

Public Document Pack

NORTH HERTFORDSHIRE DISTRICT COUNCIL

MINUTES

Meeting of the Council held in the Council Chamber, District Council Offices, Gernon Road,
Letchworth Garden City, SG6 3JF
on Thursday, 27th February, 2025 at 7.30 pm

PRESENT: Councillors: Clare Billing (Chair), Tina Bhartwas (Vice-Chair), Ian Albert, Daniel Allen, Amy Allen, David Barnard, Matt Barnes, Sadie Billing, Ruth Brown, Val Bryant, Rhona Cameron, David Chalmers, Jon Clayden, Ruth Clifton, Mick Debenham, Elizabeth Dennis, Emma Fernandes, Joe Graziano, Dominic Griffiths, Keith Hoskins, Steve Jarvis, Tim Johnson, Chris Lucas, Sarah Lucas, Ian Mantle, Nigel Mason, Bryony May, Caroline McDonnell, Ralph Muncer, Sean Nolan, Louise Peace, Vijaiya Poopalasingham, Sean Prendergast, Martin Prescott, Emma Rowe, Claire Strong, Tamsin Thomas, Tom Tyson, Paul Ward, Laura Williams, Alistair Willoughby, Stewart Willoughby, Claire Winchester, Dave Winstanley, Donna Wright and Daniel Wright-Mason.

IN ATTENDANCE: Amy Cantrill (Trainee Committee, Member and Scrutiny Officer), Ian Couper (Service Director - Resources), Susan Le Dain (Committee, Member and Scrutiny Officer), James Lovegrove (Committee, Member and Scrutiny Manager), Callum Reeve (Electoral Services Assistant), Anthony Roche (Managing Director), Melanie Stimpson (Democratic Services Manager), Jeanette Thompson (Service Director - Legal and Community) and Rebecca Webb (HR Services Manager).

ALSO PRESENT:

At the commencement of the meeting there was 1 member of the public in attendance.

Richard Beesley, Consultant was also in attendance.

88 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Audio recording – 1 minute 51 seconds

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Lisa Nash, Steven Patmore, Sam Collins and Cathy Brownjohn.

Councillor Michael Muir was absent.

89 MINUTES - 15 JANUARY AND 23 JANUARY 2025

Audio recording – 2 minutes 7 seconds

Councillor Clare Billing, as Chair, proposed and Councillor Daniel Allen seconded and, following a vote, it was:

RESOLVED: That the Minutes of the Meeting of the Committee held on 15 January and 23 January 2025 be approved as a true record of the proceedings and be signed by the Chair.

90 NOTIFICATION OF OTHER BUSINESS

Audio recording – 2 minutes 54 seconds

There was no other business notified.

91 CHAIR'S ANNOUNCEMENTS

Audio recording – 3 minutes 4 seconds

- (1) The Chair advised that, in accordance with Council Policy, the meeting would be recorded.
- (2) The Chair reminded Members that the Council had declared both a Climate Emergency and an Ecological Emergency. These are serious decisions, and mean that, as this was an emergency, all of us, Officers and Members had that in mind as we carried out our various roles and tasks for the benefit of our District.
- (3) The Chair drew attention to the item on the agenda front pages regarding Declarations of Interest and reminded Members that, in line with the Code of Conduct, any Declarations of Interest needed to be declared immediately prior to the item in question.
- (4) The Chair advised that the normal procedure rules in respect of debate and times to speak will apply.
- (5) The Chair advised that 4.8.23(a) of the Constitution did not apply to this meeting. A comfort break would be held at an appropriate time, should proceedings continue at length.
- (6) The Chair reminded the Committee about the upcoming Chair's Civic Event and Awards, being held on Friday 28 February 2025.

92 PUBLIC PARTICIPATION

Audio recording – 5 minutes 26 seconds

There was no public participation at this meeting.

93 ITEMS REFERRED FROM OTHER COMMITTEES

Audio recording – 5 minutes 30 seconds

The Chair advised that the item referred from Cabinet would be taken with the respective item on the agenda.

94 COMMUNITY GOVERNANCE REVIEW - DRAFT PROPOSALS FOR PUBLIC CONSULTATION

Audio recording – 5 minutes 46 seconds

Richard Beesley, a Consultant working for the Council, presented the report entitled 'Community Governance Review – Draft Proposals for Public Consultation' and advised that:

- The Council was undertaking a Community Governance Review (CGR) of parish electoral arrangements.
- The results from the first stage of public consultation had been used to develop a number of draft proposals.

- Once these draft proposals were approved by Council, a second round of public consultation would begin. Responses to the second round of public consultation would be used to develop the final recommendations which would come back to Council later in the year for consideration and implementation.
- This paper set out the background and legislative considerations, but nothing has been finalised at this stage.
- It was important to hear the views of local people, parish and town councils throughout the consultation.
- Part of the proposal was to change the electoral cycle to move parish and town council elections in line with North Herts Council elections.
- Another part was to amend the number of parish and town councillors as set out in paragraph 8.10 of the report.
- It was proposed to adjust several external parish boundaries and to create new town councils in Baldock and Hitchin.
- It was proposed to adjust internal parish ward boundaries to align with North Herts Council wards in Royston and to create of new parish ward in Ickleford.
- Leaflets would be distributed to households in areas affected by any proposed changes to ensure awareness of public consultations. This would start slightly later on 14 March 2025.

Following a question from Councillor Clare Strong, the Consultant advised that parish council elections could still be changed if required following the English Devolution White Paper.

Councillor Emma Fernandes proposed an amendment to recommendation 2.2 for a draft proposal for a parish and town council for Letchworth, subject to consultation with residents, with wards to align to the district wards. Councillor Nigel Mason seconded the amendment.

The following Members took part in the debate on the amendment:

- Councillor Ian Mantle
- Councillor Ralph Muncer
- Councillor David Chalmers
- Councillor Claire Strong
- Councillor Sean Nolan
- Councillor Sean Prendergast
- Councillor Nigel Mason
- Councillor Alistair Willoughby
- Councillor Tina Bhartwas
- Councillor Daniel Allen

Points raised during the debate included:

- There had been an unsuccessful attempt in the past to create a parish for Letchworth due to the results of consultation with local residents.
- Due to the uncertainty in the future of the Council following the English Devolution White Paper it was important to ensure that Letchworth was not left without a town council.
- The residents of Letchworth should be given the opportunity to discuss and offer their opinions before a decision of creating a parish and new town council was decided.
- There were concerns of the costs involved and whether it was the right time for this to happen with the uncertainty of the future of the Council.
- The number of councillor seats per ward could be determined at a later stage in the proposal.

Following a vote the amendment was **CARRIED**.

