

## **NORTHUMBERLAND COUNTY COUNCIL**

At a meeting of the **Northumberland County Council** held at County Hall, Morpeth on Wednesday 20 February 2019 at 3.00 pm.

### **PRESENT**

Councillor R.R. Dodd  
(Leader of the Council) in the Chair

### **MEMBERS**

Armstrong, E.	Lang, J.A.
Bawn, D.	Lawrie, G.
Beynon, J.	Ledger, D.
Bridgett, S.C.	Moore, R.
Campbell, D.	Murray, A.H.
Cartie, E.	Nisbet, K.
Castle, G.	Oliver, N.
Cessford, T.	Parry, K.
Clark, T.	Pattison, W.
Crosby, B.	Purvis, M.
Daley, W.	Quinn, K.
Davey, J.G.	Reid, J.
Davey, S.	Renner-Thompson, G.
Dickinson, S.	Rickerby, L.J.
Dunbar, C.	Riddle, J.R.
Dungworth, S.	Robinson, M.
Dunn, L.	Roughead, G.
Flux, B.	Sanderson, H.G.H.
Foster, J.	Seymour, C.
Gallacher, B.	Sharp, A.
Gibson, R.	Simpson, E.
Gobin, J.J.	Stewart, G.
Grimshaw, L.	Stow, K.
Hepple, A.	Swinburn, M.
Hill, G.	Swithenbank, I.C.F.
Homer, C.	Thorne, T.N.
Horncastle, C.W.	Towns, D.
Hutchinson, J.I.	Watson, J.G.
Jackson, P.A.	Wearmouth, R.W.
Jones, V.	Webb, G.
Kennedy, D.	Wilson, T.

## OFFICERS

Bradley, N.	Service Director: Strategic Commissioning and Finance
Elsdon, A.	Service Director: Finance
Hadfield, K.	Committee Services and Scrutiny Manager
Henry, L.	Legal Services Manager
Lally, D.	Chief Executive
McEvoy-Carr, C.	Executive Director of Adult Social Care and Children's Services
Roll, J.	Democratic Services Manager

Around 20 members of the press and public were in attendance.

Before the start of the meeting, Councillor Dodd asked all members to stand for a minute's silence as a mark of respect to Councillor Bernard Pidcock, who had sadly passed away on 9 February, and to Honorary Alderman and former Councillor Peter Hutchinson, who had also recently died.

Following this, the Leader paid tribute to Councillor Pidcock, whom he described as being a very dedicated councillor and champion of his community. He had brought passion and character to everything he did, and had the ability to transcend politics and be friends with everyone. His loss would be deeply felt by both members and staff alike.

Councillor Dungworth also spoke in tribute to Councillor Pidcock, whom she had regarded as her political and personal friend. He was the epitome of what a good councillor should be - passionate, committed and hard working, and his family and friends had been inundated by stories from the local community of how he had helped people. She felt all members could learn something from his way of being a councillor. He had lived every bit of his life as a socialist with a smile and ready sense of humour, and all members were poorer now that he was no longer with them.

### **66. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Dale, Richards and Wallace.

### **67. MINUTES**

With regard to Minute No.57 (Cabinet Minutes, pg 15), Councillor Hill clarified that her point had been that members had been aware that Cabinet had considered the Council Tax Support Scheme, but that it had not been included as an item on the Council agenda. Officers had accepted that this should be avoided in future.

Councillor Cessford advised that he was listed as being present in the attendance, and also in the apologies for the meeting. He had in fact, been absent.

With regard to the same minute, Councillor G. Davey remarked that the minutes clearly showed that the proposed 50% cut in Council tax support had been considered within the Conservative Administration's time period.

Councillor Grimshaw referred to the question she had raised under the same item, regarding the number of vulnerable people who had been involved in the 500 responses.

Councillor Oliver apologised for not responding to Councillor Grimshaw directly, but was aware of a response to a Freedom of Information request submitted by the Labour Group. The information could not be provided because it had been an anonymised response. Regarding the timing of the proposed 50% reduction in Council Tax support, he reiterated his previous response setting out the timetable and confirming that it was not something that had happened during the lifetime of the Conservative Administration. He offered to share the information and spreadsheet after the meeting if members wished to see him about it.

With regard to Minute No. 60 (Motions), Councillor Reid advised that Council had agreed that there should be a progress report on each agenda on this matter. There was no progress report on the agenda, and he felt there should be, even if there was nothing to report.

Mr Henry replied that a copy of the letter recently issued to the Minister had been sent to members with the Council summons. Short of saying that the letter had been issued, he was not sure what else could have been done. Councillor Dodd advised that the point was noted.

**RESOLVED** that the minutes of the meeting of County Council held on 9 January 2019 be confirmed as a true record, signed by the Business Chair and sealed with the Common Seal of the Council, subject to Councillor Cessford's amendment.

## **68. DISCLOSURE OF MEMBERS' INTERESTS**

Councillor Castle disclosed a registerable personal interest in Minute No. 84(2) of the Cabinet minutes of 12 February 2019 which had been circulated in the Chamber. He advised that he would leave the chamber should there be any discussion on the matter.

Councillor Robinson disclosed a personal, non pecuniary interest in item 9 on the agenda (Charges for Care and Support Services for Adults), and advised that he would vote on the matter.

## **69. CORRESPONDENCE**

As previously referred to, the Business Chair advised that a letter had been sent to the Minister regarding the RMT industrial action, adding that the strike was now over.

## **70. MEMBER QUESTIONS**

### **Question 1 from Councillor Hill to Councillor Oliver**

What is the total amount (including cost breakdown) that NCC incurred in the calendar year of 2018 on membership fees and other associated costs through membership of national and regional bodies including NALC, NEREO, the LGA and any other organisations which offer advice, information, training and similar membership services to local authorities?

Councillor Oliver responded that around £462k pa was spent on around 80 organisations varying in amount from £45 pa to £60,224 pa. Many of the memberships involved were to satisfy legal requirements or offered benefits, such as cost savings. The figures for the organisations mentioned were NALC - nil, NEREO - £31,824, LGA - £60,224. These also offered additional benefits including advice and benchmarking services.

Councillor Hill responded that, given the concerns over the quality of advice from these bodies as Herefordshire Council had found out, concerns about impartiality and the absence of any interest from these bodies in genuine reform of local government, she asked whether Councillor Oliver could be confident that this did not need to be looked at again to ensure that taxpayers were being given value for money. Councillor Oliver responded that the list could be looked at with Finance staff, but he could not comment on the Herefordshire issue mentioned. Very good advice had been received from the LGA in the past, and each organisation would be looked at individually to establish any areas where money did not need to be spent, but he could not comment on the other specific issues.

