

Council

Meeting of held on Monday, 4 March 2019 at 6.30 pm in Council Chamber, Town Hall,
Katharine Street, Croydon CR0 1NX

MINUTES

Present: Councillor Bernadette Khan (Chair);

Councillors Humayun Kabir, Hamida Ali, Muhammad Ali, Jamie Audsley, Jane Avis, Jeet Bains, Sue Bennett, Margaret Bird, Simon Brew, Alison Butler, Jan Buttinger, Janet Campbell, Robert Canning, Sherwan Chowdhury, Luke Clancy, Chris Clark, Pat Clouder, Stuart Collins, Mary Croos, Jason Cummings, Patsy Cummings, Nina Degrads, Jerry Fitzpatrick, Sean Fitzsimons, Alisa Flemming, Felicity Flynn, Clive Fraser, Maria Gatland, Lynne Hale, Simon Hall, Patricia Hay-Justice, Maddie Henson, Simon Hoar, Steve Hollands, Yvette Hopley, Karen Jewitt, Shafi Khan, Stuart King, Toni Letts, Oliver Lewis, Stephen Mann, Stuart Millson, Vidhi Mohan, Michael Neal, Tony Newman, Steve O'Connell, Ian Parker, Andrew Pelling, Jason Perry, Helen Pollard, Tim Pollard, Joy Prince, Badsha Quadir, Helen Redfern, Scott Roche, Pat Ryan, Paul Scott, Manju Shahul-Hameed, Niroshan Sirisena, Andy Stranack, Gareth Streeter, Robert Ward, David Wood, Louisa Woodley and Callton Young

Apologies: Councillor Richard Chatterjee, Mario Creatura and Oni Ovir

PART A

15/17 Minutes of the Previous Meeting

The minutes of the Council meeting held on 28 January 2019 were agreed as a true and accurate record.

16/17 Disclosure of Interests

There were no disclosures of pecuniary interests. Members confirmed their disclosure of interest forms were accurate and up-to-date.

17/17 Urgent Business (if any)

There was no urgent business.

18/17 Announcements

Madam Mayor, Councillor Bernadette Khan, provided Members of the Council with an update on the forthcoming events she would be attending. Those were a fundraising tea for International Women's Day, a Chinese Heritage Cultural Event, and a dinner for Croydon foster carers to celebrate their support for the borough's children.

Madam Mayor led the Members of Council in thanking Executive Director of Resources and Section 151 Officer, Richard Simpson, for his service to the Council, prior to his departure. Councillors Newman, the Leader of the Council, and Tim Pollard, Leader of the Opposition Group, were invited by Madam Mayor to also speak in recognition of the officer's work. The Leader highlighted that Richard had been an outstanding public servant for Croydon. He was particularly noted for having lead on the management of the borough's finances during a period of austerity. Councillor Tim Pollard highlighted that Richard was known for being calm and fair. It was noted that he would be very much missed.

19/17 **Council Tax and Budget**

a) Budget Presentation

A presentation on the budget reflecting the content of the report was provided by Lisa Taylor, the Director of Finance, Investment and Risk (Section 151 Officer) supported by Councillor Simon Hall, the Cabinet Member for Finance & Resources.

The Director of Finance, Investment and Risk highlighted the following points:

- I. Reserves and balances: earmarked reserves were planned to fall by £5m to fund the projected overspend. It was planned that this would be replenished by an anticipated collection fund surplus in 2019/20 and dividends from Brick by Brick. Capital reserves were planned to increase from the sale of land. Reserves were lower than those of some authorities but were holding firm and not changing significantly;
- II. Growth: three departments were to receive growth budgets: 1) Children, Families and Education, 2) Health, Wellbeing and Adults, and 3) Gateway, Strategy and Engagement. This was in response to increasing demand and to deliver the Children's Services Improvement Plan. Savings were also detailed including additional income from recent asset acquisitions, the Adult Social Care charging policy, the first dividend from Brick by Brick, more efficient commissioning and the reduction in the Pension Fund deficit as a result of a property asset transfer. Other savings were to be realised from better children's placements and as a result of the One Alliance;
- III. Council Tax: an additional £12.6m was to be raised in 2019/20 from the increase in the charge, the increasing size of the Council Tax base and improvements in the collection rate; and
- IV. Risks: increasing demand for social care and funding for Unaccompanied Asylum Seeker Children (UASC) were noted as the areas of highest risk. Added to this was the ongoing uncertainty regarding local government funding from local government given 2019/20 was the last year of the

spending review period with the government's Fair Funding Review ongoing.