Councillor Steve Jarvis proposed an amendment to recommendation 2.2. to change the proposed number of councillors for parishes with fewer than 500 electors to five. Councillor Tom Tyson seconded the amendment.

The following Members took part in the debate on the amendment:

- Councillor Val Bryant
- Councillor Ralph Muncer
- Councillor Ruth Brown
- Councillor Claire Strong
- Councillor Martin Prescott
- Councillor Tom Tyson
- Councillor David Barnard

Points raised in the debate included:

- Concern that there may not be enough councillors if one or two were absent and the number had been reduced to five, for committee meetings to be quorum.
- Reducing to number of ward councillors to five in smaller parishes could limit the skill set and knowledge available.
- The number of ward councillors did not dictate the quality of the work carried out.
- Parish councils would be encouraged to respond to public consultations to have their say on what number of councillors would best suit their community.
- The view of the residents must be sought to ensure that services were delivered effectively.
- Five councillors worked well for smaller parishes and there was always an option to increase this if required.

Councillor David Chalmers withdrew the amendment proposed to recommendation 2.2 for a draft proposal for a parish and town council for Letchworth.

The following Members took part in the debate on the substantive motion:

- Councillor Ian Mantle
- Councillor Ralph Muncer
- Councillor Nigel Mason

Points raised in the debate included:

- To consider whether it was the right time to create a new parish and town council with the impending local government reorganisation.
- The importance of consultation with parish councils, who should be encouraged to respond to ensure their views are heard.

Councillor Daniel Allen proposed and Councillor Val Bryant seconded the amended substantive motion and, following a vote, it was:

RESOLVED: That Council:

- (1) Noted the outcome of the first stage consultation.

- (2) Agreed the Draft Proposals for the Community Governance Review, launching a public consultation on these [note that the Final Recommendations will be considered at a future Council meeting, taking the results of the public consultation into account] to subject to the following amendments:

i **Letchworth:**

Draft Proposals	<p>(1) Create a new parish for Letchworth, served by a new Town Council, subject to engagement from local residents through the consultation, with wards to align to the district wards:</p> <p>Grange: 3 Norton: 2 South East: 3 South West: 3 Wilbury: 2</p> <p>(2) To ensure local people are aware of the proposal to establish a Town Council and the opportunities and implications of it, hard-copy leaflets should be produced with the Comms team and distributed to every household in Letchworth inviting them to respond to the consultation. The information will be entirely neutral, leaving the opportunity for local people to discuss and motivate the decision.</p>
------------------------	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

- ii. That the proposed number of councillors for parishes with fewer than 500 electors be reduced from 7 to 5.
- (3) Noted that hard-copy leaflets will be distributed to households in areas where external parish boundaries are proposed to be moved, new parish councils established, or new parish wards implemented.

REASON FOR DECISIONS: The Council is required to keep parish electoral arrangements under review. Following the Local Government Boundary Commission for England (LGBCE) review of district electoral arrangements (Council size and warding patterns), it is necessary to review parish arrangements across the district to bring them into alignment, ensure they remain fit for purpose, and to ensure they continue to reflect local needs. This report provides Draft Proposals following the first round of public consultation. Before Final Recommendations can be developed and considered, there must be a public consultation on the Draft Proposals, the responses to which will be taken into account in forming the Final Recommendations.

95 **LEADERSHIP TEAM AND SENIOR MANAGEMENT RESTRUCTURE**

Audio recording – 48 minutes 50 seconds

N.B. The Service Director – Resources and the Service Director – Legal and Community moved to the public gallery for this item.

The Managing Director presented the report entitled 'Leadership Team and Senior Management Restructure' and advised:

- This was a very thorough report and was self-explanatory.
- The proposals in the report have been developed over several years.
- This proposal was supported by the findings of the LGA Corporate Peer Challenge who had stated that the leadership team should be increased to ensure sufficient strategic leadership capacity and effective deliverance of services.

- The current leadership team at North Hertfordshire District Council was smaller and cheaper than other similar councils.
- The Council had been operating with this temporary structure for 18 months and a difference in delivery had been seen.
- Having a seventh director had created capacity for the other directors to dedicate to other areas.
- A number of options had been considered and these were all detailed in the report.
- The post of the 'Managing Director' was to be renamed to 'Chief Executive' and the posts of 'Service Director' renamed 'Director'.
- Descriptions of each position could be found in paragraphs 8.2-8.10 of the report.
- Staff had engaged positively and constructively to the consultation and feedback has been incorporated into this proposal where possible. The proposal had changed from start of consultation to what was presented to Council.
- If approved, the seventh director position and new structure would start from the beginning of the new financial year, 1 April 2025.

The following Members asked questions:

- Councillor Claire Strong
- Councillor Joe Graziano
- Councillor Ralph Muncer
- Councillor Martin Prescott
- Councillor David Barnard
- Councillor Daniel Allen

In response to questions, the Managing Director advised that:

- Local government was a completely different sector to retail and division of budget and headcount did not equate to equality of responsibilities.
- The post of one of the directors was part time for 30 hours a week and savings from this had already been allocated elsewhere within the staffing budget.
- The best outcome for the Council would be to retain the individual who has been in the role on a temporary basis.
- Two service directors would be retiring over the next few months and retaining this individual would help to ensure the stability of the Council.
- The timeline for recruiting a new individual would be approximately 2-3 months from start to finish, plus any notice period.
- An individual transferring from another local authority would be able to retain continuous service benefits.
- The LGA Corporate Peer Challenge identified that the current leadership team was stretched and a permanent position of a seventh director would provide additional capacity.

Councillor Ruth Brown proposed an amendment to recommendation 2.1 that the additional budget of £112k per year was for 2 years only. Councillor Paul Ward seconded the amendment.

The following Members took part in the debate on the amendment:

- Councillor Sadie Billing
- Councillor Alistair Willoughby
- Councillor Sean Nolan
- Councillor Paul Ward
- Councillor Nigel Mason
- Councillor Daniel Allen

In response to the amendment, the Managing Director advised that:

- This amendment was not practical for the Council and would send the wrong message out to the service areas and director.
- This proposal could cost the Council more money in the long term and could result in loss of the existing member of staff.
- The English Devolution White Paper had introduced uncertainty in the workforce and had destabilised staff, further interim arrangements would not be helpful at this time..
- It would be harder to recruit someone to fill this post in 2027 due to the closeness of the local government reorganisation.

Points raised during the debate included:

- It could take months to find a suitable candidate and any position offered on a two year basis would be harder to recruit for.
- Members needed to support the leadership proposal to ensure stability of services to residents.
- Resourcing of staff was one of the top three risks for the Council.