### **Question 2 from Councillor Hill to Councillor Oliver**

Since the 1st May 2017, how much money has been spent by this authority on staff compromise agreements, often dubbed “gagging agreements”? What was the total amount spent by this authority on these agreements between May 1st 2013 to May 1st 2017?

Councillor Oliver advised that, since May 2017 £1,135,518 had been spent, and a very similar figure between May 2013 and May 2017. Contractual termination or compromise agreements, which had received recent media attention, were different to gagging agreements. The agreements which the Council entered into often included a non disclosure clause, but they were effectively compromise agreements, not non disclosure agreements. These were used when it was necessary to achieve a quick resolution and was in the interests of the parties involved.

Councillor Hill queried whether Councillor Oliver agreed these payments added to public concern about the volume and number being paid out, and the gagging nature of them. If an officer left another authority with a six figure pay out and then joined this authority and left with another six figure pay out, members of the public would rightly ask whether the authority was doing its homework. Councillor Oliver could not comment on specific cases but the principle should be that the authority asked questions about things like this. If a large payment was made it would be declared in the Council's accounts, and these issues would need to be looked at on a case by case basis. He agreed that the Administration would want to know about such cases, and felt that there would be occasions when it was necessary.

## **71. CABINET MINUTES**

The Leader moved the minutes of Cabinet held on Tuesday 15 January 2019 and drew members' attention to the capital investment programme detailed at Minute No. 80(2).

**RESOLVED** that the minutes of Cabinet held on Tuesday 15 January 2019 be received.

## **72. COMMITTEE MINUTES**

### **(1) Corporate Services and Economic Growth OSC**

These were presented by Councillor Bawn.

**RESOLVED** that the minutes of the Corporate Services and Economic Growth OSC be received.

### **(2) Family and Children's Services OSC**

These were presented by Councillor Renner Thompson.

**RESOLVED** that the minutes of the Family and Children's Services OSC be received.

### **(3) Health and Wellbeing OSC**

These were presented by Councillor Watson.

With regard to Minute No. 60 (Update on Rothbury Community Hospital), Councillor Bridgett thanked councillors for their contribution, particularly Councillors Dungworth and Moore for their due diligence and searching questions. It had been reported that the closure of the hospital did not impact on the County Council. However, he felt it was becoming clear that it was starting to have a financial impact, through the increase on homecare packages and referrals to nursing care, public transport, highways and fire and rescue. In view of this, he asked whether an independent review would be done by Scrutiny to look into the actual cost of the closure to the Council. He

also asked that, where the hospital was the only substantive issue on the agenda, whether it would be possible to hold the Scrutiny meeting in Rothbury, which had happened with other meetings.

Councillor Watson responded that a number of members of the Committee were attending a meeting in Rothbury soon, as well as the NHS holding meetings in the area. It was not usual for Scrutiny to meet in a particular area. Councillor Dodd advised that Councillor Bridgett would receive a written response to his first part of his question.

With regard to Minute No.53 (Hadston/Amble and Rothbury Dental Services), Councillor Dickinson expressed his thanks to the Chair and the Committee for monitoring this issue. He was glad to see that the tender was out, albeit delayed, but was concerned about some of the wording regarding the potential for servicing Hadston and other areas from Amble, as each had its own individual pressures to deal with. Members needed to be aware of this and to keep the pressure on.

Councillor Watson appreciated these comments, adding that members had been concerned about the length of time which had been taken. An explanation had been given for this which had provided some background, and he would ensure that the issues raised by Councillor Dickinson would be taken into consideration.

**RESOLVED** that the minutes of the Health and Wellbeing OSC be received.

**(4) Health and Wellbeing Board**

These were presented by Councillor Dodd.

**RESOLVED** that the minutes of the Health and Wellbeing Board be received.

**(5) Audit Committee**

These were presented by Councillor Hill

**RESOLVED** that the minutes of the Audit Committee be received.

**73. REPORT OF THE EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR OF ADULT SOCIAL CARE AND CHILDREN'S SERVICES**

**Charges for Care and Support Services for Adults**

The report presented comments received during the recent consultation about proposed changes to the Council's charging policy for care and support services, and asked the Council to adopt a revised charging policy. The Cabinet's recommendations on this report had been circulated in the Chamber, along with a proposed amendment to recommendation 4 in the report (copy attached to the sealed minutes).

Councillor Jones introduced the report, commenting that no-one welcomed having to bring the proposed charges forward, but in the overall financial context set out in the budget, she believed they were necessary. As the issues involved were quite complex, she took members through the recommendations in detail, explaining each one. The first three set out the background, the next six were the proposed changes and the final four asked the Council to confirm existing elements of its charging policy and to adopt a formal statement of the policy attached as Appendix six to the report.

Since Cabinet had considered the report the previous week, new information had come out and the Government had frozen its figures. An amendment was therefore proposed, which had been circulated, to phase in the charge. This replaced recommendation 4 in the report with the following, and would have no impact on the Council's budget as a whole:-

*"To reduce the standard allowance for disability-related costs for people getting the highest rates of the main non-means-tested disability benefits to £40 per week from April 2019, and £35 per week from April 2020."*

*and in the Annex to Appendix 3 (the Charging Policy), under the heading "Standard Allowances" replace the figure "£35.00" with the following:*

*"£40.00 (from 8 April 2019 to 5 April 2020), and £35.00 thereafter"*

This was seconded by Councillor Swinburn.

A number of members spoke on this:-

- Councillor Dungworth pointed out that this would affect very vulnerable people. She expressed thanks that the consultation responses had been included in the report and referred to some of the genuine comments and concerns which had been submitted. The people who were impacted the most were in the protected groups. People would vote with their feet and would end up requiring more intensive care, and day care centres would end up being cut. There would be no winners in this and she urged all non Administration members to think about these most vulnerable people, and demand that the money be found elsewhere.
- Councillor Grimshaw supported this. Some of the responses made had been very moving, and the impact would be felt on care homes when carers could no longer provide the necessary support. She asked whether this financial impact on care homes had been considered.
- Councillor Reid thanked Councillor Jones for clearly setting out the complexities of this issue. The issue was not a new one and he did not feel people really understood the nature of the report. This would be the only way the Council could continue to deliver this service in Northumberland, because people were living longer. He did not feel it would be as bad in practice as people feared. He accepted that there were worries from users, but these could be worked through.