The Cabinet Member for Finance & Resources highlighted the other pressures on the budget including the lack of funding for UASC, the decline in the public health grant, the fact that the grant for Council Tax support only covered half the costs and the government's underfunding of children with Special Educational Needs and Disability (SEND). The Cabinet Member noted the overall context for the budget was one of financial crisis across England.

It was explained that the budget had been determined based on the decision to protect frontline services and to continue to invest in innovation - for example Gateway Services and the One Croydon Alliance. Investment would continue to be made in schools and homes and the Council would continue to operate ethically for example through the continued implementation of London Living Wage for Council employees and through the terms of the Council's new contracts. The budget would continue to be managed by bringing services in-house and through a focus on prevention. It was noted that government funding was being reduced by £7.8m when over £5m was needed just to cover inflationary costs. It was planned to achieve £7m in savings and £8m in income initiatives.

b) Questions to the Leader

The Leader received questions from Members of the Council on the budget.

Councillor Tim Pollard asked for clarification on the costs of the redevelopment of Fairfield Halls. It was noted that these had recently risen by £11m from £30m to £41m with the development 18 months behind schedule. Additionally, the associated college development was not going to happen.

The Leader responded that this was a major capital scheme and that more asbestos than could have been anticipated had been found during the redevelopment. It was highlighted that this was a significant investment in what was going to becoming a major artistic hub.

In his supplementary question, Councillor Tim Pollard, asked for further explanation of the budget overspend and late delivery and called on the Leader to apologise to Croydon residents. In response, the Leader highlighted that whilst plans to redevelop Fairfield Halls under previous Administrations had not come to fruition, his Administration was delivering a once in a 50 year regeneration for the people of Croydon.

Councillor Pasty Cummings asked how, against a background of government cuts, it was possible for all Members to work together to deliver better outcomes for all residents. In his response, the Leader emphasised the importance of delivering a credible budget focused as much on spending priorities as savings.

Councillor Redfern asked whether it was right to take money out of the pockets of the most vulnerable following increases made to Member allowances. Reference was made to the cancellation of Health and Wellbeing Board meetings and therefore how it appeared Members were being paid more to do less.

In response, the Leader noted that no one should be prohibited from becoming a Councillor based on their personal circumstances and that his Administration was acutely aware of the pressures on the most vulnerable given all the work it was doing to address the issues caused by the introduction of Universal Credit.

In a supplementary question, Councillor Redfern noted declining vaccination rates when meetings of the Health and Wellbeing Board had been cancelled. The Leader highlighted that whilst meetings in the Town Hall are important the Chair of the Health and Wellbeing Board had been out in the Croydon community working for residents.

Councillor Audsley asked how the budget would address the national emergency of increasing knife crime. The Leader noted that his thoughts were with the most recent victims of knife crime and that money was not everything in terms of this being addressed. The work of the Violence Reduction Network was highlighted. It was noted that the budget included a precept to benefit the Metropolitan Police Service.

In his supplementary question, Councillor Audsley noted the impact of funding cuts on Safer Neighbourhood Teams and invited opposition Members to vote to support the Mayor of London's precept to increase police funding. In his response, the Leader noted the importance of neighbourhood police officers and their work with schools.

Councillor Bird asked why there had been so little consultation on the imposition of charges for services for disabled and vulnerable residents. In response, the Leader emphasised that there had been an open and transparent consultation. It was explained that cuts to funding meant there had to be clear choices made in terms of cuts to or charging for services. The Leader called on the Opposition to support the Adult Social Care precept.

In her supplementary question, Councillor Bird called for funding to be used for services to benefit those most in need rather than for activities that were seen as inappropriate such as art shows that had caused offense. The Leader stressed that it was not the role of elected politicians to determine what could be considered good art. Whilst the art show in question had not been everyone's cup of tea it represented a fractional percentage of the Council's overall budget.

c) Questions to the Cabinet Member for Finance & Resources

Councillor Hall, the Cabinet Member for Finance & Resources took the opportunity during his announcements to also pay tribute to Richard Simpson,

the outgoing Executive Director of Resources. He noted that he had worked closely with Richard during a time of unprecedented challenge and that he had made a significant difference to the Council's performance.

The Cabinet Member for Finance & Resources received questions from Members of the Council on the budget.

Councillor Jason Cummings noted that the budget predictions for the last two years had been missed and asked if the predictions underpinning the budget for 2019/20 would also be missed.

The Cabinet Member emphasised the scale of the financial challenges faced by the Council but that year-on-year forecasting was getting better. However, this would remain a constant challenge in the coming year.

In his supplementary question, Councillor Jason Cummings accepted that the Council was under financial pressure but also noted that the number of discrepancies in the budget was high. It was noted that if forecasting was getting better this should improve.