Following a vote the amendment was **LOST**.

The following Members took part in the debate:

- Councillor Ralph Muncer
- Councillor Val Bryant

Points raised during the debate included:

- The recruitment of the Service Director – Environmental Health had made a positive impact on the directorate and improvements had been seen.
- Thought and hard work had gone into this proposal and Members wanted to keep staff happy.
- The LGA Corporate Peer Challenge wanted Officers to be able to achieve more and this would help to make this happen.

Councillor Daniel Allen proposed and Councillor Val Bryant seconded and, following a vote, it was:

RESOLVED: That Council:

- (1) Approved the ongoing additional budget of £112k per year for inclusion in the Budget 2025/26 (Revenue Budget and Investment Strategy).
- (2) Noted the proposed Leadership Team and Senior Management arrangements as set out in the report and the proposed timetable for the implementation of these arrangements.
- (3) Waived the constitutional requirements for the appoint of a Director, in this instance, and authorise the Head of Paid Service to offer the new role of Director - Regulatory to the current Service Director Housing and Environmental Health.
- (4) Authorised the Monitoring Officer and Chief Finance Officer to make the necessary amendments to the Council's Constitution (including the Contract Procurement Rules and Financial Regulations) and any consequential title changes to other Policy and Procedure documentation, to reflect the new Leadership Team and Senior Management arrangements.

REASON FOR DECISIONS: To ensure that the Council has a Leadership Team and Senior Management structure that is fit for purpose and is able to deliver the Council's priorities. The proposed structure also responds to one of the recommendations in the Corporate Peer Challenge report.

N.B. The Service Director – Resources and the Service Director – Legal and Community returned from the public gallery following the conclusion of this item.

96 PAY POLICY STATEMENT 2025/26

Audio recording – 1 hours 36 minutes 36 seconds

The Services Director Resources presented the report 'Pay Policy Statement 2025/26' and advised that:

- The draft Pay Policy Statement 2025/36 at Appendix 1 was for approval by Council.
- This was a statutory requirement to be approved annually as required by The Localism Act 2011.

Councillor Daniel Allen proposed and Councillor Ian Albert seconded and, following a vote, it was:

RESOLVED: That Council:

- (1) Approved the 2025/26 Pay Policy Statement attached at Appendix 1.
- (2) Delegated authority for revisions made in year to the Pay Policy Statement, to the Service Director - Resources, in consultation with the Leader of the Council. Revisions which might arise in the year include changes in structure, changes to employment benefits, subsequent pay awards agreed nationally and new legislative requirements.

REASON FOR DECISIONS: To comply with the requirements of Section 38 of the Localism Act 2011, Statutory Guidance issued under s40 and the Local Government Transparency Code 2015.

N.B. There was a break in proceedings following this item and the meeting reconvened at 21:23

97 BUDGET 2025/26 (REVENUE BUDGET AND INVESTMENT STRATEGY)

Audio recording 1 hour 56 minutes 30 seconds

N.B. Cllr Paul Ward declared an interest in this item due to his employment and left the Chamber for the duration of consideration of recommendation 2.8.

N.B. During the break Councillor Dominic Griffiths left the meeting and did not return.

The Chair advised that recommendation 2.8 would be taken ahead of recommendations 2.1-2.7 and 2.9 and the debate and vote on these would be taken separately.

The Chair invited Councillor Daniel Allen, as Leader of the Council, to introduce the referral from Cabinet.

N.B. Councillor Ruth Clifton left the Chamber at 21.29 and did not return.

Councillor Ian Albert, as the Executive Member for Finance and IT, presented recommendation 2.8 of the report entitled 'Budget 2025/26 (Revenue Budget and Investment Strategy)' and advised that:

- The Investment Strategy highlighted where the Council could invest surplus funds and included the prudential and treasury indicators.
- Capital spend implications meant that the Council would need to borrow to fund the capital programme and this meant that capital investment came with an increased cost.
- The Council would need to borrow externally in the longer term with a premium.
- Borrowing whether internally or externally resulted in a Minimum Revenue Position charge that was spread over the life of the asset it was used to fund.

Councillor Ian Albert proposed and Councillor Daniel Allen seconded and, the outcome of the recorded vote was:

VOTE TOTALS:

YES	:	40
ABSTAIN	:	0
NO	:	2
TOTAL	:	42

THE INDIVIDUAL RESULTS WERE AS FOLLOWS

Cllr Ian Albert	YES
Cllr Amy Allen	YES
Cllr Daniel Allen	YES
Cllr David Barnard	NO
Cllr Matt Barnes	YES
Cllr Tina Bhartwas	YES
Cllr Clare Billing	YES
Cllr Sadie Billing	YES
Cllr Ruth Brown	YES
Cllr Val Bryant	YES
Cllr Rhona Cameron	YES
Cllr David Chalmers	YES
Cllr Jon Clayden	YES
Cllr Mick Debenham	YES
Cllr Elizabeth Dennis	YES
Cllr Emma Fernandes	YES
Cllr Joe Graziano	
Cllr Dominic Griffiths	YES
Cllr Sarah Lucas	YES
Cllr Keith Hoskins	YES
Cllr Steve Jarvis	YES
Cllr Tim Johnson	YES
Cllr Chris Lucas	YES
Cllr Ian Mantle	YES
Cllr Nigel Mason	YES
Cllr Bryony May	YES
Cllr Caroline McDonnell	YES
Cllr Ralph Muncer	NO
Cllr Sean Nolan	YES
Cllr Louise Peace	YES
Cllr Vijaiya Poopalasingham	YES
Cllr Sean Prendergast	YES
Cllr Martin Prescott	YES
Cllr Emma Rowe	YES

Cllr Claire Strong	
Cllr Tamsin Thomas	YES
Cllr Tom Tyson	YES
Cllr Laura Williams	YES
Cllr Alistair Willoughby	YES
Cllr Stewart Willoughby	YES
Cllr Claire Winchester	YES
Cllr Dave Winstanley	YES
Cllr Donna Wright	YES
Cllr Daniel Wright-Mason	YES

RESOLVED: That Council:

- (1) Approved the Investment Strategy as detailed in Appendix F.

REASON FOR DECISION: The Council's Investment Strategy is set to comply with relevant statutory guidance, including the CIPFA Prudential Code. The Strategy also sets out the Council's approach to risks in relation to the investment of surplus cash.

N.B. Following the conclusion of the vote on recommendation 2.8, Cllr Paul Ward returned to the Chamber for the rest of the item.

