

CABINET

THURSDAY, 4 FEBRUARY 2021

PRESENT: Councillors David Cannon, Andrew Johnson (Chairman), David Coppinger, Samantha Rayner, Stuart Carroll (Vice-Chairman), David Hilton, Gerry Clark, Donna Stimson and Ross McWilliams

Also in attendance: Councillors Bateson, Larcombe, Tisi, C Da Costa, W Da Costa, Bhangra, L Jones, Haseler, Shelim, Baldwin, Price, Hunt, Werner, Del Campo, Davey, Singh and Barbara Richardson (RBWM Property Company)

Officers: Duncan Sharkey, Kevin McDaniel, Hilary Hall, Adele Taylor, Andrew Valance, Nikki Craig, Emma Duncan, Louisa Dean, Shilpa Manek and David Cook.

APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

There were no apologies received.

DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

There were no declarations of interest received.

MINUTES

RESOLVED UNANIMOUSLY: That the minutes of the meeting held on 28 January 2021 were approved.

APPOINTMENTS

None

CABINET MEMBERS' REPORTS

A) 2021/22 BUDGET

Cabinet considered the budget report that set out the financial plans for the Royal Borough of Windsor and Maidenhead (RBWM) and its Net Budget Requirement and associated Council Tax level for 2021/22.

The Chairman informed Cabinet, when giving his introduction to this meeting, that there had been a closed E-petition regarding speed limits on the A308. The lead petitioner had declined the opportunity to address Cabinet on the petition as subject matter was already planned to be undertaken, his statement had been circulated to Cabinet as requested.

The Lead Member for Finance and Ascot informed Cabinet that this was a balanced budget that many said could not be achieved. The foundation for this was laid in the current year's budget which was subject to greater scrutiny and challenge than in the past and included, for the first-time, contingency that has been used to manage some of the burden of savings that were prevented by COVID-19. Through careful management of the current budget, we are able to set aside a COVID-19 reserve of £3million that will be used next year as one-off funding to help manage the impact of £9.2million of ongoing COVID-19 costs. As Cabinet we do not doubt the challenge that we face in 2021/22 but the budget we propose provides a balance between the financial imperative and meeting the key priorities of our residents.

At last year's budget setting Council, we voted on five separate papers that collectively made up the budget. This took time and gained nothing. This year there will be just one vote that encompasses every budget element.

Today's papers follow that format and Cabinet will be asked to recommend the following appendices to Council.

These include;

- The revenue budget
- Fees and charges
- Capital budget
- Treasury management including strategy
- The Pay policy statement
- Proposed pay award
- Feedback from consultations.

The Revenue budget, fees and charges and capital budget have all been reviewed by O&S. I am sure Cabinet will wish to focus on the revenue budget but for information Fees and charges have been increase generally in line with inflation at 1.6%.

New capital projects are restricted to fully-funded schemes, where scheme costs are fully or largely met by external funding. Income generating schemes with a strong business case, unavoidable capital investment predominantly relating to immediate requirements to replace or enhance essential fixed assets for service delivery. There is no discretionary spending

Council will also need to approve the treasury management strategy, the approved list of counterparties with whom we invest cash balances. Table 2 on page 171, the prudential indicators on page 187 and the Minimum Revenue Provision policy. There is a requirement to set MRP aside for all capital expenditure we use the annuity method to calculate MRP

The Lead Member also informed that £895K has been set aside in the budget contingency to cover a pay award for RBWM, Optalis and AfC staff. The proposed RBWM pay award increases the minimum hourly rate to £10 an hour which matches a union request and an across the board increase of 2% which in my opinion is greatly deserved by our staff.

The Chairman said he wished to thank all those who had participated in the consultation which was the first meaningful consultation undertaken on the budget in recent times. There had been an excellent response rate but the administration would also look at lessons learnt to improve the process for future years. Cabinet had considered the responses and the appendix would be updated for the final Cabinet report.

The Lead Member for Housing, Communications and Youth Engagement said that this was the first meaningful budget consultation for some time and there had been excellent response rates especially when compared to our neighbouring authorities. There had been over 800 response and he thanked those that had participated. For future consultations we will look to increase the participation and be even more engaged so residents can help shape the budget. There were many interesting comments but he wished to highlight two themes that stood out these were weekly black bin collections and rural car parking charges. He asked if the relevant lead members could provide further information on these.