In response, the Cabinet Member noted that this was the Administration's fifth budget process which he believed was increasingly robust, involving lots of detailed work. However, it wasn't possible to look into the future and determine the budget calculations with certainty. During each year there would be changes resulting from central government that could not be predicted. There could also be in-year innovation.

Councillor Henson expressed her personal thanks to Richard Simpson, the outgoing Executive Director of Resources. She highlighted the hidden cuts to local government budgets being made by central government. For example, the expectation on councils to provide for UASC without any recourse to public funds.

Councillor Hall agreed with this assessment and noted that the Council was continuing to lobby central government to properly fund UASC. It was noted that this was hitting Croydon harder than others as it was a gateway authority for UASC. Nevertheless there was a commitment to maintain the quality of care provided.

In her supplementary question, Councillor Henson asked about the risks caused by the ongoing lack of funding for UASC. Councillor Hall highlighted that the lack of funding may impact on the number of UASC for which the Council could provide care as well as putting pressure on the regional dispersal mechanism. The Cabinet Member called on Councillor Jason Cummings to assist the call for fairer funding from the government.

The Cabinet Member confirmed that the budget priorities were correct in response to **Councillor Parker's** question. In his supplementary question, Councillor Parker asked if it was correct to increase Cabinet Member allowances by 40% at a time when budget reductions were hitting the most

vulnerable residents and, for example, limiting their access to adequate heating. Councillor Hall responded that the maximum increase to allowances received by Cabinet Members was 5% and that the Council was protecting services to vulnerable residents despite government cuts.

Councillor Hay-Justice gave her congratulations for mitigating the impact of austerity for example by transferring the value of affordable homes for the immediate benefit of the Pension Fund. Councillor Hall confirmed that the Council's interest in those affordable homes had reduced the Council's contribution to the Pension Fund from £31m to £29m during 2019/20.

In a supplementary question, Councillor Hay-Justice asked what advice had been received regarding the protection needed in order to undertake the property asset transfer. The Cabinet Member responded that the asset transfer decision had been approved by Council at its meeting in January 2019 and that a direct interest in the properties would be achieved by way of a lease between the Council and Affordable Homes charity and that this would be held by the Pension Fund. The actuary would advise the Pension Fund administrator to ensure it was fully funded. It was noted that the government stood as guarantor of the Pension Fund and therefore it was fully protected. Entering into the property asset transfer was based on the advice of the pension actuary and the fund's legal advisors.

Councillor Stranack asked the Cabinet Member to clarify how much was raised from the payment of parking fees and penalties and how much this was expected to increase during the 2019/20 financial year. The Cabinet Member said he would provide detailed information on the funds raised during 2018/19 from parking fees and penalties subsequent to the meeting. An increase of £4.3m during 2019/20 was anticipated from parking fees and penalties. This reflected that officers had previously been over prudent in their budget outturn predictions. Councillor Hall highlighted that residents could avoid the payment of fines by parking legally.

Councillor Stranack noted that £11.34 was taken from every resident in parking charges and asked if those parking charges would increase in the future. The Cabinet Member confirmed he supported the increase in parking charges; enforcement was right and proper both as a source of income generation and to ensure parking was done correctly and did not create danger by blocking roads. It was also noted that over half of all parking fines were levied on drivers who did not live in the borough.

d) Scrutiny Business Report

Councillor Fitzsimons, Chair of the Scrutiny and Overview Committee, commented that over the previous two months the scrutiny committees had been reviewing the budget proposals. It was noted that the government settlement was getting increasingly later every year, impacting on the time available for scrutiny to undertake its function. The details of conclusions and recommendations made by the scrutiny committee were noted as contained in the report in the agenda.

A dedicated session looking at the education budget had found that funding continued to be tight with schools struggling to meet demands. However, it was positive that there was an increased focus on prevention and the importance of places. In terms of Children's Services, it was thought that there would be longer term consequences resulting from budget cuts and it was noted that Adult Social Care was significantly underfunded nationally – the 1% precept increase was not enough to cover increasing demand for services with the impact particularly felt in the south of the borough. It was noted that the Cabinet Member for Finance & Resources had agreed to work with scrutiny to improve the process for reviewing the budget.

There were no questions from Members for Councillor Fitzsimons.

e) Council Tax Debate

The Leader moved the motion for the Council budget highlighting that this was set against a backdrop of cuts, austerity and Brexit but that there would still be investment in the local community and frontline services would be protected. Thanks were given for the hard work of the Cabinet Member for Finance & Resources, Richard Simpson, the outgoing Executive Director for Resources, Lisa Taylor, the newly appointed Director of Finance, Investment and Risk, in addition to the other Cabinet Members for their work on developing the budget for 2019/20.