The Chair invited Councillor Ian Albert, as the Executive Member for Finance and IT, presented recommendations 2.1-2.7 and 2.9 of the report entitled 'Budget 2025/26 (Revenue Budget and Investment Strategy)'. The Chair advised the Councillor Albert had been granted permission to speak for fifteen minutes on this item to deliver the budget speech. Councillor Albert advised that:

- The LGA Corporate Peer Challenge review had reported that prudent financial management had put the Council in a strong position with good reserves.
- This year the budget report had been combined into one which reflected that any capital spend would have revenue implications.
- There was an addendum version of the main report and Appendix B.
- The Council was required to set a balanced budget which could include using some reserves in the short term.
- The General Fund reserves were well above the minimum recommended by the Section 151 Officer.
- Funding growth for 2025/26 would come from the guaranteed Extended Producer Responsibility funding of £1.435 million.
- 2026/27 would be the first year since 2016 that the Council would have a multi-year settlement.
- Scenarios for future funding were considered in the Section 25 report at Appendix D.
- Consideration of the recommended minimum General Fund balances were detailed in paragraphs 8.16-8.18 of the report and the conclusions were in paragraphs 8.37-8.41.
- It was proposed to increase Council Tax for 2025/26 by 2.99% which was the maximum amount allowed without holding a referendum.
- Details of new savings and investments were identified at Appendix B (addendum version).
- There were three additional amendments be added to the recommendations. £30K for 2025/26 only, increase grant funding for Community Forums; contingency budget of £40K in 2025/26 for feasibility work to be carried out for viable options for a Learner Pool at Royston Leisure Centre; additional Community Safety Officer at a cost of £52K per year from 2025/2026 onwards .
- Details of the new capital investments were detailed at Appendix C.
- The Council wished to be able to deliver the project of installation of the Learner Pool at Royston Leisure Centre as set out in paragraph 8.2 of the report.

Following a question from Councillor Claire Strong, the Executive Member for Finance and IT advised that he believed the amount of £4 million quoted in the budget for the Museum Storage Option was the correct figure and should not be altered at this point.

N.B. Councillor Sean Nolan left the Chamber at 21.57 and did not return.

Councillor Ralph Muncer proposed amendments to the budget which would be debated and voted on separately. It was noted that Councillor Muncer had been granted an extension of ten minutes to speak. Councillor David Barnard seconded the amendments to R4, R5, R7, R8, R17, R19, R23, R28, R29, R30, R31, R32, R36.

The following Members took part in the debate about the Block 1 amendments R5, R7, R8 and R36 removal:

- Councillor Nigel Mason
- Councillor Dave Winstanley
- Councillor Elizabeth Dennis
- Councillor Alistair Willoughby
- Councillor Tina Bhartwas

Points raised during the debate included:

- The budget proposals had been through levels of scrutiny and it was important to invest in statutory services.
- This amendment would take away investment from areas that were in critical need.
- The Council needed to raise local taxes to provide services to residents.
- There was a significant amount of development planned within the district which were essential for the benefit of the local community.
- Officers provided essential frontline services to all residents in the district.

In response to the amendment, the Executive Member for Finance and IT advised that these were sound recommendations and to remove them from the budget would remove key roles needed to improve statutory services.

Following a recorded vote, the amendment was **LOST**.

VOTE TOTALS:

YES	:	16
ABSTAIN	:	1
NO	:	24
TOTAL	:	41

THE INDIVIDUAL RESULTS WERE AS FOLLOWS:

Cllr Ian Albert	NO
Cllr Amy Allen	NO
Cllr Daniel Allen	NO
Cllr David Barnard	YES
Cllr Matt Barnes	YES
Cllr Tina Bhartwas	NO
Cllr Clare Billing	NO
Cllr Sadie Billing	NO
Cllr Ruth Brown	YES
Cllr Val Bryant	NO
Cllr Rhona Cameron	NO
Cllr David Chalmers	NO

Cllr Jon Clayden	YES
Cllr Mick Debenham	NO
Cllr Elizabeth Dennis	NO
Cllr Emma Fernandes	NO
Cllr Joe Graziano	YES
Cllr Sarah Lucas	NO
Cllr Keith Hoskins	
Cllr Steve Jarvis	YES
Cllr Tim Johnson	YES
Cllr Chris Lucas	YES
Cllr Ian Mantle	NO
Cllr Nigel Mason	NO
Cllr Bryony May	YES
Cllr Caroline McDonnell	YES
Cllr Ralph Muncer	YES
Cllr Louise Peace	
Cllr Vijaiya Poopalasingham	NO
Cllr Sean Prendergast	YES
Cllr Martin Prescott	YES
Cllr Emma Rowe	NO
Cllr Claire Strong	YES
Cllr Tamsin Thomas	NO
Cllr Tom Tyson	YES
Cllr Paul Ward	YES
Cllr Laura Williams	NO
Cllr Alistair Willoughby	NO
Cllr Stewart Willoughby	NO
Cllr Claire Winchester	ABSTAIN
Cllr Dave Winstanley	NO
Cllr Donna Wright	NO
Cllr Daniel Wright-Mason	NO

The following Members took part in the debate about the Block 2 amendments (R4 to add the Air Quality Officer but not the other two posits, remove R17,R19, R26, R27, R28, R29 and R32, delay R23 and R30 to 2026/27 and limit R31 to £50K):

- Councillor Ruth Brown
- Councillor Matt Barnes
- Councillor Amy Allen
- Councillor Daniel Allen
- Councillor Nigel Mason
- Councillor Alistair Willoughby
- Councillor David Barnard

Points raised during the debate included:

- The comments regarding litters bins were negative. The removal of litter bins had been proven to reduce litter and not to increase it.
- Public consultations had been carried out regarding the removal of litter bins.
- There was a climate emergency and the provision of Hydrogenated Vegetable Oil (HVO) fuel waste, recycling and street cleansing services vehicles was the best way to reduce CO2 emissions.
- Fly tipping was a completely different issue to litter bins.

In response to the amendment, the Executive Member for Finance and IT advised that there would be no point to delaying the Ransoms Recreation maintenance project by one year and these amendments should be rejected.

Following a recorded vote, the amendment was **LOST**.