- Councillor Cartie felt the proposal was dreadful and would have a massive impact on communities, as paying more for care would mean a greater reliance on food banks. Also, mortality rates were actually stabilising, if not reducing, because of poverty.
- Councillor Robinson understood the need to balance the budget but felt that micro management could mean the wider picture was lost. He also queried what was meant by recommendation 12. Councillor Jones confirmed that this related to the charges for services provided to carers, and no changes were proposed.
- Councillor Dickinson felt this was the wrong thing to do and could not be justified. The proposals would affect the people who were already at breaking point, as the Council was not the only organisation asking more of them. Responses had come in from organisations which understood the system inside out and the effect these proposals would have, and which were familiar with the circumstances of the people who accessed these packages of care. He urged members not to support it so that the proposals, and the areas of impact, could be looked at again.
- The Leader reminded members that it had been made clear in Scrutiny that no-one would be forced to pay if they could not afford it, and that individual packages would be agreed with officers. This was about the Administration taking a responsible approach to making provision for an ageing population. The County had one of the best social care systems in the country and measures had to be taken to ensure it had a sustainable future or it would collapse.

In response to some of these points, Councillor Jones confirmed that the savings gap had been considered, and she encouraged members to focus on why the proposals were necessary. Officers had been working hard to minimise potential impacts and any individual could ask to have their circumstances reviewed if they believed they could not afford to pay, in order to make sure their charge was at a level which they could reasonably manage. The proposals would be very little effect on those on low incomes. She accepted the point made about people being frightened and advised that a lot had been put in place to make sure that carers and care managers were aware of what the changes would mean, and to make sure people understood that extra support had been put in place to help. She stressed that the Authority would never ask any individual to pay more than it cost to provide. If someone felt that they had other disability related items of care above the standard level of social care and they felt this was more than the Council was allowing, they just had to say so. She reminded members that this consultation had begun on 21 October 2018 until December, and asked why members had not raised any concerns before now when there had been ample opportunity for this. She felt that some of the concerns being expressed were not genuine.

On the required number of members calling for a named vote on this issue, the votes were cast as follows:-

**FOR: 36** as follows:-

Armstrong, E.	Oliver, N.
Bawn, D.L.	Pattinson, W.
Beynon, J.A.	Quinn, K.R.
Castle, G.	Reid, J.
Cessford, T.	Renner-Thompson, G.
Daley, W.	Rickerby, L.J.
Dodd, R.R.	Riddle, J.R.
Dunbar, C.	Roughead, G.
Flux, B.	Sanderson, H.G.H.
Gibson, R.	Seymour, C.
Homer, C.	Sharp, A.
Horncastle, C.W.	Stewart, G.
Hutchinson, J.I.	Stow, K.
Jackson, P.A.	Swinburn, M.
Jones, V.	Thorne, T.
Lawrie, R.	Towns, D.
Moore, R.	Watson, J.G.
Murray, A.H.	Wearmouth, R.W.

**AGAINST: 26** as follows:-

Bridgett, S.C.	Grimshaw, L.
Campbell, D.	Hepple, A.
Cartie, E.	Hill, G.
Clark, T.S.	Lang, J.
Crosby, B.	Ledger, D.
Davey, J.G.	Nisbet, K.
Davey, S.	Parry, K.

Dickinson, S.	Purvis, M.
Dungworth, S.	Robinson, M.
Dunn, L.	Simpson, E.
Foster, J.	Swithenbank, I.C.F.
Gallacher, B.	Webb, G.
Gobin, J.J.	Wilson, T.

**ABSTENTION: 1** as follows:-

Kennedy, D.	
-------------	--

It was therefore **RESOLVED** that:-

- (a) the contents of the report on comments made during the consultation, attached as Appendix A be noted;
- (b) the equality impact assessment, attached as Appendix B, be noted;
- (c) the detailed advice provided in the report, and advice from the Care Act statutory guidance cited in the report, be noted;
- (d) the standard allowance for disability-related costs for people getting the highest rates of the main non-means-tested disability benefits be reduced to £40 per week from April 2019, and £35 per week from April 2020, and in the Annex to Appendix 3 (the charging policy), under the heading “Standard Allowances” the “£35.00” figure be replaced with the following:-  
“£40.00 (from 8 April 2019 to 5 April 2020), and £35.00 thereafter”;
- (e) the minimum income figures for members of a couple set out in national regulations be adopted, but capping the additional charge for working age adults at a figure calculated on the same basis as the figure of £19.45 quoted in the consultation document (adjusted as necessary for changes in the nationally prescribed minimum income figures);
- (f) the policy that charges for home care will take account of the full cost to the Council of the person’s service, up to the limit of what the person is assessed as able to afford to pay, with the exceptions set out in the report for the “very rural” areas of Northumberland and for other special circumstances, be adopted;
- (g) in principle, all social care day services from 1 October 2019 be charged for on the basis of their full cost, up to the limit of what each person is assessed as able to afford to pay, including those services operated by the mental health organisation Blyth Star which are currently not chargeable but are similar in nature to other services which are; and authority be delegated to

the Executive Director, in consultation with the Cabinet Member for Adult Wellbeing & Health, to determine what Blyth Star services should be exceptions to this, because charging would undermine the nature of the support which they offer;

(h) the discount currently offered to service users who pay by Direct Debit be ended, and in its place, an introductory offer for new charge-payers of a discount of £10 on their first three bills be introduced;

(i) a weekly administration fee be introduced for people who choose to ask the Council to arrange services for them when they have savings of more than the capital limit (currently £23,250), and would be able to make private arrangements. This fee to be based on the actual administrative costs, and initially set at £3.45, or £4.00 for people not paying by Direct Debit. The discount for payment by Direct Debit provided for in the previous recommendation will not be available where a person is paying an administration fee;

(j) all income above the minimum amounts provided for in regulations continue to be treated as available to pay charges, other than where there are specific exceptions in the Council's policy;

(k) it be confirmed that there will continue to be no maximum weekly charge;

(l) after considering the advice from the Care Act statutory guidance quoted in section 9 of the report, and the reasoning set out in that section, it be confirmed that carers should continue to be charged on the same basis as disabled people for any services provided directly to meet their own needs; and

(m) the charging policy attached as Appendix C be adopted, (taking into account the changes referred to in resolution (d) above), to take effect from 8 April 2019.

#### **74. REPORTS OF THE EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR OF FINANCE AND DEPUTY CHIEF EXECUTIVE**

##### **(1) Medium Term Financial Plan 2019-22 and Budget 2019-20**

The report provided the Medium Term Financial Plan 2019-22 and Budget for 2019- 20, following the Government's Autumn Budget of 29 October 2018 and the publication of the provisional Local Government Finance Settlement on 13 December 2018. An amendment to the table on page 30 of the report (point 115), and the recommendations of the Cabinet meeting of 12 February 2019 were circulated (copies attached to the sealed minutes).