Examples of how the budget would continue to invest in the borough were detailed including the Fairfield Hall redevelopment, the Music City Project, Culture Enterprise Zone and the Youth Zone, which was going to be the largest youth project ever in Croydon, providing opportunities for Croydon's young people every night of the week.

It was emphasised that there was a firm grip on Council finances and that there would still be innovation for example through the work of Brick by Brick. A focus on value for money meant that sheltered homes would come back into Council control with all their staff to receive the London Living Wage. The borough's libraries had also come back into the Council's control and would benefit from a programme of investment. Service developments in Norbury would be made in recognition of the late Councillor Mansell.

Whilst Children's Services had received a tough Ofsted inspection, the service would receive extra investment as it was clear this was required. Whilst the outcome of Ofsted's latest monitoring visit was yet to be published, it was clear that the improvement journey was happening. The Leader thanked Councillors Flemming and Shafi Khan along with frontline staff. The investment in Children Service's was highlighted as only possible thanks to prudent financial management.

The Leader noted the need to be honest about the average increase of £1.54 to Council Tax payments in addition to the increases for the Greater London Assembly (GLA) and the Adult Social Care precept. However, this was as a

result of the government driving austerity. The Leader therefore was proud to move the motion to support the budget as this would deliver and invest for the many and not the few.

Councillor Hall seconded the motion and reserved the right to speak.

Councillor Tim Pollard responded. He noted his disappointment that the budget was explained as all the fault of the government and highlighted that the need to decrease funding had resulted from the previous Labour Government's spending and the resulting structural deficit.

It was highlighted that the government wanted funding to be raised and spent locally. As a result there was nowhere for the Administration to hide its failings. The redevelopment of Fairfield Halls was £11m over budget and late, with the associated involvement of the college no longer going ahead. Westfield was yet to happen. Brick by Brick had borrowed to build private sector housing with no new Council housing provided. The Pension Fund had been subject to speculation. The new bin service was not fit for purpose with it assumed that the costs of the contract were going to be allowed to increase and there was no evidence of fines being levied. There had been a failure to administer Adult Social Care contracts leaving residents with no heating or bathing facilities. Charges were to be made for services for vulnerable residents. Children's Services had failed its Ofsted inspection and the speed of improvement was too slow. There had been a persistent failure to achieve set budgets whilst the Cabinet Member allowance had been increased along with publicity and press office budget increases. The Administration was putting up Council Tax and applying precepts as much as allowed. However, there was a need to get finances on a stable footing. For example, to benefit Children's Services and the bin service. For that reason, the Conservative Members would vote in support of the budget.

Councillor Butler, the Deputy Leader and Cabinet Member for Homes and Gateway Services, also spoke in favour of the budget. Making sure all Croydon residents had a home was a huge focus – having a home was a fundamental right. Children could be damaged if they had no home. The Council therefore needed to increase the supply of homes as demonstrated by the rise of the private rented sector. As a result, £39m would be invested in the coming year. Additionally, a sprinkler programme would mean 26 of the tallest blocks in the borough would benefit from installation despite this receiving no funding from government. Against a housing benefit freeze, the Council would use its landlord licensing scheme to ensure safe and decent standards in the rented sector. Brick by Brick would continue its building programme to address the housing waiting list, the numbers in temporary accommodation and those saving to buy for themselves. Stable and decent homes were fundamental to belonging somewhere. The Council would continue to fix Council homes and oppose no fault evictions.

Councillor Hopley criticised the budget, highlighting the excessive charges that would be imposed on the most vulnerable, elderly and disabled. Poor conditions in assisted homes were highlighted; it was noted that these were

only being rectified as a result of the focus these were given by Conservative Members. Charges for services for vulnerable residents were being increased despite an ineffective consultation; this had only achieved eight responses despite the charges applying to thousands of residents. Many carers were not even aware of these charges as they were not mentioned on the Council website and there was no clarity about how charges would be put in place. In the words of carers, it was wrong to charge for these services in the same way as the Council charges for planning. Arts and Member allowances should not be funded in preference for charges made to residents.

Councillor Avis, the Cabinet Member for Families, Health and Social Care, spoke in support of the budget and highlighted the effect of cuts to local government funding and the resulting cuts to services. The impact of cuts on services had been assessed by the Local Government Association, the Kings Fund, the Trussell Trust and the National Audit Office. It was noted that by 2025, social care would have a national funding gap of £3.4billion. The government was described as in a state of denial with regard to the impact of austerity on the poor. The Cabinet Member rejected the claims made by Councillor Hopley and highlighted that charges for services were as a result of austerity.