VOTE TOTALS:

YES	:	5
ABSTAIN	:	0
NO	:	38
TOTAL	:	43

THE INDIVIDUAL RESULTS WERE AS FOLLOWS:

Cllr Ian Albert	NO
Cllr Amy Allen	NO
Cllr Daniel Allen	NO
Cllr David Barnard	YES
Cllr Matt Barnes	NO
Cllr Tina Bhartwas	NO
Cllr Clare Billing	NO
Cllr Sadie Billing	NO
Cllr Ruth Brown	NO
Cllr Val Bryant	NO
Cllr Rhona Cameron	NO
Cllr David Chalmers	NO
Cllr Jon Clayden	NO
Cllr Mick Debenham	NO
Cllr Elizabeth Dennis	NO
Cllr Emma Fernandes	NO
Cllr Joe Graziano	YES
Cllr Sarah Lucas	NO
Cllr Keith Hoskin	NO
Cllr Steve Jarvis	NO
Cllr Tim Johnson	NO
Cllr Chris Lucas	NO
Cllr Ian Mantle	NO
Cllr Nigel Mason	NO
Cllr Bryony May	NO
Cllr Caroline McDonnell	NO
Cllr Ralph Muncer	YES
Cllr Louise Peace	NO
Cllr Vijaiya Poopalasingham	NO
Cllr Sean Prendergast	NO
Cllr Martin Prescott	YES
Cllr Emma Rowe	NO
Cllr Claire Strong	YES
Cllr Tamsin Thomas	NO
Cllr Tom Tyson	NO
Cllr Paul Ward	NO
Cllr Laura Williams	NO
Cllr Alistair Willoughby	NO
Cllr Stewart Willoughby	NO
Cllr Claire Winchester	NO
Cllr Dave Winstanley	NO
Cllr Donna Wright	NO
Cllr Daniel Wright-Mason	NO

Councillor Paul Ward proposed amendments to the budget. Councillor Ruth Brown seconded the amendments excluding those that had already been voted on, R5, R7, R8, R26 and £5K per Community Forums withdrawn as already included within the original motion proposed as amended. These were to remove the capital allocation for air-conditioning at Hitchin Town Hall of £100K, to amend the museum storage capital budget to £3 million and add a Royston Leaner Pool capital allocation for 2026/27- 2027/28 of £3 million.

In response to a question from Councillor Ralph Muncer, the Service Director Resources advised that the impact of the proposed amendments on the Section 25 report was difficult, but not impossible to achieve.

The following Members took part in the debate about the amendment:

- Councillor Martin Prescott
- Councillor Matt Barnes
- Councillor Tamsin Thomas
- Councillor Daniel Wright-Mason
- Councillor Elizabeth Dennis
- Councillor Tim Johnson
- Councillor Steve Jarvis
- Councillor Alistair Willoughby
- Councillor Mick Debenham
- Councillor Ralph Muncer
- Councillor Ruth Brown

Points raised during the debate included:

- There was a solid economic case for the Learner Pool at Royston Leisure Centre and it was good to see this project included.
- The Learner Pool was an investment that would provide wider benefits to the community and it should not be removed.
- The Museum Storage Option would achieve value for money whilst achieving a long-term project. £4 million was the upper limit for consideration.
- It was difficult to install air conditioning in Grade II listed buildings such as the Hitchin Town Hall and it is not yet known if the decarbonisation works will result in air conditioning not being required.

In response to the amendment, the Executive Member for Finance and IT advised that there was a huge amount of social value in these projects.

Following a recorded vote, the amendment was **LOST**.

VOTE TOTALS:

YES	:	20
ABSTAIN	:	0
NO	:	23
TOTAL	:	43

THE INDIVIDUAL RESULTS WERE AS FOLLOWS:

Cllr Ian Albert	NO
Cllr Amy Allen	NO
Cllr Daniel Allen	NO
Cllr David Barnard	YES
Cllr Matt Barnes	YES
Cllr Tina Bhartwas	NO

Cllr Clare Billing	NO
Cllr Sadie Billing	NO
Cllr Ruth Brown	YES
Cllr Val Bryant	NO
Cllr Rhona Cameron	NO
Cllr David Chalmers	YES
Cllr Jon Clayden	YES
Cllr Mick Debenham	NO
Cllr Elizabeth Dennis	NO
Cllr Emma Fernandes	NO
Cllr Joe Graziano	YES
Cllr Sarah Lucas	NO
Cllr Keith Hoskins	YES
Cllr Steve Jarvis	YES
Cllr Tim Johnson	YES
Cllr Chris Lucas	YES
Cllr Ian Mantle	NO
Cllr Nigel Mason	NO
Cllr Bryony May	YES
Cllr Caroline McDonnell	YES
Cllr Ralph Muncer	YES
Cllr Louise Peace	YES
Cllr Vijaiya Poopalasingham	NO
Cllr Sean Prendergast	YES
Cllr Martin Prescott	YES
Cllr Emma Rowe	NO
Cllr Claire Strong	YES
Cllr Tamsin Thomas	NO
Cllr Tom Tyson	YES
Cllr Paul Ward	YES
Cllr Laura Williams	NO
Cllr Alistair Willoughby	NO
Cllr Stewart Willoughby	NO
Cllr Claire Winchester	YES
Cllr Dave Winstanley	NO
Cllr Donna Wright	NO
Cllr Daniel Wright-Mason	NO

In response to a question from Councillor Ralph Muncer, the Service Director – Resources advised that the impact of the agreed amendments on the Section 25 report was difficult, but not impossible to achieve.

Councillor Ian Albert proposed and Councillor Daniel Allen seconded the amended original recommendations and, the outcome of the recorded vote was:

VOTE TOTALS:

YES	:	23
ABSTAIN	:	0
NO	:	20
TOTAL	:	43

THE INDIVIDUAL RESULTS WERE AS FOLLOWS

Cllr Ian Albert	YES
Cllr Amy Allen	YES
Cllr Daniel Allen	YES
Cllr David Barnard	NO

Cllr Matt Barnes	NO
Cllr Tina Bhartwas	YES
Cllr Clare Billing	YES
Cllr Sadie Billing	YES
Cllr Ruth Brown	NO
Cllr Val Bryant	YES
Cllr Rhona Cameron	YES
Cllr David Chalmers	NO
Cllr Jon Clayden	NO
Cllr Mick Debenham	YES
Cllr Elizabeth Dennis	YES
Cllr Emma Fernandes	YES
Cllr Joe Graziano	NO
Cllr Sarah Lucas	YES
Cllr Keith Hoskins	NO
Cllr Steve Jarvis	NO
Cllr Tim Johnson	NO
Cllr Chris Lucas	NO
Cllr Ian Mantle	YES
Cllr Nigel Mason	YES
Cllr Bryony May	NO
Cllr Caroline McDonnell	NO
Cllr Ralph Muncer	NO
Cllr Louise Peace	NO
Cllr Vijaiya Poopalasingham	YES
Cllr Sean Prendergast	NO
Cllr Martin Prescott	NO
Cllr Emma Rowe	YES
Cllr Claire Strong	NO
Cllr Tamsin Thomas	YES
Cllr Tom Tyson	NO
Cllr Paul Ward	NO
Cllr Laura Williams	YES
Cllr Alistair Willoughby	YES
Cllr Stewart Willoughby	YES
Cllr Claire Winchester	NO
Cllr Dave Winstanley	YES
Cllr Donna Wright	YES
Cllr Daniel Wright-Mason	YES

Therefore it was:

RESOLVED: That Council:

- (1) Noted the position on the Collection Fund and how it would be funded.
- (2) Noted the position relating to the General Fund balance and that due to the risks identified a minimum balance of £2.6 million was recommended.
- (3) Noted the revenue savings that were likely to be required in future years, combined with the Chief Finance Officer's section 25 report (Appendix D) which provided a commentary on the risks and reliability of estimates contained in the budget.
- (4) Approved the revenue savings and investments as detailed in Addendum Appendix B, as amended by additional proposals.
- (5) Approved the capital programme as detailed in Appendix C.