The Leader introduced the MTFP and Budget and highlighted a number of points including:-

- Real change was beginning to happen under the Conservative Administration, which was determined to be forward looking and ambitious for the whole of the County. No longer would handouts be sought from the Government, but the case would be made for real investment in the County to make sure it had a great future.
- There had been some great successes in the past year - a £600m investment fund from the creation of the North of Tyne Combined Authority, and a multi million pound investment fund from the Borderlands Growth Deal bringing money and power to enable the Authority to decide on its own future. This would provide the means to make Northumberland a great place to live, work, visit and invest in.
- All of this required financial stability, and the Administration had worked hard to fix the Council's finances. Over the next three years, the MTFP plan before members would result in a balanced budget. The previous Administration had left a debt of almost £1.5 bn, which had been reduced to around £700m. This was a major achievement and provided the financial stability which was needed.
- The Administration planned to retain and improve essential central services. A base budget review had been done, and over the next three years £15m extra would be put into Adult Services, £2.2m extra into Children's Services and £800k into post 16 transport giving all young people in Northumberland equal access to education.
- The Administration was tackling the long term structural issues of the County, such as the lack of affordable housing for local people. This would be addressed by a new Council house building programme which would be one of the first in the country for decades. There were poor standards of educational attainment in the County, particularly in secondary education, and the Administration planned a major capital investment programme, including a rebuild of Astley Community High School which had included in the budget for the first time and would be delivered. He was also pleased to announce a firm commitment to a £15m investment for a new High School in Berwick. Work had also been ongoing for some time on the business case for major improvements to James Calvert Spence College.
- Special Educational Needs had also been neglected for some time with too many children being sent out of County, due to lack of local facilities. This had been addressed, and a major new facility, Ashdale School, was just about to open in Ashington. All Councillors would be invited along to visit this state of the art facility.
- A huge investment programme had begun on the County's highways with extra investment provided by the Government
- The Administration had committed to spending £100m on the County's roads over its four year term and this was well on the way to being achieved. People could now see the benefits of this investment.
- For the first time, investment was being made in car parks which was very important to the economic life of the County's towns. Work had been done to establish where the areas of need were and a £10m fully funded plan was in place to deliver the extra spaces.
- Health and wellbeing improvement was another important commitment for the Administration and investment in the County's parks, including Druridge Bay Country Park and Hirst Park in Ashington played a major

part in this. There was a programme to upgrade and rebuild the County's leisure centres after years of neglect. The new leisure centre in Berwick would be in planning by the Spring and delivered as quickly as possible. Major changes would be seen in Berwick as a result of measures which had been taken in the last 18 months by the Administration. £18m had been included in the budget for the first time this year for a new leisure centre in Morpeth which was much needed.

- Active Northumberland had been rescued from financial collapse at the end of the previous Administration the previous year, but they now had a sound financial plan and were being backed by significant investment from the Council.
- This year a new town centre would be delivered in Bedlington, and significant progress would be made in delivering a new town centre for Ashington which had private sector interest and investment and would deliver hundreds of new jobs. Real progress was also being made on the Hexham old bus station site.
- Transport investment was key to the County's long term future and there were exciting opportunities ahead. Two vital schemes had been built into the budget - the Blyth Relief Road, a much needed measure to tackle the tremendous congestion, and there was an opportunity for major national funding for the Northumberland Line. A business case to Government was being drawn up for this. After decades of talking about it, something was now actually being done, and he questioned why no progress had been made on this during previous Administrations. This would make a major difference to the lives of local residents.
- He referred to the alternative budget offered by Labour on Facebook and commented that a lot of it seemed to be the things that were already being done, and he detailed some of the issues involved.
- The Conservative budget was about prudent planning, making essential services better, providing what communities needed, tackling long term issues which had been neglected for years, providing a more prosperous future for residents, and about making a County which worked for everyone.

Councillor Oliver, as Cabinet Member for Corporate Services, then addressed members as follows:-

When the Conservative Administration had taken control in May 2017 there had been a huge hole in the budget, rapidly rising debt and large parts of the County completely ignored. The Conservatives had run the 2017 campaign on a very simple manifesto and the political landscape had now changed.

Residents across the County now realised that the Conservative Administration offered the brightest future for the County. Labour had introduced a punitive tax on 6th Form students but had failed to deal with the challenges in education. The Conservatives had promised to reverse this decision in their manifesto and this had been delivered. Investment was being made in schools, and leadership standards were being raised because everyone in the County needed the best possible start. Labour had planned to take the Authority into £1.5bn of debt. Left unchecked, this would have been catastrophic. Arch had been abolished and Advance Northumberland would build extra care housing, council housing and regenerate town centres. Labour

had planned to spend £80m on a new county hall in Ashington which would not have created any new jobs, only moved the existing ones. The Administration would deliver a new development in Ashington with proper jobs and facilities which residents could be proud of. Significant regeneration projects were also being delivered in Bedlington, Blyth and Prudhoe amongst others. More and better paid jobs were being created. Labour's record on roads had been poor with rural areas generally ignored. The Administration had a significant road investment programme, fixing potholes and seeing Government investment into main roads.

He believed everyone in the chamber wanted the same thing - the opportunity to offer residents a more prosperous and better future. The fundamental differences were around how this could be achieved. Labour had had decades to address the significant differences in education and health levels across the County. The Administration was committed to addressing these differences and investing in transformative change. This was a budget which dealt with the serious challenges the Authority faced and offered increased prosperity for everybody, and he urged members to support it.

A number of members then spoke including:-

- Councillor Bridgett referred to three areas of efficiencies on pgs 53--55 of the Budget book. He sought assurances on highways maintenance that front line staff would not be affected. He also raised concerns about the proposal for electronic town and parish council consultation on planning applications, which would be a problem where broadband was an issue, and sought clarification about the proposed review of Community Chest funding where savings of £86,000 were identified. Councillor Sanderson confirmed that front line staff would not be affected. The savings would come from improved communication, better use of IT and improvements to how defects and potholes were being fixed. Regarding planning consultations, Councillor Oliver added that where there was a clear problem with e-access, then this would be looked at on a case by case basis. Regarding the community chest, the central budget was being reduced but an announcement would be made regarding alternative plans which would provide greater opportunities for local community organisations to access funding.
- Councillor G. Davey commented that the Council was now unrecognisable in local government as a Council which dealt with a £1bn budget. He reminded members that the Labour Administration had built a number of council houses from Embleton to Blyth which were of very good quality. In response to some of the comments made, he advised that many of the commitments made by the Leader had been included in the last Labour manifesto, and that the "black hole" had been created by moving the MTFP by an additional year, which had sucked in £35m of additional cuts. The Conservative Administration was simply replicating the cuts being made by the Government on the poor at a local level, and felt that the Labour Administration had left the Council in very good financial shape. He moved a number of amendments to the budget:-

- a. The reinstatement of the council tax support scheme, to be funded from business rates retention. The Administration's council tax support scheme would take almost £700k from the poorest people in the Blyth and Ashington area alone, which would impact drastically on the local economy.
- b. Maintain current level of charges for home care, to be funded through the growth in income from housing.
- c. The formation of a cross party working group to scrutinise the £500m capital spend and work with those given the delegation.
- d. The inclusion of the borrowing requirement for the Northumberland Line and the Blyth Relief Road into this year's budget not 2023, so that if the opportunity arose from the Government, the money was in place.