Councillor Hoar criticised the budget, stating the Administration had given free access to land speculation in the borough. Bus routes were being cut and the 20 mile per hour zone was enforced against the opposition of residents. The budget being based on parking fines was seen as the result of not being able to budget correctly. Imposing parking fines on those from outside the borough would impact on economic activity. This was described as punishing the car driver and not being on the side of residents.

Councillor Hamida Ali, the Cabinet Member for Safer Croydon and Communities, spoke in support of the budget. The GLA precept was being levied to fill the holes in government funding for the police and to put an additional 1,300 police officers on London's streets. Dame Louise Casey had highlighted the lack of government understanding regarding the financial stability of policing with police numbers at their lowest since 2003. The public health approach to tackling crime was not being effectively supported by the government. There had been a cut in the core grant with funding rounds pitting communities against each other. Work of officers in Croydon had seen a decrease in knife crime by 3% since January 2018. Local authorities were having to fill in the gaps left by central government.

Councillor O'Connell supported the police precept. It was highlighted how the local and national knife crime crisis needed leadership at all levels. As a result, Councillor O'Connell noted that London deserved a fair budget settlement in order to benefit the Metropolitan Police Force. He detailed how he had written to the government accordingly. The number one issue for London was the impact of knife crime on young people. The GLA supported the precept proposed by the Mayor of London but called for more to be done by the Mayor, Sadiq Khan. The increase in City Hall staff numbers by 30% was specifically noted. It was Councillor O'Connell's opinion that the public

health approach to crime reduction would take 10 years and that action was needed immediately.

Councillor Shafi Khan, the Deputy Cabinet Member for Children, Young People and Learning, spoke in support of the budget highlighting that government funding cuts were continuing to have an impact on services and jobs in the borough. It was noted that there was no sign of improvements to government funding with continuing growth in demand for services. It was noted that whilst it was preferable not to raise Council Tax, the Administration was determined to support the most vulnerable residents. It was emphasised that the Administration had attracted millions of pounds of investment to the borough and had delivered efficiencies of £20m with the Council's reserves above the minimum required. The Administration was realising its ambitions; bringing partners together to deliver for residents with 88% of primary and 82% of secondary school pupils in Croydon in school places judged good or better. The Youth Zone would deliver a universal offer whilst a new all-through special school in New Addington was being developed. The budget was optimistic and looked beyond austerity and would make Croydon a greater place to live and learn.

Councillor Bains criticised the budget describing it as the Cabinet Members picking the pocket of the ordinary people whilst giving themselves pay rises. Councillor Bains asked what had happened to the Westfield development. It was suggested that the Administration didn't want this in Croydon with the result that billions of pounds of investment and jobs were at risk. It was noted that this was in contrast to the last Conservative Administration that had passed the planning permission for the Westfield development. It was noted that the Administration had made no condemnation of anti-Semitism.

Councillor Sirisena spoke in support of the budget highlighting the effect of nine years of austerity cuts and the greater impact this had on inner city communities compared to middle England. The cuts were responsible for undermining the effectiveness of services and for putting Adult Social Care at risk. It was noted that the cuts had resulted in the collapsed of Conservative Councils such as Northamptonshire but that the government's Fair Funding Review of local government funding was leading to increased funding for Conservative areas. This was described as divide and rule. Councillor Sirisena stated that it did not have to be this way; at the next general election a new relationship could be formed providing a voice for local government through a local government commission which would be placed at the heart of decision making in Whitehall. This would work, including with Conservative councils, to rebuild Britain. This would reverse academisation to democratically provide the education that was needed. Adult Social Care would be fully funded and there would be a focus on early intervention and prevention. Whilst the Council's budget was under great duress, Croydon Labour was delivering for the many and not the few.

Councillor **Jason Cummings** criticised the budget. He noted that the financial pressures were not disputed. However, budget decisions were made behind closed doors with residents being forced to pay the bills. It was highlighted

that the Administration was unable to keep to the budget that it had set itself and expected residents to bail it out through the payment of parking charges and fines and new charges for social care. Councillor Jason Cummings predicted that the Administration would fail to meet its budget in the next municipal year. Croydon did need the money in the budget but he didn't trust what Labour would do with it.

Having previously reserved his right to speak, Madam Mayor called on **Councillor Hall** to speak which he did in favour of the budget. The Cabinet Member described the fiscal backdrop to the budget, highlighting the onslaught on local spending by the government, population increases and demographic changes which meant services needed to grow and change. It was noted that it would be easy to feel despair in such a situation and be forced to slice services. However, this was not the approach being taken by the Administration. The principles of the budget were innovation, investment in the future, investment in properties and ambition for Croydon. This was typified in the development company that had been set up to build 1,000 homes in the borough. The focus on prevention meant that families in the most need were supported. For example, as a result of the impact of Universal Credit, over 100 families were helped with 50 tenancies saved. Investment had been made in fire safety work, the redevelopment of Fairfield Halls, the Youth Zone, apprenticeships and the London Living Wage. The ground maintenance contract had been taken back in-house, meaning that staff would be paid the London Living Wage. As a result of the budget more of Croydon's spending was being kept in the borough with local firms. It was noted that the Pension Fund was no longer investing in tobacco companies.

