

MINUTES  
OF A MEETING OF THE  
**BOROUGH COUNCIL OF WOKING**

held on 23 February 2023

Present:

Cllr S Hussain (Mayor)  
Cllr M I Raja (Deputy Mayor)

Cllr H Akberali	Cllr C S Kemp
Cllr A Azad	Cllr A Kirby
Cllr T Aziz	Cllr R N Leach
Cllr A-M Barker	Cllr L S Lyons
Cllr J Brown	Cllr L M N Morales
Cllr G T Cosnahan	Cllr J P Morley
Cllr K M Davis	Cllr E Nicholson
Cllr S Dorsett	Cllr S M Oades
Cllr G W Elson	Cllr D Roberts
Cllr W P Forster	Cllr J R Sanderson
Cllr P J T Graves	Cllr T G Spenser
Cllr I Johnson	Cllr M A Whitehand
Cllr D M C Jordan	

Also Present: Claire Storey, Independent CoOpted Member.

Absent: Councillors M Ali, A J Boote and A Caulfield.

**1. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE.**

Apologies for absence had been received from Councillor Ali, Councillor Boote and Councillor Caulfield.

**2. MAYOR'S COMMUNICATIONS.**

The Mayor had attended a number of events in recent weeks, including the ShopMobility Pancake Race, a visit to a ladies' club in Knaphill and a lunch hosted by the Friends of Chobham Rugby Club.

Leigh Clarke, Director of Finance and Section 151 Officer

On behalf of the Council, the Mayor paid tribute to Leigh Clarke who, after working at the Council for eighteen years, would be leaving her roles as Director of Finance and Section 151 Officer. The Council thanked Leigh for her long service, noting that she had been pivotal in many of the Council's achievements over the years.

**3. URGENT BUSINESS.**

No items of Urgent Business were considered.

#### 4. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST.

In accordance with the Officer Employment Procedure Rules, the Chief Executive, Julie Fisher, declared a disclosable personal interest (non-pecuniary) in any items concerning the companies of which she was a Council-appointed director. The companies were listed in an attached schedule. The interests were such that Mrs Fisher could advise on those items.

In accordance with the Officer Employment Procedure Rules, the Strategic Director - Corporate Resources, Kevin Foster, declared a disclosable personal interest (non-pecuniary) in any items concerning the companies of which he was a Council-appointed director. The companies were listed in an attached schedule. The interests were such that Mr Foster could advise on those items.

In accordance with the Officer Employment Procedure Rules, the Strategic Director - Place, Giorgio Framalico, declared a disclosable personal interest (non-pecuniary) in any items concerning the companies of which he was a Council-appointed director. The companies were listed in an attached schedule. The interests were such that Mr Framalico could advise on those items.

In accordance with the Officer Employment Procedure Rules, the Strategic Director - Communities, Louise Strongitharm, declared a disclosable personal interest (non-pecuniary) in any items concerning the companies of which she was a Council-appointed director. The companies were listed in an attached schedule. The interests were such that Mrs Strongitharm could advise on those items.

#### 5. QUESTIONS.

Copies of questions submitted under Standing Order 8.1 together with draft replies had been published in advance of the meeting. The replies were confirmed by Members of the Executive, supplementary questions were asked and replies given as set out below:

1. Question from Councillor Colin Kemp

“The town buggy service is a life line for many of our most vulnerable residents and so earlier this year I questioned what impact outsourcing the grants to Foundation for Surrey would have for this service provision and was assured it would be supported. I understand the application has been refused by the Foundation. Why has this been allowed to happen and will the council now step in to support this vital service.”

Reply from Councillor Will Forster

“Although Woking Community Transport (WCT) completed an expression of interest for funding for the town centre buggy, however they did not submit a full application by the deadline. Therefore, it is not correct that the Community Foundation for Surrey (CFS) refused the application.

I have been reassured that WCT was fully aware of the grant process and deadline for the Woking Borough Council Community Fund, so I am as disappointed as Councillor Kemp that no application was submitted and the town centre buggy will not be funded by the Community Fund.

The Council will work with WCT, Woking Shopmobility and other partners to ensure local people with mobility issues are supported when visiting Woking. Woking's town centre facilities are fully compliant under the Disability Discrimination Act which requires public service providers to take reasonable steps to provide access for disabled people.

However, it is worth noting that shopping habits have fundamentally changed following the pandemic and as a result the demand for the town centre buggy has declined significantly. For example, last month the buggy was not used at all after 1.30 pm. It made a total of 172 trips across the town centre which when calculated against the monthly cost, equates to over £8 per trip across Jubilee Square."