Councillor Davey felt that the Administration's budget attacked ordinary people and would ruin the County, and he referred to concerns that the Budget was based on a secret report planning to reduce the terms and conditions of staff, which was how the MTFP was being funded and how the reserves were being kept at the level they were.

- The Leader advised that these amendments should have been shared with the S151 Officer to ensure that they stood up financially. The council tax support scheme had been decided upon in January and Council had just decided on care charges so there was no scope to change these decisions which had just been made. The Monitoring Officer confirmed that no decision taken by Council could be reversed or changed within six months without a written notice of motion being presented by the requisite number of members. This requirement affected both the council tax support scheme and care charges amendments. The other amendments could validly be debated, but he echoed the Leader's comments regarding the ability of the S151 Officer to look at the impact of those amendments. That was not to say that they couldn't be debated and voted upon, but he counselled members as Monitoring Officer that the S151 Officer and other officers had not been able to comment on the precise financial implications of those amendments. He advised that the Business Chair's ruling was final on the acceptance of any amendments.
- Councillor Davey then confirmed that he wished to put forward amendments (c) and (d) detailed above, which was seconded by Councillor Dungworth.
- Councillor Reid commented that it would be physically impossible to start the Northumberland Line in the current financial year, so amendment (d) was pointless. Regarding the Working Group, he suggested that was what Scrutiny did anyway.
- Councillor Oliver confirmed that there was a scrutiny system in place which had existed under the Labour Administration. However, this same Administration had included in its budget a delegation of £450m in capital spending to the Chief Executive and Leader without the need for any Scrutiny at all. This had since been abolished and he confirmed that the capital programme in the Budget would be subject to the usual Scrutiny and Cabinet process, which worked perfectly well. Bringing forward the capital spend as suggested was not necessary because no

work would be done this year, and it would mean reworking the whole budget.

- The Leader then moved that Council move to an immediate vote on both amendments together. A named vote took place, and the votes were cast as follows:-

**FOR: 22** as follows:-

Campbell, D.	Grimshaw, L.
Cartie, E.	Hepple, A.
Clark, T.S.	Lang, J.
Davey, J.G.	Ledger, D.
Davey, S.	Nisbet, k.
Dickinson, S.	Parry, K.
Dungworth, S.	Purvis, M.
Dunn, L.	Simpson, E.
Foster, J.	Swithenbank, I.C.F.
Gallacher, B.	Webb, G.
Gobin, J.J.	Wilson, T.

**AGAINST: 40** as follows:-

Armstrong, E.	Murray, A.H.
Bawn, D.L.	Oliver, N.
Beynon, J.A.	Pattison, W.
Castle, G.	Quinn, K.
Cessford, T.	Reid, J.
Crosby, B.	Renner-Thompson, G.
Daley, W.	Rickerby, L.J.
Dodd, R.R.	Riddle, J.R.
Dunbar, C.	Robinson, M.
Flux, B.	Roughead, G.
Gibson, R.	Sanderson, H.G.H.

Hill, G.	Seymour, C.
Homer, C.	Sharp, A.
Horncastle, C.W.	Stewart, G.
Hutchinson, J.I.	Stow, K.
Jackson, P.A.	Swinburn, M.
Jones, V.	Thorne, T.
Kennedy, D.	Towns, D.
Lawrie, R.	Watson, J.G.
Moore, R.	Wearmouth, R.

## **ABSTENTION: 0**

The amendment therefore fell.

- Councillor Reid felt that the budget did not address the fundamental funding problems of the Council, but simply charged people more which was a risky strategy, because at some point, people could choose not to spend their money. 38% of the £12m identified was coming from increased charges and this did not tackle the underlying problem. Over the life of the MTFP, 56% of efficiencies were actual increases in charges. He encouraged the Administration to start looking at the way the Council worked because this approach was not a long term solution. On some specific points, he did not support the £100k reduction in tree maintenance budget as he received many complaints about tree issues, he did not support the cut to the community chest budget, or the funding allocated for devolution. Regarding the Northumberland Line, he queried where the £3.46m was coming from and whether it included the £680k figure mentioned. There was a 21% increase for the Police and Crime Commissioner body, which was of no use whatsoever. There had been ten years of local government reform and no progress made. He could not support the Budget because it did not tackle the fundamental reasons why successive Administrations weren't getting a proper grip on the organisation.
- Councillor Oliver agreed that the Council needed to be run as efficiently as possible and advised that, of the savings identified, 34% were from income generation and 66% from service reviews, management of vacancies and contract savings. There were some savings at the back end of the MTFP still to be identified and work continued on those areas, and he agreed that the Council needed to be run as efficiently as possible. The £3.46m figure would be taken from reserves and then capitalised if the Northumberland Line scheme went ahead. The revenue contribution to NoT running costs would be coming from

revenue costs but there would be a reduction in other contributions to NECA so the net effect was about nil.