- (6) Approved a net expenditure budget of £22.914m, as detailed in Appendix E as amended.
- (7) Approved a Council Tax increase of 2.99%, which was in line with the provisions in the Medium Term Financial Strategy.
- (8) Approved the adoption of the four clauses in relation to the Code of Practice on Treasury Management (as detailed in paragraphs 8.32 to 8.35).
- (9) Approved to increase Grant funding for Community Forums by £30,000 for 2025/26 only, in the light of the continued reduced support to local organisations from County Council Member Locality Budgets.
- (10) Approved to set aside a contingency budget of £40k in 2025/26 that will allow cost effective feasibility work to be carried out to further assess whether there are viable options for a Learner pool at Royston Leisure Centre.
- (11) Approved that once having spoken with residents, particularly in the rural communities, to add an additional Community Safety Officer post at a cost of £52,000 per year from 2025/26 onwards.

REASONS FOR DECISIONS:

- (1) To ensure that all relevant factors are considered in arriving at a budget (revenue and capital) and Council Tax level for 2025/26. To ensure that the budget is aligned to Council priorities for 2024-28 as set out in the Council Plan.
- (2) The Council's Investment Strategy is set to comply with relevant statutory guidance, including the CIPFA Prudential Code. The Strategy also sets out the Council's approach to risks in relation to the investment of surplus cash.

98 COUNCIL TAX RESOLUTION 2025/26

Audio recording - 3 hours 37 minutes 3 seconds

The Service Director – Resources presented the report 'Council Tax Resolution 2024/25' and advised that:

- The Council was required to incorporate the various other elements of the Council Tax precepts to set the overall Council Tax bills for the district.
- As there would be an increase to the forecast spend for 2025/26 this had resulted in a change to the figures in recommendations 2.2 (a) and (b)'

Councillor Ian Albert proposed and Councillor Daniel Allen seconded the amended recommendations and, the outcome of the recorded vote was:

VOTE TOTALS:

YES	:	37
ABSTAIN	:	3
NO	:	1
TOTAL	:	41

THE INDIVIDUAL RESULTS WERE AS FOLLOWS:

Cllr Ian Albert	YES
Cllr Amy Allen	YES
Cllr Daniel Allen	YES
Cllr David Barnard	NO

Cllr Matt Barnes	YES
Cllr Tina Bhartwas	YES
Cllr Clare Billing	YES
Cllr Sadie Billing	YES
Cllr Ruth Brown	YES
Cllr Val Bryant	YES
Cllr Rhona Cameron	YES
Cllr David Chalmers	YES
Cllr Jon Clayden	YES
Cllr Mick Debenham	YES
Cllr Elizabeth Dennis	YES
Cllr Emma Fernandes	YES
Cllr Joe Graziano	ABSTAIN
Cllr Sarah Lucas	YES
Cllr Keith Hoskins	YES
Cllr Steve Jarvis	YES
Cllr Tim Johnson	YES
Cllr Chris Lucas	YES
Cllr Ian Mantle	YES
Cllr Nigel Mason	YES
Cllr Bryony May	YES
Cllr Caroline McDonnell	YES
Cllr Ralph Muncer	ABSTAIN
Cllr Louise Peace	YES
Cllr Vijaiya Poopalasingham	YES
Cllr Sean Prendergast	YES
Cllr Martin Prescott	
Cllr Emma Rowe	YES
Cllr Claire Strong	ABSTAIN
Cllr Tamsin Thomas	
Cllr Tom Tyson	YES
Cllr Paul Ward	YES
Cllr Laura Williams	YES
Cllr Alistair Willoughby	YES
Cllr Stewart Willoughby	YES
Cllr Claire Winchester	YES
Cllr Dave Winstanley	YES
Cllr Donna Wright	YES
Cllr Daniel Wright-Mason	YES

RESOLVED: That Council:

(1) Noted that at its meeting on 23 January 2025 the Council Tax Setting Committee confirmed the amount 50,836.30 as its Council Tax base for the year 2025/2026 in accordance with regulation 3 of the Local Authorities (Calculation of Council Tax Base) Regulations 2012 (the Regulations).

b) 50,836.30 being the amount calculated by the Council, in accordance with Regulation 3 of the Regulations, as its Council Tax base for the year.

c)

Parish/Town	Council Tax Base	Parish/Town	Council Tax Base
Ashwell	901.70	Knebworth	2,018.70
Barkway	438.90	Lilley	178.00
Barley	338.20	Offley	616.30

Bygrave	129.40	Pirton	702.50
Caldecote and Newnham	56.70	Preston	246.10
Clothall	86.90	Radwell	58.30
Codicote	1,711.30	Reed	160.60
Graveley	175.50	Royston	6,871.60
Great Ashby	2,012.10	Rushden and Wallington	212.10
Hinxworth	162.60	St Ippolyts	948.50
Holwell	160.20	St Pauls Walden	582.10
Ickleford	898.10	Sandon	247.50
Kelshall	80.90	Therfield	267.50
Kimpton	1,062.50	Weston	446.40
Kings Walden	425.00	Wymondley	431.20

Being the amounts calculated by the Council, in accordance with Regulation 6 of the Regulations, as the amounts of its Council Tax base for the year for dwellings in those parts of its area to which one or more special items relate.