#### Supplementary Question

"Thank you, Mr. Mayor, I do. I've seen an e-mail, I know they left it right to the last minute but I've seen an e-mail that came in and I can't remember the dates, but I think it was due in on the 23<sup>rd</sup> of something and they sent in on the 23<sup>rd</sup>, but I don't think it was over the limit, I think it was right on it. Would the Portfolio Holder take away to go and have a look into it and just see if we can't do anything to help this very valuable service for Woking's elderly and disabled in the town centre?"

#### Reply by the Deputy Leader

"Thank you, Mr. Mayor. As stated in my answer, they did not apply on time and I have checked this despite the initial question, they did not apply on time, which is sad that they did not wish to do so. However this Council is going to work with, particularly Woking Shopmobility, but other organisations to ensure our town is accessible and I can hopefully give Councillor Kemp that assurance."

#### 2. Question from Councillor Colin Kemp

"The Community bus service is used by the disabled, elderly and most vulnerable residents. Demand is continuing to grow with a further 208 Woking residents joining the service since March last year with the current membership standing at 3745 Woking residents. However, since the council's financial support was switched to a Service Level agreement the council is continuing to reduce support by 3% this year and 13% over the next three years. This is putting huge pressure on the service to increase their ticket prices for the most vulnerable users. Does the portfolio holder agree that this is hugely unfair on our most vulnerable residents and confirm what will be done to rectify this terrible situation."

#### Reply from Councillor Will Forster

"Woking Community Transport is a valued local charity and the increase in membership is to be commended. The scale of the charity is also to be noted and the service supports local residents in Woking and wider residents across the County in other contractual arrangements with the County Council.

The Council has committed to funding Woking Community Transport for its services through a Service Level Agreement in order to better monitor and support the charity. Previously the charity had to submit annual funding applications to the Council but this new arrangement provides more clearer, secure and sustainable funding.

A reduction in the Community Grants budget was agreed by the Executive in Autumn 2021 and therefore there is an overall reduction in community grants this year to meet that agreement. All recipients of Service Level Agreements have themselves agreed a reduction in costs and Woking Community Transport will receive a 10% reduction, not 13%, over the next three years under current arrangements. Woking Borough Council will continue to support our local community transport provider more than any other Council in Surrey.”

Supplementary Question

No.

3. Question from Councillor Melanie Whitehand

“In the Investment Programme Paper.. 12.1..

It states..

There are a number of initiatives that have not been included in the Investment Programme as they are not yet ready for formal consideration. These include projects at the former Robin Hood and Anchor pub sites.

My understanding from the last Full Council meeting, whereby I submitted a question on these two sites and that question was answered by Cllr Roberts was that the sites were under review. The paper says there are no formal plans for these sites. Are there informal plans that the residents of Knaphill could help shape if they are consulted on at an early stage? One of these sites is now an eyesore and to see the other site be in such a sad state is disappointing for the Village street scene so it would be helpful if the Portfolio Holder could give some steer on future plans on these two sites.”

Reply from Councillor Dale Roberts

“As set out in my answer two weeks ago, we need to carefully consider our options for these two sites given the complexities of these and the over-inflated price paid. The Council now has a strategic approach to the management of its assets and future proposals for all Council assets will be considered in the context of the Council’s strategic priorities and our wider financial challenges. There are currently no formal or informal plans for these sites.”

Supplementary Question

No.

4. Question from Councillor Melanie Whitehand

“I recently subscribed to the Green waste collection programme.

I was advised I would be added to the list and payment was required in order for my name to be included.

I duly paid the subscription of £45, as requested. It occurred to me though that all the many customers on the waiting list have also paid their fee up front. Could the Portfolio Holder advise me as to whether this is normal practice? Because it would

seem that Amey are holding some considerable funds before any service is delivered.”

Reply from Councillor Peter Graves

“Since the scheme commenced in 2009, all new garden waste subscribers pay the subscription fee upon signing up to the service. This generates an instruction for Amey to deliver the garden waste containers. To ensure that the resident receives a full years' worth of collections, the 12-month subscription commences from the date that the bin is delivered to the property, and not the date that the resident paid to join the service.”

Supplementary Question

No.

**6. COUNCIL TAX WBC23-011.**

The Council had before it the reports and recommendations for the Medium Term Financial Strategy, General Fund, Service Plans, Budgets and Prudential Indicators 2023-24, the Housing Revenue Account Budgets 2023-24, the Investment Programme 2022-23 to 2026-27, the Capital, Investment and Treasury Management Strategies and the ThamesWey Business Plans. A report on the 2023-24 Council Tax proposals was also before the Council.