- Councillor Bawn supported the Budget which he felt was modest and measured, and included commendable capital projects. It made difficult decisions and he encouraged all members to support it, as a good budget for the County.
- Councillor Hill encouraged members to look at the budget as a whole and just individual elements within it and hoped that they did not abstain from the vote. There were a number of elements she supported including the attitude to dealing with debt and the reversal of a lot of the previous Administration's policies. She was glad to see that Berwick was finally getting some investment and would like to see a lot more. She asked whether there was any more information regarding the planned £15m investment for education in Berwick, and urged the Administration to remember Berwick in its council housing programme.
- Councillor Campbell felt strongly that the Administration were forgetting about the poor in this Budget. The Northumberland Line had been talked about since 1986 and the movement on this now was not due to a Conservative Government because they had been in office for 18 years previously with no progress. She asked when there would finally be trains running, and was disappointed that Blyth was only getting a relief road.
- Councillor Grimshaw read out some figures from an FOI response regarding wards affected by the council tax support scheme changes. The Leader's ward - 21 people affected, Deputy Leader's ward - 27 people affected. 14,792 households would be affected, the vast majority in the south east of Northumberland. Collection rates were predicted to fall from 99% to 83%. At least 150 of the Council's own staff would be affected. 7,679 single women, 4,456 disabled people, 6,442 families with children. She asked when the Conservatives had ditched their plans for a County which worked for everyone.
- Councillor Oliver replied that this matter had already been voted on and the decision not taken lightly, but some of the figures being quoted were inaccurate. The figure of 14,792 referred to people not households. The collection rate figure of 99.3% was for the existing council tax base and the 83% referred to the 14,792 figure, not overall. Therefore the aggregate change would not be a fall from 99% to 83%. The figure had been benchmarked across other Authorities in the north east and all other Labour authorities had some level of support reduction, apart from Durham. He reminded members that Labour had planned to increase the level of council tax support by 50%.
- Councillor Roughead welcomed the commitment from Councillor Sanderson to working with NALC and Northumberland SLCC on the town and parish council planning consultation issue, and was glad to see that Berwick was getting some long overdue investment. He had general support for the budget as it contained measures to address the Council's debt strategy and he highlighted a necessary amendment to pg 282 of the Budget book which contained an out of date reference to the Money Laundering Officer. The Leader confirmed this could be taken as part of the substantive motion.

- Councillor Dungworth commented that the Labour Administration had begun the Northumberland Line project a long time ago so it was unfair for the Leader to say that Labour had done nothing. Many projects that the current Administration was taking forward had been started by Labour, and the lack of acknowledgement of that she felt was below the belt. Many projects contained in the capital plan were for things that Labour had started, which the Administration was now trying to take credit for. She agreed that the Council needed to look at those areas where there had been an historic lack of investment, and those areas had not been controlled by the Labour party historically. The capital plan was not dissimilar to Labour's capital plan and contained things which her Group had planned, such as Morpeth Leisure Centre. There were things which had been added at the last minute to the budget, and things which were blatant investments into Conservative wards at the expense of the wider County. For example, the LTP was clearly weighted towards the more rural areas. The Budget asked people to pay more in order to receive less and was disproportionately unfair to those who needed the Council's support the most.
- Councillor Dunn could not support the budget but welcomed comments from the Leader regarding the commitment to Druridge Bay, which should apply to all of the County. She lobbied for support for Lynemouth Bay which desperately needed investment to put right its severe problems.
- Councillor Foster queried the need for a cinema in Ashington as she understood that Cramlington was already underused. Her concern was that a cinema would be located in an area close to where another cinema was underperforming. She did not have facts to back that up but that was what she had been told. In terms of Bedlington town centre, she understood that the anchor business could not be secured to take the project forward, so what assurances did people have that the development would actually happen? If this could not be secured, what assurances did people have that the cinema could be secured for Ashington?
- Councillor Dickinson confirmed that the 14,792 did refer to households as only one council tax per household was paid. There was nothing in the capital programme for Bedlington town, and he echoed the previous comments made regarding not looking back, and the effect of this Budget on the poor, which did not protect the vulnerable but targeted them.
- Councillor Wearmouth advised that the Northumberland Line project had a two phased approach and there were options for further funding, which he could provide information on. He urged members to stop talking down places like Ashington and Bedlington, adding that a number of retailers were keen to set up in Ashington, Cramlington Vue was one of the better performing Vue cinemas and investment for Bedlington had been included in the Advance budget.
- Councillor Gallacher thanked Councillor Wearmouth for his positive approach to delivering the Northumberland Line, but felt more information was needed on the two phase approach to this. He had concerns regarding the validity of the survey results for the Ashington cinema because of the 412 people surveyed, 200 had been school

pupils, and a number of visitor views had been captured. Ashington Town Council had done its own comprehensive survey of local residents and a cinema had not come out on top. The Town Council's suggestions were a cinema, a public arena, a theatre and a music hall in one facility, and the push for a night time economy was very strong.

The Leader closed the debate by commenting that much of the budget was a cross party programme. He assured members that the Administration would deliver and this was already being proved, and he commended all of the proposals contained in the MTFP and Budget to members, incorporating the amendment circulated (to the table on page 30 of the report, point 115 (inclusion of Berwick Swan Centre and Berwick Education Business Case and Build commitment in 2022-23), and the amendment highlighted by Councillor Roughead at pg 282 This was seconded by Councillor Oliver.

A named vote took place on this issue, and the votes were cast as follows:-

**FOR: 38** as follows:-

Armstrong, E.	Moore, R..
Bawn, D.L.	Murray, A.H.
Beynon, J.A.	Oliver, N.
Castle, G.	Pattison, W.
Cessford, T.	Quinn, K.
Crosby, B.	Renner-Thompson, G.
Daley, W.	Riddle, J.R.
Dodd, R.R.	Robinson, M.
Dunbar, C.	Roughead, G.
Flux, B.	Sanderson, H.G.H.
Gibson, R.	Seymour, C.
Hill, G.	Sharp, A.
Homer, C.	Stewart, G.
Horncastle, C.W.	Stow, K.
Hutchinson, J.I.	Swinburn, M.
Jackson, P.A.	Thorne, T.
Jones, V.	Towns, D.

Kennedy, D.	Watson, J.G.
Lawrie, R.	Wearmouth, R.

**AGAINST: 22** as follows:-

Campbell, D.	Grimshaw, L.
Cartie, E.	Hepple, A.
Clark, T.S.	Lang, J.
Davey, J.G.	Ledger, D.
Davey, S.	Nisbet, K.
Dickinson, S.	Parry, K.
Dungworth, S.	Purvis, M.
Dunn, L.	Simpson, E.
Foster, J.	Swithenbank, I.C.F.
Gallacher, B.	Webb, G.
Gobin, J.J.	Wilson, T.

