action plan be approved and that the monitoring of the action plan be undertaken by the Overview and Scrutiny Committee on a six-monthly basis.

54.2 The Head of Corporate Services explained that the results of the corporate peer challenge had been somewhat overshadowed by the COVID-19 pandemic. However, it was a significant piece of work for the Council so needed to be considered by Members. The report from the review team had been very positive about the Council and gave much for it to be proud of. A summary of the feedback could be found in the executive summary of the report and, as would be expected, there were some areas identified for improvement with five key recommendations that were summarised within Page No. 2 of the final report. The internal action plan comprised those recommendations and associated action points, as well as other less implicit recommendations, and that could be found at Appendix 2 to the report. The final report would be published on the Council's website and promoted by the Communications Team via a press release and social media messages and, in addition, all stakeholders who had participated during the challenge would receive a link to the report.

54.3 A Member indicated that some of the recommendations referred to the Garden Town and she felt it was helpful to note that this was a transforming programme which had moved on significantly since the corporate review. The Chair agreed and advised that the recommendations which had been made had largely not been a surprise but the small number of them had been great news following such an extensive and intensive exercise. He offered thanks on behalf of all Members to everyone who had been involved in the review process the outcome of which he thought was well deserved and a great reflection on the way Tewkesbury Borough Council worked as an authority, as well as its effort and professionalism. A Member questioned how much work the action plan would create for Officers at a time when they were already stretched with the response to the COVID-19 pandemic. In response, the Head of Corporate Services advised that no Officers had indicated they would not be able to address the actions, many of which were already being worked on. In addition, a Member noted that one of the things mentioned was the need for a succession plan for the Chief Executive and she queried whether this was being addressed; particularly as the current Deputy Chief Executive was about to leave the authority. The Chief Executive confirmed that, when the time came, he was sure the Council would be able to find a fantastic replacement, but he undertook to begin informal discussions with Members about this issue.

54.4 Accordingly, it was

**RESOLVED:**

That it be **RECOMMENDED TO COUNCIL:**

1. That the peer review action plan be **APPROVED**.
2. That monitoring of the action plan be undertaken by the Overview and Scrutiny Committee on a six-monthly basis.

**EX.55 WORMINGTON VILLAGE HALL GRANT UPDATE**

55.1 The report of the Head of Finance and Asset Management, circulated separately at Pages No. 1-4, set out discussions with both Wormington Village Society and the Chair of Dumbleton Parish Council and recommended the withdrawal of the offer of a community grant to Wormington Village Society. The Executive Committee was asked to approve the withdrawal of the £57,700 offer to the Society.

- 55.2 The Head of Finance and Asset Management explained that in January 2020, Members had received an annual update on capital grant schemes which remained outstanding and one of the updates presented was a grant offer to Wormington Village Society to support the development of a village hall in Wormington. The grant had been awarded in March 2013 and, since the offer had been made, the Wormington Village Society had been in discussion with Dumbleton Parish Council regarding the use of land where it was intended to build the new village hall. The land identified was in the ownership of Dumbleton Parish Council and, following the receipt of independent legal advice, a number of constraints had been identified by the Parish Council in relation to the use of the land for the proposed village hall which meant the scheme had been unable to proceed. Several meetings and exchanges of correspondence had taken place between the two parties, but no agreement had been reached. At the meeting in January, Members had agreed to a six-month extension to the grant to allow the Deputy Chief Executive to engage with the parties concerned to try and move the project forward; however, it had become clear from the outcome of those discussions that Dumbleton Parish Council had a firm position, supported by independent legal advice, and would not deviate from the advice given. With that in mind, the Deputy Chief Executive could not see how the proposed village hall project could progress.
- 55.3 During the discussion which ensued, Members agreed that seven years was plenty of time for the grant to have been available and the project to move forward so it seemed fair to withdraw it at this stage given no agreement could be reached. A Member questioned whether the money would be available for other community groups to bid for and, in response, the Head of Finance and Asset Management confirmed that the money was capital funding and as such could not be used for strengthening the COVID-19 community funding. The funding would sit in the capital programme unless the Council made a decision to remove it and it could remain there for as long as required. The Council's Community Funding Officer would be able to understand if there were any projects out there that could benefit from the money and Members would be able to direct appropriate projects to it.
- 55.4 Upon being proposed and seconded, it was