The Mayor set out the procedure to be adopted in determining the Council Tax for the coming year. The Mayor would first take the reports on the Medium Term Financial Strategy, General Fund, Service Plans, Budgets and Prudential Indicators, Housing Revenue Account Budgets, the Investment Programme, the Capital, Investment and Treasury Management Strategies, and the ThamesWey Business Plans. The Mayor would then invite the Council to consider the recommendation in the report on the 2023/24 Council Tax.

A procedure note had been prepared which clearly set out all the recommendations before the Council.

The Leader of the Council, Councillor Barker, made a statement on the Budget for 2023-24. Councillor Davis, on behalf of the Conservative Group, and Councillor T Aziz, Leader of the Labour Group, responded to the budget statement.

Following the responses, the Mayor advised the Council that the Portfolio Holder for Finance, Councillor Roberts, would introduce the reports for Agenda Items 6A to 6D together; an opportunity to debate each of the items would be given following the introduction. The Leader of the Council would introduce agenda item 6e, ThamesWey Business Plans 2023.

Councillor Roberts set out the basis on which the proposals for Council Tax for the coming year had been drawn up, outlining the financial position faced by the Authority and the objectives going forward. A 3% increase in Council Tax was proposed for Woking Borough Council, from £255.46 in 2022/23 to £263.12 in 2023/24; it was noted that Surrey County Council had agreed an increase of 2.99% in their precept and that the precept set by the Surrey Police and Crime Commissioner had increased by £15, the maximum allowed for 2023/24.

The total of the precepts from Surrey County Council, Surrey Police and Crime Commissioner, and the budget required for the Borough's purposes resulted in a Band D Council Tax of £2,248.77 in 2023/24, an overall increase of £71 on the previous year. The sum comprised of elements directed to the County Council (£1,675.08), the Police and Crime Commissioner (£310.57) and Woking Borough Council (£263.12).

Following the introduction, the Council was directed to the first of the reports, the Medium Term Financial Strategy, General Fund, Service Plans, Budgets and Prudential Indicators.

**6a. Medium Term Financial Strategy (MTFS), General Fund, Service Plans, Budgets and Prudential Indicators 2023-24 WBC23-002.**

The report presented the latest update on the Council's Medium Term Financial Strategy, incorporating detailed budget proposals for 2023/24. The Council was required to have regard to the report in approving the budget and council tax.

The Council was able to set a balanced budget for 2023/24 with the use of £8.3m one off reserves and had made arrangements:

- to operate a cost control framework and discipline;
- to establish further savings through developing a minimum viable position for all services;
- to track savings and establish full financial variance monitoring in a timely way;
- To establish a Fit for the Future programme;
- to review the prudent position on the amounts set aside for debt;
- to stabilise reserves; and
- to review Company business plans and investments.

The Council was in the territory of Section 114 but at present a Section 114 Notice was not required, though this could change as work on the 2024/25 budget progressed.

The net budget for the General Fund was £11.4m and the resulting Band D Council Tax figure for 2023/24 was £263.12, an increase of 3% compared to the current year. The budget did not incorporate any changes to the Minimum Revenue Provision (MRP), the amount the Council set aside for the repayment of debt. An independent review of the Council's MRP policy had been commissioned, to be completed by early April 2023. Until then, the MRP policy adopted in 2022 was being adopted, with any changes arising from the review to be brought forward in 2023/24.

The overall approach proposed in the papers before the Council were debated at length following which the Portfolio Holder was afforded an opportunity to reply to the key points raised. Following the debate, the Mayor referred the Members to the recommendations within the report and in accordance with Standing Order 10.8 the recommendations were put to a vote.

The names of Members voting for and against the recommendations were recorded as follows:

In favour:	Councillors T Aziz, A-M Barker, G Cosnahan, W Forster, P Graves, I Johnson, A Kirby, R Leach, L Lyons, L Morales, J Morley, E Nicholson, S Oades, M I Raja, D Roberts, J Sanderson and T Spencer.
Total in favour:	17
Against:	Councillors A Azad, J Brown, K Davis, S Dorsett, G Elson and M Whitehand.
Total against:	6
Present not voting:	The Mayor, Councillor S Hussain, and Councillors Dr H Akberali, D Jordan and C Kemp,
Total present not voting:	4

The recommendations were therefore carried by 17 votes in favour and 6 votes against.