**ABSTENTIONS: 2** as follows:-

Reid, J.	Rickerby, L.J.
----------	----------------

It was therefore **RESOLVED** that:-

(1) (a) the Medium Term Financial Plan covering the period 2019-22 detailed within Appendix 1 and the revenue budget for 2019-20; including, the requirement to deliver budget balancing targets equating to £12.8 million in 2019-20 and £36.4 million over the period 2019 to 2022 be approved;

(b) it be noted that the figures contained within the Medium Term Financial Plan 2019-22 within Appendix 1 are based on the provisional Local Government Finance Settlement of 18 December 2018; and, take into account the Council being part of the North of Tyne 75% Business Rates Pool Pilot with Newcastle City and North Tyneside Councils;

(2) the estimated retained Business Rates and the Top-Up grant funding received by the Council over the period of the Medium Term Financial Plan be noted;

- (3) the £1.3 million contribution required to fund the estimated cumulative Collection Fund Business Rates deficit at 31 March 2019 be noted;
- (4) the receipt of non-recurrent grant funding of £1.0 million for 2018-19 funded from a surplus on the National Business Rates Retention Levy/Safety Net account, some of which will be utilised in 2019-20, be noted;
- (5) the estimated receipt of the New Homes Bonus of £6.0 million for 2019-20 and the indicative allocation of £17.5 million over the period of the Medium Term Financial Plan, be noted;
- (6) the total estimated receipt of Improved Better Care Fund grant of £10.6 million in 2019-20 and £31.8 million over the period of the Medium Term Financial Plan be noted;
- (7) the receipt of non-recurrent Social Care Support grant and Winter Pressures grant of £4.1 million in 2019-20 be noted;
- (8) a 2.99% increase in Council Tax for 2019-20 be approved, noting that this is in line with the Government's assumptions regarding the Council's Core Spending Power, and it be noted that the Medium Term Financial Plan 2019-22 includes a 1.99% annual increase in Council Tax over the remaining period of the plan, and, that an estimate of annual Tax Base growth has been included;
- (9) the contribution of protected Collection Fund Council Tax balances of £2.3 million in 2019-20 to support the Medium Term Financial Plan be noted;
- (10) a 1% increase in Council Tax in 2019-20 be approved for use on Adult Social Care services; raising an additional £1.9 million in 2019-20, and it be noted that the Medium Term Financial Plan assumes an increase of 2% for future years which would raise an additional £7.7 million for use on Adult Social Care services;
- (11) the schedule of Service Specific grants of £241.9 million contained within Appendix 2 be noted;
- (12) the schedule of recurrent pressures of £19.5 million that has been included within the Medium Term Financial Plan, detailed in Appendix 3 be approved;
- (13) the schedule of non-recurrent pressures of £2.1 million that has been included within the Medium Term Financial Plan, detailed in Appendix 4 be approved;
- (14) the use of £1.6 million from the Strategic Management Reserve to fund non-recurrent pressures in 2019-20, and £2.1 million over the period of the Medium Term Financial Plan be approved;

- (15) the Inflation Schedule totalling £5.3 million detailed in Appendix 5 be approved;
- (16) the schedule of Growth and Commitments of £19.3 million detailed in Appendix 6 be approved;
- (17) the identified budget balancing measures contained in Appendix 7 of £12.8 million for 2019-20; and, £6.5 million for 2020-21; and £6.0 million for 2021-22 be approved. Also the additional requirement to identify and deliver further budget balancing measures of £5.2 million in 2020-21 and £5.8 million in 2021-22 in order to balance the budget be noted and approved;
- (18) the 2019-20 budgets by service area detailed in Appendix 9 be noted;
- (19) the Summary of the Reserves and Provisions contained within Appendix 10 be noted;
- (20) the use of £0.3 million from the General Fund in 2019-20 be approved;
- (21) the overall reduction in the ring-fenced Dedicated Schools Grant of £19.72 million in 2019-20 be noted. This is a result of the expectation that fifteen schools will convert to academies during 2019-20;
- (22) the Housing Revenue Account 2019-20 budget as detailed within Appendix 11 be agreed, which will reduce the estimated balance on the HRA reserve from £27.4 million at 31 March 2018, to £14.9 million at 31 March 2024. This will fund a Housing Investment programme over the same period which will allow £22.5 million of new investment in council housing;
- (23) it be noted that 2019-20 is the fourth and final year of a compulsory 1.0% reduction for Council tenants' rents and that the budget detailed in Appendix 11 assumes that rents will rise by CPI plus 1% from April 2020 in line with Government guidance;
- (24) the indicative 30 year Housing Revenue Account business plan as detailed within Appendix 11 be noted;
- (25) it be noted that the Government has removed the Housing Revenue Account borrowing cap on 29 October 2018 which will enable the Council to consider a new Housing Investment Programme without the constraints of the previous debt cap;
- (26) Council agree to refinance a maturing Housing Revenue Account loan of £15.3 million during 2019-20;
- (27) the Capital Strategy 2019-20 to 2021-22 contained within Appendix 12 be approved;
- (28) the delegation of the detail of the use of the Strategic Regeneration budget to the Council's Section 151 Officer, Executive Director of Place, the Cabinet Member for Corporate Services and the Cabinet Member for Economic Development be approved;

(29) the revised Capital Programme as detailed within Appendix 13 (as amended at the meeting) be approved; and the projects highlighted within the main body of the report which will complete after 2021-22 be noted;

(30) the delegation of the detail of the final Local Transport Programme and any subsequent in year amendments be delegated to the Executive Director - Place and the Cabinet Member for Environment and Local Services;

(31) the delegation to Cabinet to approve individual projects, which propose to utilise the flexibilities of capital receipts, be agreed;

(32) the Prudential Indicators based on the proposed Capital Programme detailed within Appendix 14 be approved;

(33) the Minimum Revenue Provision Policy detailed in Appendix 15 be approved;

(34) the proposed Treasury Management Strategy Statement 2019-20 detailed in Appendix 16 be approved;

(35) the Revenues and Benefits Policies for 2019-20 contained within Appendix 17 be approved, the proposed changes to the Council Tax Discount, Corporate Debt and Rate Relief policies in particular be noted, and the required update to the anti-money laundering policy highlighted by Councillor Roughead be incorporated;

(36) the Pay Policy Statement for 2019-20 at Appendix 18 be approved;

(37) Approve a delegation to amend the budget 2019-20 and Medium Term Financial Plan in light of any changes as a result of the final Local Government Finance Settlement to the Council's Section 151 Officer in consultation with the Cabinet Member for Corporate Services; and

(38) the recommendations of the Cabinet be accepted.

## **(2) Council Tax 2019-20**

The report provided Council Members with the financial information to enable the Council to calculate and set the Council Tax for 2019-20.

A named vote took place on this issue, and the votes were cast as follows:-

**FOR: 39** as follows:-

Armstrong, E.	Oliver, N.
Beynon, J.A.	Pattison, W.
Castle, G.	Quinn, K.

Cessford, T.	Reid, J.
Crosby, B.	Renner-Thompson, G.
Daley, W.	Rickerby, L.J.
Dodd, R.R.	Riddle, J.R.
Dunbar, C.	Robinson, M.
Flux, B.	Roughead, G.
Gibson, R.	Sanderson, H.G.H.
Hill, G.	Seymour, C.
Homer, C.	Sharp, A.
Horncastle, C.W.	Stewart, G.
Hutchinson, J.I.	Stow, K.
Jackson, P.A.	Swinburn, M.
Jones, V.	Thorne, T.
Kennedy, D.	Towns, D.
Lawrie, R.	Watson, J.G.
Moore, R.	Wearmouth, R.
Murray, A.H.	