**RESOLVED:** That the grant offer of £57,700 previously made to Wormington Village Society be **WITHDRAWN**.

#### **EX.56 TEWKESBURY TOGETHER 2021**

- 56.1 The report of the Head of Development Services, circulated at Pages No. 219-221, outlined the aims for Tewkesbury Together, plus a proposal for potential funding from the Council. Members were asked to allocate £25,000 from reserves to support Tewkesbury Together 2021 and to delegate authorisation of the spend to the Head of Development Services and the Head of Finance and Asset Management, in consultation with the Lead Members for Finance and Asset Management and Economic Development/Promotion.
- 56.2 The Economic and Community Development Manager explained that 2021 was a momentous year for Tewkesbury as it would be 900 years since the consecration of the Abbey and 550 years since the Battle of Tewkesbury, and a Steering Group had been formed in the town to represent various organisations with the aim of putting together a programme of events to celebrate the significant date.



Unfortunately the planning had been somewhat hampered by COVID-19 and the uncertainty of what would and would not go ahead over the coming months, so there was not currently an agreed schedule of events in place; notwithstanding this, it had been requested that the Borough Council allocate a sum of £25,000 towards the 2021 celebrations. It was recommended that the Steering Group could then submit proposals for the funds which would be delegated to the relevant Heads of Service and Lead Members to approve.

56.3 During the discussion which ensued, a Member questioned what kind of events were planned and, in response, the Economic and Community Development Manager confirmed there were ideas for improving existing events as well as adding new ones such as light shows, school activities, public art, and sport and art events – unfortunately this was all dependent upon the situation with the pandemic. It was hoped that by next summer the world would be in a much better position and events could take place across the whole Borough to commemorate the occasions. In terms of the COVID-19 pandemic, a Member questioned what would happen to the funding if the Steering Group could not hold any events and she was advised that the proposals would come to the relevant Officers and Members for endorsement, so if no events took place, none of the money would be spent. The figure of £25,000 was considered to be a sensible figure but if the Steering Group submitted a proposal which cost slightly more than that would be considered under the delegation. A suggestion was made that the recommendation be amended to include a need for events to draw in the rest of the Borough but, in response, the Chief Executive confirmed that he was certain the organisers would want to engage people from across the whole Borough, as well as those further afield, given the significance of the celebration.

56.4 Accordingly, it was

**RESOLVED:**

1. That £25,000 be allocated from reserves to support Tewkesbury Together 2021.
2. That the Head of Development Services and Head of Finance and Asset Management, in consultation with the Lead Member for Finance and Asset Management and the Lead Member for Economic Development/Promotion, be authorised to spend the allocation.

**EX.57 INFRASTRUCTURE FUNDING STATEMENT**

57.1 The report of the Community Infrastructure Levy Manager for the Joint Core Strategy Authorities, circulated at Pages No. 222-249, updated the Committee on the preparation of the Infrastructure Funding Statement for 2020 including the required Infrastructure List. Members were asked to recommend to Council that the publication of the Infrastructure Funding Statement for 2020 be approved and to note that the annual Community Infrastructure Levy Rates Summary Statement would be published alongside the Infrastructure Funding Statement.

57.2 The Head of Development Services explained that the Infrastructure Funding Statement was a requirement of the Community Infrastructure Levy Regulations 2010 (as amended) because the Council had a Community Infrastructure Levy Charging Schedule. The Infrastructure Funding Statement consisted of four parts: Community Infrastructure Levy report; S106 report; Infrastructure List; and the Annual Community Infrastructure Levy Rates Summary Statement. It also included a list of infrastructure projects which were appended to the report. All figures within the Statement were factual and the contents were prescribed by the Regulations, so the Council did not have discretion to change them.

57.3 Members thanked the Officers for the very thorough report, and it was

**RESOLVED:**

That it be **RECOMMENDED TO COUNCIL:**

1. That the publication of the Infrastructure Funding Statement (IFS) for 2020 be **APPROVED**.
2. That it be **NOTED** that the Annual Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) Rates Summary Statement will be published alongside the Infrastructure Funding Statement.