**RESOLVED**

- That (i) the Revenue Estimates and Human Resource requirements for 2023/24 be approved;
- (ii) a Band D Council Tax for the Borough of Woking for 2023/24 of £263.12 be approved; and
- (iii) the Prudential Indicators at Appendix 3 to the report be approved, subject to any changes arising from consideration of the Investment Programme, revenue budgets and Final Government Settlement.

**6b. Housing Revenue Account Budgets 2023-24 WBC23-003.**

The Council noted that the Housing Revenue Account (HRA) was forecast to be significantly impacted by rising costs from energy and contractual inflation in the coming year. The HRA was already facing considerable financial challenges as a result of losing homes and associated rental income to the Sheerwater regeneration project and the legacy impact of 4 years' of rent cuts.

Following a consultation, the Government had taken the decision to adopt a 7% ceiling for increases in social rents. It was therefore proposed that the Council should increase its rents by 7% for 2023-24. Even so, the HRA was forecast to make an estimated deficit of £1,365,498 in the coming year, requiring a contribution of £1,366,898 from reserves to maintain a working balance per property of £100. Work was currently underway to secure the sum of £3.8m from ThamesWey, representing the compensation agreed for the costs incurred by the Council in underwriting the New Vision Homes' costs of developing the first proposed regeneration scheme for Sheerwater. The payment would be incorporated into the 2024 ThamesWey Business plans, considered later in the meeting, and would be critical for the HRA if it was to set a balanced budget in 2024-25 and beyond.

The proposals were debated in detail by the Members, with a number of concerns expressed over the impact of the proposed increase in social rents on tenants. The

Portfolio Holder for Housing, Councillor Johnson, responded to the points raised and emphasised the necessity of ensuring that sufficient income was achieved to meet the costs of repairs. It was further stated that those tenants on full benefits would not be affected by the increase in rent.

The Mayor referred the Members to the recommendations within the report and in accordance with Standing Order 10.8 the recommendations were put to a vote.

The names of Members voting for and against the recommendations were recorded as follows:

In favour: Councillors Dr H Akberali, A-M Barker, G Cosnahan, W Forster, P Graves, I Johnson, D Jordan, A Kirby, R Leach, L Lyons, L Morales, J Morley, E Nicholson, S Oades, D Roberts, J Sanderson and T Spencer.

Total in favour: 17

Against: None.

Total against: 0

Present not voting: The Mayor, Councillor S Hussain, and Councillors A Azad, T Aziz, J Brown, K Davis, S Dorsett, G Elson, C Kemp, M I Raja and M Whitehand.

Total present not voting: 10

The recommendations were therefore carried by 17 votes in favour and no votes against.

**RESOLVED**

That (i) the Final Housing Revenue Account budgets for 2023-24, as set out in Appendix 1 to the report, be agreed; and

(ii) with effect from 3 April 2023, rents be increased by 7%.

**6c. Investment Programme 2022-23 to 2026-27 WBC23-004.**

The Mayor referred Councillors to the report on the Investment Programme which set out the capital and one-off investments required to deliver the Council's key strategies and objectives. The Programme included projects where the funding and consequent revenue implications had been incorporated into the General Fund and Housing Revenue Account budgets for 2023/24. It was noted that inclusion in the Investment Programme did not necessarily mean a project would proceed, only that the Council would undertake it if resources permitted.

The report outlined the impact of the Covid pandemic on local government finances and that it was clear that the economic model on which the Council's budget was based had changed.

The Mayor referred the Members to the recommendations within the report and in accordance with Standing Order 10.8 the recommendations were put to a vote.



The names of Members voting for and against the recommendations were recorded as follows:

In favour: Councillors Dr H Akberali, A Azad, T Aziz, A-M Barker, J Brown, G Cosnahan, K Davis, S Dorsett, G Elson, W Forster, P Graves, I Johnson, D Jordan, C Kemp, A Kirby, R Leach, L Lyons, L Morales, J Morley, E Nicholson, S Oades, M I Raja, D Roberts, J Sanderson, T Spencer and M Whitehand.

Total in favour: 26

Against: None.

Total against: 0

Present not voting: The Mayor, Councillor S Hussain.

Total present not voting: 1

The recommendations were therefore carried by 26 votes in favour and no votes against.

**RESOLVED**

- That (i) the Investment Programme 2022/23 to 2026/27 be approved subject to reports on projects where appropriate;
- (ii) the proposed financing arrangements be approved; and
- (iii) the Local Authority Housing Fund (LAHF) grant be accepted and used to acquire 15 properties for Afghan and Ukrainian families.