**AGAINST: 22** as follows:-

Campbell, D.	Grimshaw, L.
Cartie, E.	Hepple, A.
Clark, T.S.	Lang, J.
Davey, J.G.	Ledger, D.
Davey, S.	Nisbet, K.
Dickinson, S.	Parry, K.
Dungworth, S.	Purvis, M.
Dunn, L.	Simpson, E.
Foster, J.	Swithenbank, I.C.F.

Gallacher, B.	Webb, G.
Gobin, J.J.	Wilson, T.

## **ABSTENTIONS: 0**

### **(1) County Council RESOLVES:**

- (a) that the Council Tax Requirement for the Council's own purposes for 2019-20 (excluding parish precepts) is £177,740,416;
- (b) that the following amounts be calculated for 2019-20 in accordance with Sections 31 to 36 of the Act:
  - i) Being the aggregate amount of gross expenditure which the Council estimates for the items set out in Section 31 A (2) of the Act taking into account all precepts issued to it by parish councils: £689,765,096.
  - ii) Being the aggregate of the gross income which the Council estimates for the items set out in Section 31 A (3) of the Act: £503,076,956.
  - iii) Being the amount by which the aggregate at (b) i) above exceeds the aggregate at (b) ii) above, calculated by the Council in accordance with Section 31 A (4) of the Act as its Council Tax requirement for the year. (Item R in the formula in Section 31B of the Act) (including parish precepts): £186,688,140.
  - iv) Being the amount at (b) iii) above (Item R), all divided by Item T, above, calculated by the Council, in accordance with Section 31B of the Act as the basic amount of its Council Tax at Band D for the year (including parish precepts): £1,781.09.
  - v) Being the aggregate amount of all special items referred to in Section 34 (1) of the Act (total all parish precepts): £8,950,851.
  - vi) Being the amount at (b) iv) above less the result given by dividing the amount at (b) v) above by Item T, above, calculated by the Council, in accordance with Section 34 (2) of the Act, as the basic amount of its Council Tax at Band D for the year for dwellings in those parts of its area to which no parish precept relates: £1,695.70.
- (c) that the Council Tax for 2019-20, excluding the Police precept, will be increased by 3.9% (including the Adult Social Care Precept of 1%), equating to a charge per Band D household of £1,695.70 (excluding special expenses). For other bands different proportions will apply. For example, Band A properties will be charged 6/9 (two thirds) of a Band D property and Band H properties will be charged 18/9 (double) of a

Band D property.

The relevant valuation bands are as follows:

Valuation	Northumberland County	Adult Social	Total
Band	Council	Care Precept	
	£ : p	£ : p	£ : p
A	1,050.07	80.39	1,130.46
B	1,225.09	93.79	1,318.88
C	1,400.10	107.19	1,507.29
D	1,575.11	120.59	1,695.70
E	1,925.13	147.39	2,072.52
F	2,275.16	174.19	2,449.35
G	2,625.18	200.98	2,826.16
H	3,150.22	241.18	3,391.40

- (d) under Section 52ZB of the Local Government Finance Act 1992 that the Council's basic amount of Council Tax for 2019-20 is not excessive in accordance with principles approved under Section 52ZC(1) of the Act.

(i.e. the proposed Council Tax increase for 2019-20 means that the Council does not need to hold a referendum on its proposed Council Tax. The regulations set out in Section 52ZC of the Act requires all billing authorities (council and precept authorities (i.e. Fire and Police authorities)) to hold a referendum on their proposed level of basic Council Tax each year if they exceed government guidelines which are set out annually. For 2019-20 the guideline increase is 4% (including the Adult Social Care Precept).

As the Council is proposing a Council Tax increase of 3.9% (including Adult Social Care and special expenses) for 2019-20 then the above regulations have no impact for 2019-20.

**(2) County Council APPROVES:**

- (a) that the matters listed in section 3 (c) of the report are identified as special expenses and that all other matters which might otherwise be considered to be special expenses under the prevailing legislation are deemed to be general expenses.
- (b) that the Council Tax Leaflet continues be made available via the Council's website, rather than enclosed with Council Tax bills, and that the final document be delegated to and finalised by the Section 151 Officer.

**(3) County Council NOTES:**

- (a) that the Police and Crime Commissioner has agreed the recommended level of precept of £14,080,029 for 2019-20. This represents an increase of 21.8%, equating to an additional £24.00 on a Band D property; the resulting valuation bands will be as follows:

Valuation Band	Northumbria Police Authority
	£: p
A	89.55
B	104.48
C	119.40
D	134.33
E	164.18
F	194.03
G	223.88
H	268.66

- (b) the Aggregate of Council Tax requirements, including that of Northumbria Police Authority, the Council's own requirement and that for Adult Social Care purposes (excluding Parish Precepts), are as follows:

Valuation Band	Northumberland County Council	Adult Social Care Precept	Northumbria Police Authority	Total
	£ : p	£ : p	£ : p	£ : p
A	1,050.07	80.39	89.55	1,220.01
B	1,225.09	93.79	104.48	1,423.36
C	1,400.10	107.19	119.40	
	1,626.69			
D	1,575.11	120.59	134.33	1,830.03
E	1,925.13	147.39	164.18	2,236.70
F	2,275.16	174.19	194.03	2,643.38
G	2,625.18	200.98	223.88	3,050.04
H	3,150.22	241.18	268.66	3,660.06

- (c) the total amount of parish precepts requested is £8,947,724 and is detailed in Appendix 1. This represents an increase of £385,615 when

compared to 2018-19.

Changes in total Council Tax range from an increase of 5.6% in Craster to a reduction of 0.2% in Kirkwhelpington

- (d) special expenses of £3,127 are applied to North Sunderland Parish only in relation to play area inspection and maintenance. This has increased from £3,054 in 2018-19.

**4. County Council NOTES:**

- (a) the basic Council Tax valuation bands are shown in paragraph 3 (b).
- (b) the detailed Council Tax calculations are set out in Appendices 2 and 3. Analysis of the Council Tax by parish is provided at Appendix 2 excluding Northumbria Police precept. Appendix 3 shows the total Council Tax charge by parish (including the Council only element and Adult Social Care Precept, Northumbria Police Precept, Special Expenses and Parish Precepts).

**75. ANNUAL TIMETABLE OF MEETINGS 2019-20**

Council was asked to approve a timetable of meetings for 2019-20.

**RESOLVED** that the timetable of meetings for 2019-20 be agreed.

The Common Seal of the County Council  
of Northumberland was hereunto affixed  
in the presence of:-

.....  
Chair of the County Council

.....  
Duly Authorised Officer