This was in contrast to the situation under the last Conservative Administration when libraries were closed, youth work and funding of the voluntary sector was cut and monthly bin collections were proposed.

As required by the Council's Constitution, recommendations 1.1 to 1.3, as detailed in the report, were taken by a recorded vote using the electronic voting system. The remaining recommendations (1.4 to 1.10 as detailed in the report) were taken en block. As requested by the Leader and supported by ten additional Members, these remaining recommendations were taken as a poll vote using the electronic voting system.

Madam Mayor then moved to the vote on the recommendations.

The first vote was for recommendation 1.1: A **2.99%** increase in the Council Tax for Croydon Services (a level of increase Central Government had assumed in all councils' spending power calculation).

The recommendation was put to the vote. The Members who voted in favour were: Councillors Humayun Kabir, Hamida Ali, Muhammad Ali, Jamie Audsley, Jane Avis, Jeet Bains, Sue Bennett, Margaret Bird, Simon Brew, Alison Butler, Jan Buttinger, Janet Campbell, Robert Canning, Sherwan Chowdhury, Luke Clancy, Chris Clark, Pat Clouder, Stuart Collins, Mary Croos, Jason Cummings, Patsy Cummings, Nina Degrad,

Jerry Fitzpatrick, Sean Fitzsimons, Alisa Flemming, Felicity Flynn, Clive Fraser, Maria Gatland, Lynne Hale, Simon Hall, Patricia Hay-Justice, Maddie Henson, Simon Hoar, Steve Hollands, Yvette Hopley, Karen Jewitt, Bernadette Khan, Shafi Khan, Stuart King, Toni Letts, Oliver Lewis, Stephen Mann, Stuart Millson, Vidhi Mohan, Michael Neal, Tony Newman, Steve O'Connell, Ian Parker, Andrew Pelling, Jason Perry, Helen Pollard, Tim Pollard, Joy Prince, Badsha Quadir, Helen Redfern, Scott Roche, Pat Ryan, Paul Scott, Manju Shahul-Hameed, Niroshan Sirisena, Andy Stranack, Gareth Streeter, Robert Ward, David Wood, Louisa Woodley and Callton Young.

The recommendation was carried unanimously (with Councillors Bird, Hollands and Redfern voting orally).

The second vote was for recommendation 1.2: A **1.0%** increase in the Adult Social Care precept (a charge Central Government had assumed all councils would levy in its spending power calculations).

The recommendation was put to the vote. The Members who voted in favour were: Councillors Humayun Kabir, Hamida Ali, Muhammad Ali, Jamie Audsley, Jane Avis, Jeet Bains, Sue Bennett, Margaret Bird, Simon Brew, Alison Butler, Jan Buttinger, Janet Campbell, Robert Canning, Sherwan Chowdhury, Luke Clancy, Chris Clark, Pat Clouder, Stuart Collins, Mary Croos, Jason Cummings, Patsy Cummings, Nina Degrads, Jerry Fitzpatrick, Sean Fitzsimons, Alisa Flemming, Felicity Flynn, Clive Fraser, Maria Gatland, Lynne Hale, Simon Hall, Patricia Hay-Justice, Maddie Henson, Simon Hoar, Steve Hollands, Yvette Hopley, Karen Jewitt, Bernadette Khan, Shafi Khan, Stuart King, Toni Letts, Oliver Lewis, Stephen Mann, Stuart Millson, Vidhi Mohan, Michael Neal, Tony Newman, Steve O'Connell, Ian Parker, Andrew Pelling, Jason Perry, Helen Pollard, Tim Pollard, Joy Prince, Badsha Quadir, Helen Redfern, Scott Roche, Pat Ryan, Paul Scott, Manju Shahul-Hameed, Niroshan Sirisena, Andy Stranack, Gareth Streeter, Robert Ward, David Wood, Louisa Woodley and Callton Young.

The recommendation was carried unanimously (with Councillors Bird, Hollands and Redfern voting orally).