**6d. Capital, Investment and Treasury Management Strategies WBC23-005.**

The Council considered a report which set out recommendations for the Treasury Management Strategy, the Minimum Revenue Provision (MRP) Strategy and the Treasury Management Prudential Indicators, as required under the Chartered Institute of Public Finance and Accountancy's Prudential Code.

Since 2019/20 the Council had also been required to approve a Capital Strategy and Investment Strategy outlining the Council's activities, the reasons for and types of investments undertaken and the risk exposure as a result of these decisions. The purpose was to provide a comprehensive and transparent picture of the Council's position, linking links into the Council's overall corporate plans and objectives.

The Mayor referred the Members to the recommendations within the report.

In accordance with Standing Order 10.8 the recommendations were put to a vote. The names of Members voting for and against the recommendations were recorded as follows:

In favour: Councillors Dr H Akberali, A Azad, T Aziz, A-M Barker, J Brown, G Cosnahan, K Davis, S Dorsett, G Elson, W Forster, P Graves, I Johnson, D Jordan, C Kemp, A Kirby, R Leach, L Lyons, L

Morales, J Morley, E Nicholson, S Oades, M I Raja, D Roberts, J Sanderson, T Spencer and M Whitehand.

Total in favour:	26
Against:	None.
Total against:	0
Present not voting:	The Mayor, Councillor S Hussain.
Total present not voting:	1

The recommendations were therefore carried by 26 votes in favour and no votes against.

**RESOLVED**

- That (i) the Treasury Management Strategy set out in the report be approved;
- (ii) the Capital and Investment Strategies for 2023/24 be approved; and
- (iii) the Treasury Management Prudential Indicators set out in table 1 of Section 4 of the Treasury Management Strategy and the MRP policy set out in Appendix A be approved, subject to any changes arising from consideration of the Investment Programme and revenue budgets.

**6e. ThamesWey Business Plans 2023 WBC23-010.**

The Leader of the Council introduced the report on the ThamesWey Business Plans for 2023. In doing so, it was noted that the Council had established a new corporate governance framework, creating a Shareholder Advisory Group (SAG) to provide a clear focus for Members to set out policy, strategy, and control for the companies that it funded. The business plans had been reviewed by the Group as well as in the context of the challenging budget and Medium Term Financial Strategy for the Council.

Some concern was expressed over the possibility of pausing the Sheerwater Regeneration scheme. However, the Council was advised that a mid-term review had always been planned and that it was important to ensure a robust and careful approach was taken to further debt finance, mitigating the risk to the Council's financial position and allowing time for the Council to consider the policy implications of any rephrasing of borrowing.

The Leader of the Council responded to the points made during the debate, following which the Mayor referred the Members to the recommendations within the report. In accordance with Standing Order 10.8 the recommendations were put to a vote and the names of Members voting for and against the recommendations were recorded as follows:

In favour:	Councillors Dr H Akberali, T Aziz, A-M Barker, G Cosnahan, W Forster, P Graves, I Johnson, D Jordan, A Kirby, R Leach, L Lyons, L Morales, J Morley, E Nicholson, M I Raja, D Roberts, J Sanderson and T Spencer.
------------	---

Total in favour:	18
Against:	None.
Total against:	0
Present not voting:	The Mayor, Councillor S Hussain, and Councillors A Azad, J Brown, K Davis, S Dorsett, G Elson, C Kemp, S Oades, and M Whitehand.
Total present not voting:	9

The recommendations were therefore carried by 18 votes in favour and no votes against.

**RESOLVED**

- That (i) the wider ThamesWey Business Plans be noted;
- (ii) £70.3m of funding, required to continue delivery of ThamesWey Business Plans through to the end of 2023/24, be approved with the exception of Cyan, Blue and Emerald phases, which will pause at tender stage to allow these phases to be part of the wider review of the delivery of Sheerwater;
- (iii) a review period for Sheerwater phases be agreed, including the future of Cyan, Blue, Emerald and other phases, with any subsequent report back to Full Council in July; and
- (iv) the wider Shareholder actions be agreed for review in 2023.

**Council Tax 2023/24.**

The Mayor referred the Council back to the report on the Council Tax for the coming year, and the recommendation contained therein. As noted earlier in the meeting, it was proposed that the Council's element of the 2023/24 Council Tax levels should be increased by 3%.

The Mayor referred the Members to the recommendations within the report and, in accordance with Standing Order 10.8, the recommendations were put to a vote.