- d) That it be noted that at this meeting on the 27 February 2025 the Council has calculated the Council Tax requirement for the Council's own purposes for 2025/26 (excluding Parish precepts) as £13,612,944. As detailed in 2.2 (e) below the sum of special items is £1,522,848 and hence the total Council Tax requirement (including Parish precepts) is £15,135,792.
- (2) That the following amounts be now calculated by the Council for 2025/2026 in accordance with Sections 31A, 31B and 34 to 36 of the Local Government and Finance Act 1992 (the Act):-
- a) £82,806,829 being the aggregate of the amounts which the Council estimates for the items set out in Section 31A(2)(a) to (f) of the Act.
 - b) £67,671,037 being the aggregate of the amounts which the Council estimates for the items set out in Section 31A(3) (a) to (d) of the Act.
 - c) £15,135,792 being the amount by which the aggregate at (a) above exceeds the aggregate at (b) above, calculated by the Council, in accordance with Section 31A(4) of the Act, as its Council Tax requirement for the year.
 - d) £297.74 being the amount at (c) above divided by the amount at 2.1(a) above calculated by the Council in accordance with Section 31B(1) as the basic amount of its Council Tax for the year.
 - e) £1,522,848 being the aggregate amount of all special items referred to in Section 34(1) of the Act.
 - f) £267.78 being the amount at (d) above less the result given by dividing the amount at (e) above by the amount at 2.1(a) above, calculated by the Council, in accordance with Section 34(2) of the Act, as the basic amount of its Council Tax for the year for dwellings in those parts of its area to which no special item relates.

g)

Parish/Town	Basic £	Parish Precept £	Total £
Ashwell	267.78	124.89	392.67
Barkway	267.78	98.28	366.06
Barley	267.78	99.24	367.02
Bygrave	267.78	71.95	339.73
Caldecote and Newnham	267.78	42.08	309.86
Clothall	267.78	21.59	289.37
Codicote	267.78	64.80	332.58
Graveley	267.78	57.94	325.72
Great Ashby	267.78	24.00	291.78
Hinxworth	267.78	68.75	336.53
Holwell	267.78	92.50	360.28
Ickleford	267.78	67.23	335.01
Kelshall	267.78	35.61	303.39
Kimpton	267.78	84.71	352.49
Kings Walden	267.78	90.75	358.53
Knebworth	267.78	95.29	363.07
Lilley	267.78	108.97	376.75
Offley	267.78	66.09	333.87
Pirton	267.78	95.61	363.39
Preston	267.78	68.10	335.88
Radwell	267.78	26.42	294.20
Reed	267.78	51.54	319.32
Royston	267.78	59.22	327.00
Rushden and Wallington	267.78	20.92	288.70
St Ippolyts	267.78	41.98	309.76
St Pauls Walden	267.78	86.79	354.57
Sandon	267.78	34.34	302.12
Therfield	267.78	37.38	305.16
Weston	267.78	51.52	319.30
Wymondley	267.78	100.53	368.31

being the amounts given by adding to the amount at 2.2(f) above the amounts of the special item or items relating to dwellings in those parts of the Council's area mentioned above divided in each case by the amount at 2.1(b) above, calculated by the Council, in accordance with Section 34(3) of the Act, as the basic amounts of its Council Tax for the year for dwellings in those parts of its area to which one or more special items relate.

h)

Parish/Town	Valuation Bands							
	A £	B £	C £	D £	E £	F £	G £	H £
Ashwell	261.78	305.41	349.03	392.67	479.93	567.19	654.45	785.34
Baldock	178.52	208.27	238.03	267.78	327.29	386.79	446.30	535.56
Barkway	244.04	284.71	325.38	366.06	447.41	528.75	610.10	732.12
Barley	244.68	285.46	326.23	367.02	448.58	530.14	611.70	734.04
Bygrave	226.49	264.23	301.98	339.73	415.23	490.72	566.22	679.46
Caldecote and Newnham	206.57	241.00	275.42	309.86	378.72	447.57	516.43	619.72
Clothall	192.91	225.06	257.21	289.37	353.68	417.98	482.28	578.74
Codicote	221.72	258.67	295.62	332.58	406.49	480.39	554.30	665.16
Graveley	217.15	253.33	289.52	325.72	398.11	470.48	542.87	651.44
Great Ashby	194.52	226.94	259.35	291.78	356.62	421.46	486.30	583.56
Hexton	178.52	208.27	238.03	267.78	327.29	386.79	446.30	535.56

Hinxworth	224.35	261.74	299.13	336.53	411.32	486.10	560.88	673.06
Hitchin	178.52	208.27	238.03	267.78	327.29	386.79	446.30	535.56
Holwell	240.19	280.21	320.24	360.28	440.35	520.40	600.47	720.56
Ickleford	223.34	260.56	297.78	335.01	409.46	483.90	558.35	670.02
Kelshall	202.26	235.97	269.67	303.39	370.81	438.23	505.65	606.78
Kimpton	234.99	274.16	313.32	352.49	430.82	509.15	587.48	704.98
Kings Walden	239.02	278.85	318.69	358.53	438.21	517.87	597.55	717.06
Knebworth	242.05	282.38	322.72	363.07	443.76	524.43	605.12	726.14
Langley	178.52	208.27	238.03	267.78	327.29	386.79	446.30	535.56
Letchworth	178.52	208.27	238.03	267.78	327.29	386.79	446.30	535.56
Lilley	251.17	293.02	334.88	376.75	460.48	544.19	627.92	753.50
Nuthampstead	178.52	208.27	238.03	267.78	327.29	386.79	446.30	535.56
Offley	222.58	259.67	296.77	333.87	408.07	482.25	556.45	667.74
Pirton	242.26	282.63	323.01	363.39	444.15	524.89	605.65	726.78
Preston	223.92	261.24	298.55	335.88	410.52	485.16	559.80	671.76
Radwell	196.13	228.82	261.50	294.20	359.58	424.95	490.33	588.40
Reed	212.88	248.36	283.83	319.32	390.28	461.24	532.20	638.64
Royston	218.00	254.33	290.66	327.00	399.67	472.33	545.00	654.00
Rushden and Wallington	192.47	224.54	256.62	288.70	352.86	417.01	481.17	577.40
St Ippolyts	206.51	240.92	275.34	309.76	378.60	447.43	516.27	619.52
St Pauls Walden	236.38	275.77	315.17	354.57	433.37	512.15	590.95	709.14
Sandon	201.41	234.98	268.54	302.12	369.26	436.39	503.53	604.24
Therfield	203.44	237.34	271.25	305.16	372.98	440.78	508.60	610.32
Weston	212.87	248.34	283.82	319.30	390.26	461.21	532.17	638.60
Wymondley	245.54	286.46	327.38	368.31	450.16	532.00	613.85	736.62

being the amounts given by multiplying the amounts at 2.2(f) and 2.2(g) above by the number which, in the proportion set out in Section 5(1) of the Act, is applicable to dwellings listed in a particular valuation band divided by the number which in that proportion is applicable to dwellings listed in valuation band D, calculated by the Council, in accordance with Section 36(l) of the Act, as the amounts to be taken into account for the year in respect of categories of dwellings listed in different valuation bands.