The third vote was for recommendation 1.3: The GLA increase of **8.93%**, of **which** 91% would be used for the Metropolitan Police service and 9% would be used for the fire service. With reference to the principles for 2019/20 determined by the Secretary of State under Section 52ZC (1) of the Local Government Finance Act 1992 (as amended) it was confirmed that in accordance with s.52ZB (1) the Council Tax and GLA precept referred to above were **not excessive** in terms of the most recently issued principles and as such to note that no referendum was required. This was detailed further in section 3.5 of the report.

The recommendation was put to the vote. The Members who voted in favour were: Councillors Humayun Kabir, Hamida Ali, Muhammad Ali,

Jamie Audsley, Jane Avis, Jeet Bains, Sue Bennett, Margaret Bird, Simon Brew, Alison Butler, Jan Buttinger, Janet Campbell, Robert Canning, Sherwan Chowdhury, Luke Clancy, Chris Clark, Pat Clouder, Stuart Collins, Mary Croos, Jason Cummings, Patsy Cummings, Nina Degrads, Jerry Fitzpatrick, Sean Fitzsimons, Alisa Flemming, Felicity Flynn, Clive Fraser, Maria Gatland, Lynne Hale, Simon Hall, Patricia Hay-Justice, Maddie Henson, Simon Hoar, Steve Hollands, Yvette Hopley, Karen Jewitt, Bernadette Khan, Shafi Khan, Stuart King, Toni Letts, Oliver Lewis, Stephen Mann, Stuart Millson, Vidhi Mohan, Michael Neal, Tony Newman, Steve O'Connell, Ian Parker, Andrew Pelling, Jason Perry, Helen Pollard, Tim Pollard, Joy Prince, Badsha Quadir, Helen Redfern, Scott Roche, Pat Ryan, Paul Scott, Manju Shahul-Hameed, Niroshan Sirisena, Andy Stranack, Gareth Streeter, Robert Ward, David Wood, Louisa Woodley and Callton Young.

The recommendation was carried unanimously (with Councillors Bird, Hollands and Redfern voting orally).

The remaining recommendations (1.4 – 1.10) were taken en block.

The recommendations were put to the vote. The Members who voted in favour were: Councillors Humayun Kabir, Hamida Ali, Muhammad Ali, Jamie Audsley, Jane Avis, Jeet Bains, Sue Bennett, Margaret Bird, Simon Brew, Alison Butler, Jan Buttinger, Janet Campbell, Robert Canning, Sherwan Chowdhury, Luke Clancy, Chris Clark, Pat Clouder, Stuart Collins, Mary Croos, Jason Cummings, Patsy Cummings, Nina Degrads, Jerry Fitzpatrick, Sean Fitzsimons, Alisa Flemming, Felicity Flynn, Clive Fraser, Maria Gatland, Lynne Hale, Simon Hall, Patricia Hay-Justice, Maddie Henson, Simon Hoar, Steve Hollands, Yvette Hopley, Karen Jewitt, Bernadette Khan, Shafi Khan, Stuart King, Toni Letts, Oliver Lewis, Stephen Mann, Vidhi Mohan, Michael Neal, Tony Newman, Steve O'Connell, Ian Parker, Andrew Pelling, Jason Perry, Helen Pollard, Tim Pollard, Joy Prince, Badsha Quadir, Helen Redfern, Scott Roche, Pat Ryan, Paul Scott, Manju Shahul-Hameed, Niroshan Sirisena, Andy Stranack, Gareth Streeter, Robert Ward, David Wood, Louisa Woodley and Callton Young.

One Councillor voted against (Councillor Millson). The recommendation was carried (with Councillors Bird, Hail, Hollands and Redfern voting orally).

RESOLVED: The Members of the Council resolved to agree the following recommendations:

1. A **2.99%** increase in the Council Tax for Croydon Services (a level of increase Central Government had assumed in all councils' spending power calculation).
2. A **1.0%** increase in the Adult Social Care precept (a charge Central Government had assumed all councils would levy in its spending power calculations).

3. The GLA increase of **8.93%**, of which 91% would be used for the Metropolitan Police service and 9% would be used for the fire service.

With reference to the principles for 2019/20 determined by the Secretary of State under Section 52ZC (1) of the Local Government Finance Act 1992 (as amended) it was confirmed that in accordance with s.52ZB (1) the Council Tax and GLA precept referred to above were **not excessive** in terms of the most recently issued principles and as such to note that no referendum was required. This was detailed further in section 3.5 of the report.