The names of Members voting for and against the recommendations were recorded as follows:

In favour:	Councillors A-M Barker, G Cosnahan, W Forster, P Graves, I Johnson, A Kirby, R Leach, L Lyons, L Morales, J Morley, E Nicholson, S Oades, D Roberts, J Sanderson and T Spencer.
Total in favour:	15
Against:	Councillors A Azad, J Brown, K Davis, S Dorsett, G Elson, C Kemp and M Whitehand.
Total against:	7

Present not voting: The Mayor, Councillor S Hussain, and Councillors Dr H Akberali, T Aziz, D Jordan and M I Raja.

Total present not voting: 5

The recommendations were therefore carried by 15 votes in favour and 7 votes against.

RESOLVED

That (i) the revenue estimates for 2023/24, as submitted, be approved;

(ii) it be noted that the Chief Financial Officer, in accordance with the terms of his delegated authority, has calculated the following amount for the year 2023/24 in accordance with regulations made under Section 31B(3) of the Local Government Finance Act 1992 as amended (the Act) as:-

a) 42,611 being the amount calculated by the Council, in accordance with regulation 3 of the Local Authorities (Calculation of Council Tax Base) Regulations 1992, as its Council Tax base for the year;

(iii) the Council calculates that the Council Tax requirement for the Council's own purposes for 2023/24 is £11,211,968.

(iv) the following amounts be now calculated by the Council for the year 2023/24 in accordance with Sections 31 to 36 of the Act:-

a) £170,931,278 being the aggregate of the amounts which the Council estimates for the items set out in Section 31A (2) of the Act;

b) £159,719,310 being the aggregate of the amounts which the Council estimates for the items set out in Section 31A (3) of the Act;

c) £11,211,968 being the amount by which the aggregate at 4 a) above exceeds the aggregate at 4 b) above, calculated by the Council, in accordance with Section 31A(4) of the Act, as its council tax requirement for the year;

d) £263.12 being the amount at 4 c) above divided by the amount at 2 a) above, calculated by the Council, in accordance with section 31 B of the Act, as the basic amount of its Council Tax for the year;

(v) it be noted for the year 2023/24 Surrey County Council and Surrey Police and Crime Commissioner have issued precepts to the Council, in accordance with Section 40 of the Local Government Finance Act 1992, for each of the categories of dwellings in the Council's area as shown in the table below.

(vi) the Council, in accordance with Section 30 and 36 of the Local Government Finance Act 1992, hereby sets the aggregate

amounts shown in the table below as the amounts of council tax for the year 2023/24 for its area and for each of the categories of dwellings :-

Valuation Band	Surrey County Council Basic £	Adult Social Care £	Total Surrey County Council £	Surrey Police and Crime Commissioner £	Woking Borough Council £	Aggregate of Council Tax Requirements £
A	971.43	145.29	1,116.72	207.05	175.41	1,499.18
B	1,133.33	169.51	1,302.84	241.55	204.65	1,749.04
C	1,295.24	193.72	1,488.96	276.06	233.88	1,998.90
D	1,457.14	217.94	1,675.08	310.57	263.12	2,248.77
E	1,780.95	266.37	2,047.32	379.59	321.59	2,748.50
F	2,104.76	314.80	2,419.56	448.60	380.06	3,248.22
G	2,428.57	363.23	2,791.80	517.62	438.53	3,747.95
H	2,914.28	435.88	3,350.16	621.14	526.24	4,497.54

(vii) the Council's basic amount of Council Tax for 2023/24 is not excessive in accordance with the principles approved under Section 52 ZB of the Local Government Finance Act 1992 as amended.

## 7. APPOINTMENT OF STATUTORY OFFICER WBC23-012.

The Leader of the Council introduced a report proposing the appointment of a statutory officer, namely a Section 151 Officer. It was noted that the Council's current Director of Finance and Section 151 Officer, Leigh Clarke, would be leaving Woking Borough Council and new management arrangements would need to be put in place. It was therefore proposed that the interim Director of Finance should be appointed as the Council's Section 151 Officer whilst the appointment of a permanent Director of Finance was made.

RESOLVED

That Brendan Arnold, Interim Director of Finance, be appointed as Director of Finance (S151 Officer) with effect from 1<sup>st</sup> March 2023.

## 8. NOTICES OF MOTION.

No notices of motion had been received.

The meeting commenced at 7.00 pm and ended at 9.52 pm

Chairman: \_\_\_\_\_

Date: \_\_\_\_\_