- (3) Noted that for 2025/2026 Hertfordshire County Council and the Hertfordshire Police & Crime Commissioner has stated the following amounts in precepts issued to the Council, in accordance with Section 40 of the Act, for each of the categories of dwellings shown below:-

Precepting Authority	Valuation Bands							
	A £	B £	C £	D £	E £	F £	G £	H £
Hertfordshire County Council	1,179.91	1,376.57	1,573.22	1,769.87	2,163.17	2,556.48	2,949.78	3,539.74
Hertfordshire Police & Crime Commissioner	176.67	206.11	235.56	265.00	323.89	382.78	441.67	530.00

- (4) That, having calculated the aggregate in each case of the amounts at 2.2(h) and 2.3 above, the Council, in accordance with Section 30(2) of the Local Government Finance Act 1992, hereby sets out the following provisional amounts as the amounts of Council Tax for 2025/2026 for each of the categories of dwellings shown below:-

List of parishes and tax at different bands (County, Care, Police, District and Parish)

Parish/Town	Valuation Bands							
	A £	B £	C £	D £	E £	F £	G £	H £
Ashwell	1,618.36	1,888.09	2,157.81	2,427.54	2,966.99	3,506.45	4,045.90	4,855.08
Baldock	1,535.10	1,790.95	2,046.81	2,302.65	2,814.35	3,326.05	3,837.75	4,605.30
Barkway	1,600.62	1,867.39	2,134.16	2,400.93	2,934.47	3,468.01	4,001.55	4,801.86
Barley	1,601.26	1,868.14	2,135.01	2,401.89	2,935.64	3,469.40	4,003.15	4,803.78
Bygrave	1,583.07	1,846.91	2,110.76	2,374.60	2,902.29	3,429.98	3,957.67	4,749.20
Caldecote and Newnham	1,563.15	1,823.68	2,084.20	2,344.73	2,865.78	3,386.83	3,907.88	4,689.46

Clothall	1,549.49	1,807.74	2,065.99	2,324.24	2,840.74	3,357.24	3,873.73	4,648.48
Codicote	1,578.30	1,841.35	2,104.40	2,367.45	2,893.55	3,419.65	3,945.75	4,734.90
Graveley	1,573.73	1,836.01	2,098.30	2,360.59	2,885.17	3,409.74	3,934.32	4,721.18
Great Ashby	1,551.10	1,809.62	2,068.13	2,326.65	2,843.68	3,360.72	3,877.75	4,653.30
Hexton	1,535.10	1,790.95	2,046.81	2,302.65	2,814.35	3,326.05	3,837.75	4,605.30
Hinxworth	1,580.93	1,844.42	2,107.91	2,371.40	2,898.38	3,425.36	3,952.33	4,742.80
Hitchin	1,535.10	1,790.95	2,046.81	2,302.65	2,814.35	3,326.05	3,837.75	4,605.30
Holwell	1,596.77	1,862.89	2,129.02	2,395.15	2,927.41	3,459.66	3,991.92	4,790.30
Ickleford	1,579.92	1,843.24	2,106.56	2,369.88	2,896.52	3,423.16	3,949.80	4,739.76
Kelshall	1,558.84	1,818.65	2,078.45	2,338.26	2,857.87	3,377.49	3,897.10	4,676.52
Kimpton	1,591.57	1,856.84	2,122.10	2,387.36	2,917.88	3,448.41	3,978.93	4,774.72
Kings Walden	1,595.60	1,861.53	2,127.47	2,393.40	2,925.27	3,457.13	3,989.00	4,786.80
Knebworth	1,598.63	1,865.06	2,131.50	2,397.94	2,930.82	3,463.69	3,996.57	4,795.88
Langley	1,535.10	1,790.95	2,046.81	2,302.65	2,814.35	3,326.05	3,837.75	4,605.30
Letchworth	1,535.10	1,790.95	2,046.81	2,302.65	2,814.35	3,326.05	3,837.75	4,605.30
Lilley	1,607.75	1,875.70	2,143.66	2,411.62	2,947.54	3,483.45	4,019.37	4,823.24
Nuthampstead	1,535.10	1,790.95	2,046.81	2,302.65	2,814.35	3,326.05	3,837.75	4,605.30
Offley	1,579.16	1,842.35	2,105.55	2,368.74	2,895.13	3,421.51	3,947.90	4,737.48
Pirton	1,598.84	1,865.31	2,131.79	2,398.26	2,931.21	3,464.15	3,997.10	4,796.52
Preston	1,580.50	1,843.92	2,107.33	2,370.75	2,897.58	3,424.42	3,951.25	4,741.50
Radwell	1,552.71	1,811.50	2,070.28	2,329.07	2,846.64	3,364.21	3,881.78	4,658.14
Reed	1,569.46	1,831.04	2,092.61	2,354.19	2,877.34	3,400.50	3,923.65	4,708.38
Royston	1,574.58	1,837.01	2,099.44	2,361.87	2,886.73	3,411.59	3,936.45	4,723.74
Rushden and Wallington	1,549.05	1,807.22	2,065.40	2,323.57	2,839.92	3,356.27	3,872.62	4,647.14
St Ippolyts	1,563.09	1,823.60	2,084.12	2,344.63	2,865.66	3,386.69	3,907.72	4,689.26
St Pauls Walden	1,592.96	1,858.45	2,123.95	2,389.44	2,920.43	3,451.41	3,982.40	4,778.88
Sandon	1,557.99	1,817.66	2,077.32	2,336.99	2,856.32	3,375.65	3,894.98	4,673.98
Therfield	1,560.02	1,820.02	2,080.03	2,340.03	2,860.04	3,380.04	3,900.05	4,680.06
Weston	1,569.45	1,831.02	2,092.60	2,354.17	2,877.32	3,400.47	3,923.62	4,708.34
Wymondley	1,602.12	1,869.14	2,136.16	2,403.18	2,937.22	3,471.26	4,005.30	4,806.36

REASONS FOR DECISIONS:

- (1) The Council is required to set the Council Tax and to set the overall level of Council Tax for the following financial year, taking into account the precepts of all major and local precepting authorities.
- (2) The level of Council Tax Requirement has been considered necessary to meet the budgeting needs of the Council for 2025/26.

N.B. Councillors Martin Prescott and Tim Johnson left the Chamber at 23.08 and did not return.

99 QUESTIONS FROM MEMBERS

Audio recording - 3 hours 39 minutes 43 seconds

No questions were submitted by Members of the Council, in accordance with Standing Order 4.8.11 (b).

100 NOTICE OF MOTIONS

Audio recording - 3 hours 39 minutes 46 seconds

No motions were received by Members of the Council, in accordance with Standing Order 4.8.12.

The meeting closed at 11.12 pm

Chair