4. The calculation of budget requirement and council tax as set out in Appendix D and E to the report in the agenda. Including the GLA increase this would result in a total increase of 4.88% in the overall council tax bill for Croydon.
5. The revenue budget assumptions as detailed in report 6.1 and the associated appendices :-
 - i. The programme of revenue savings and growth by department for 2019/20 (Appendix A of report 6.1).
 - ii. The Council's detailed budget book for 2019/20 (Appendix B of report 6.1).
6. The Capital Programme as set out in section 16, table 16 and 17 of report 6.1.
7. To note there are no proposed amendments to the Council's existing Council Tax Support Scheme for the financial year 2019/20.
8. The adoption of the Pay Policy statement at Appendix H of report 6.1;
9. Approve the increase in premium for long-term empty dwellings with effect from 1st April 2019 as set out in section 9.10 of the agenda report and Appendix I of report 6.1.
10. The adoption of the Adult Social Care Charging Policy with effect from the 1st April 2019 as set out in section 8.11 and appendix J of report 6.1.

20/17

Recommendations of Cabinet referred to Council for decision

Madam Mayor invited Councillor Hall to move the recommendations contained in the Cabinet report relating to the Treasury Management Policy Statement, Minimum Provision Policy Statement, Minimum Provision Policy Statement, Capital Strategy and Annual Investment Strategy for 2019/20.

Councillor Hall highlighted the recommendations in the report noting that these were about the careful stewardship of the capital strategy and borrowing for a purpose.

The recommendations were seconded by Councillor Patsy Cummings, put to the vote and carried.

Madam Mayor invited Councillor Butler to move the recommendations contained in the Cabinet report relating to the Housing Asset Management Plan.

Councillor Butler proposed the recommendations in the report. It was highlighted that these were about the effective maintenance and improvement of Council homes. It was noted that residents were involved in decisions about the upkeep of properties; this was about being a good social landlord. The difficulties of managing the housing asset budget due to government intervention was emphasised. The Cabinet Member reported that there was an increased emphasis on fire safety as a result of the Grenfell Tower fire. Fuel poverty meant there was an increasing emphasis on fuel efficient solutions. The objective was to provide affordable homes in which residents could take pride. It was important that residents have a say and are heard. As a social landlord the role of the Council was more than just providing a roof; activity was being taken to address antisocial behaviour, provide play spaces, job opportunities and training.

The recommendations were seconded by Councillor Hay-Justice, put to the vote and carried.

RESOLVED: The Members of the Council resolved to agree the following recommendations:

Treasury Management Policy Statement

1. To approve the Treasury Management Statement 2019/2020 as set out in Appendix 7.1, including the following recommendations:
 - 1.1. That the Council takes up the balance of its 2018/2019 borrowing requirement and future years' borrowing requirements, as set out in paragraph 4.5 (Appendix 7.1).
 - 1.2. That for the reasons detailed in paragraph 4.14 (Appendix 7.1), opportunities for debt rescheduling were to be reviewed throughout the year by the Director of Finance, Investment and Risk (S151 Officer) and that, she be given delegated authority, in consultation with the Cabinet Member for Finance & Resources and in conjunction with the Council's independent treasury advisers, to undertake such rescheduling only if revenue savings or additional cost avoidance could be achieved at minimal risk in line with organisational considerations and with regard to the Housing Revenue Account (HRA) as set out in the Council's Medium Term Financial Strategy 2018/2022.
2. That delegated authority be given to the Director of Finance, Investment and

Risk (S151 Officer) in consultation with the Cabinet Member for Finance & Resources, to make any necessary decisions to protect the Council's financial position in light of market changes or investment risk exposure.

3. That the Council adopts the 2017 edition of the revised Treasury Management Code of Practice and Prudential Code issued by CIPFA in December 2017.
4. That the Council adopts the Annual Investment Strategy as set out in paragraph 4.16 and 4.17 (Appendix 7.1).
5. That the Authorised Borrowing Limits (required by Section 3 of the Local Government Act 2003) as set out in paragraph 4.18 (Appendix 7.1) and as detailed in Appendix 7.1C be as follows:

2019/2020	2020/2021	2021/2022
£1,486.05m	£1,550.30m	£1,615.40m

6. That the Council approve the Prudential Indicators as set out in Appendix 7.1C of this report.
7. The Annual Minimum Revenue Provision Policy Statement (required by the Local Authorities (Capital Financing and Accounting) (England) (Amendment) Regulations 2008SI 2008/414) as set out in Appendix 7.1D of the report.
8. That the Council's authorised counterparty lending list as at 31 December 2018 as set out in Appendix 7.1E of the report and the rating criteria set for inclusion onto this list be approved.
9. That the Council adopts the Capital Strategy Statement set out below in section (Appendix 7.1).

Housing Asset Management Plan (HAMP) 2019 - 28

2. The Housing Asset Management Plan 2019 – 2028 be approved and implemented.

21/17 **Exclusion of the Press and Public**

This item was not required.

The meeting ended at 8.56 pm

Signed:

.....

Date:

.....
.....