**EX.58 REPLACEMENT PAY AND DISPLAY PARKING MACHINES**

- 58.1 The report of the Head of Finance and Asset Management, circulated at Pages No. 250-254, outlined a request for a capital budget of £117,000 to replace the ageing parking pay and display machines within the Borough Council's car parks. The Committee was asked to recommend to Council that the capital funding requested be approved and that authority be delegated to the Head of Finance and Asset Management to procure suitable parking pay and display machines that offered cash and card payment options with a remote back office function.
- 58.2 The Head of Finance and Asset Management explained that the Borough Council managed 10 car parks across Tewkesbury and Winchcombe towns which currently had an ageing stock of pay and display machines that had not been replaced for more than 13 years. The age of the machines was causing a lot of problems in terms of frequent breakdowns and difficulty in sourcing parts as well as the issue of not holding data centrally and offering a lack of functionality for payments etc. Replacing the machines would give an opportunity to offer card payment for users and remote access for Officers via a back-office portal which would receive live data of car park usage and any machine faults, as well as reducing the ongoing maintenance costs of the machines. The popularity of the Council's cashless system via 'Ringo' had been helpful and that, along with better machines, meant the current provision of 18 machines could be reduced to 12 as there would not be the requirement for more than one machine in the smaller car parks as a back up in case of breakdowns. The costs within the report were for the most expensive machines and the highest number that could be required; this was likely to be reduced considerably through the procurement process and as the number of machines was agreed. Any money that was not required would go back into balances.
- 58.3 Members agreed that the current machines were at the end of their life and needed replacing but some questioned whether they needed to have a cash option at all now people were much more used to contactless payments, it was felt this would also reduce the likelihood of vandalism of, and theft from, the machines. In response, the Head of Development Services agreed that the Council had seen a great uplift in the past few months of people using the payment app and the added functionality of contactless in the new machines would benefit many more people but there were still those that wanted to pay cash and it was felt that, particularly in the short to medium term, that ability should still be offered. Certainly, in the longer term it may be a consideration to move away from cash payments entirely. In terms of the security of the machines, this had improved significantly in recent years meaning they were far less likely to be broken into and, in addition, they were concreted into the ground so it was also difficult to steal the whole machine. In

terms of the funding, the Head of Finance and Asset Management agreed that it was a difficult balance given the Council did not have very much money to spend at the moment; however, the current machines were coming to the end of their useful life and the Council did have capital reserves to fund smaller projects such as this which should reduce the resources needed to ensure they were operational. In response to a query regarding the costs of collecting cash from the machines, the Head of Finance and Asset Management explained that the charge to the Council was made on the cash collected rather than physically having to go to empty the machines.

58.4 In terms of the costs of the machines, the Head of Finance and Asset Management confirmed that Officers had spoken to all of the main providers and from those three, the highest price had been used in the report so he was confident the procurement process would bring the project in at a lower cost. Back office costs would be included in the overall price so it was not just about the cost of the machinery and obviously the tenders would have to be assessed on a like for like basis to ensure the Council was achieving the best value for money. He was happy to provide Members with the informal quote received to date, but that information was liable to change as the Council went through the procurement process. He was of the view that there would be some savings in Officer time as well as direct cashable savings; although there was not very many hours of a post associated with the role so there would not be cashable savings on man hours as such.

58.5 Accordingly, it was

**RESOLVED:** That it be **RECOMMENDED TO COUNCIL:**

1. That capital funding of £117,000 be allocated from the Capital Receipts Reserve for the replacement of car park pay and display machines across all authority-owned and charged car parks.
2. That authority be delegated to the Head of Finance and Asset Management to procure suitable parking pay and display machines that offer cash and card payment options with a remote back office function.

**EX.59 SEPARATE BUSINESS**

59.1 The Chair proposed, and it was

**RESOLVED** That, under Section 100(A)(4) of the Local Government Act 1972, the public be excluded from the meeting for the following items on the grounds that they involve the likely discussion of exempt information as defined in Part 1 of Schedule 12A of the Act.

**EX.60 SEPARATE MINUTES**

60.1 The separate Minutes of the meeting held on 21 October 2020, copies of which had been circulated, were approved as a correct record.

**EX.61 RECYCLING MATTERS**

*(Exempt –Paragraph 3 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A of the Local Government Act 1972 –Information relating to the financial or business affairs of any particular person (including the authority holding that information))*

- 61.1 The Committee considered emerging issues affecting the Council's recycling service and agreed a delegated authority for the procurement, and contract award, of the Haulage, Sorting and Sale of Dry Mixed Recycling at a Materials Recovery Facility.

**EX.62 MANAGEMENT ARRANGEMENTS FOLLOWING THE DEPARTURE OF THE DEPUTY CHIEF EXECUTIVE**

*(Exempt –Paragraph 1 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A of the Local Government Act 1972 – Information relating to any individual)*

- 62.1 The Committee made a recommendation to Council regarding the management arrangements to be put into place following the departure of the Deputy Chief Executive.

The meeting closed at 6:40 pm