The Lead Member for Planning, Environmental Services and Maidenhead informed that he should have introduced fortnightly black bin collection as soon as the Council declared a climate emergency. Those councillors who wanted to achieve carbon neutrality by 2030 should have demanding a change in the frequency of waste collection. It was now proposed to collect black bins fortnightly but everything else would remain the same. This would encourage greater recycling and the use of food waste bins. There would also be a positive impact on our carbon reduction. Residents were good at using the blue bins but we were over using the black bins. Properties with communal bins, such as flats, would retain a weekly

collection so will those properties that had to use bin bag collections. There was no health risk with fortnightly collection and clinical waste collection would remain as is. Some had said that this change was breaking our election promises but they were made before the climate change emergency was made.

The Deputy Chairman of Cabinet, Adult Social Care, Children's Services, Health and Mental Health mentioned that with regards to fortnightly collection mentioned that he had been approached by young people and whilst visiting centres that the vast majority raised the importance of climate change and the need for us all to do something. He also reiterated the need to retain current collection for flats and clinical waste.

The Lead Member for Climate Change, Sustainability, Parks and Countryside said that many areas of the council had worked together on climate change and improving recycling and reducing household waste was a priority along with plastic free. There would also be a reduction in emissions with fewer collections.

The Lead Member for Public Protection and Parking addressed Cabinet on the concerns raised by the proposed rural car parking charges. He said that the proposal had been put forward for a number of reasons with the best management of our assets being one of them. It would also encourage people to use alternative forms of transport and thus reduce car movements. The proposal was also part of the standardisation of charges across the borough. He had spoken to stockholders, users of the car parks and residents. He welcomed Cabinet's views. He also mentioned that it as proposed to use the ringo system rather than parking metres. After listening to the feedback there was an opportunity to change some of the proposals such as having free half hour and no charges for the school run.

The Chairman asked Cabinet for their views on the proposed parking charges and it became clear that Cabinet felt this should be re considered. Cllr Clark raised concern about the one size fits all approach as although some would benefit from charges others would not. Cllr Hilton agreed that the proposals had not been popular and that reviewing individual car parks may be beneficial, he supported the idea of free half hour for school drop off / pick up. Cllr Carroll said he was concerned about the impact this could have on peoples physical and mental health if it discouraged them using public spaces especially during the pandemic. Cllr Stimson also said that there had been a lot of push back from residents. Cllr Rayner said she had been contacted by village associations, the scouts and volunteer that help in her ward that had raised concern that the charges could have a negative impact on their work.

The Lead Member said that given the views of Cabinet and the views of residents then he proposed that this item is not brought forward, subject to finances, and a review be undertaken looking at each individual car park. The Chairman agreed with the proposals to remove this budget line and the Lead Member for Finance said he could discuss using the C-19 reserves to cover the impact. Cabinet resolved unanimously to remove this budget line from next years budget proposals.

The Deputy Chairman of Cabinet, Adult Social Care, Children's Services, Health and Mental Health thanked everyone who had engaged in the consultation process. For his area he had followed five principles;

- Protecting vulnerable people and furthering service excellence.
- Opportunity and innovation to maximise life chances.
- Transformation, looking at different ways of doing things which has been vital during the pandemic. Better enhanced life chances and outcomes.
- Consultation, as seen it's a core principle when changing services.
- Ensure services are future proof financially and being responsible for taxpayers money.

There was a small increase in the adult social care budget and a reasonable increase in the children's services budget. He mentioned he continued to lobby the Government over funding for adult social care.

The Deputy Leader of the Council, Resident and Leisure Services, HR, IT, Legal, Performance Management and Windsor informed Cabinet that she also wished to thank those who took part in the consultation on the comments from overview and scrutiny panels. She mentioned that she had engaged with SMILE and would meet with them again when the new director was in place. With regards to libraries the transformation strategy had recently been approved to go out for consultation. The biggest impact on the budget had been leisure services which had been severely impacted by the pandemic and had resulted in the need to appoint a new provider. With regards to cultural services they were working with partners to become sustainable. There had been a slight adjustment in the budget when first published to six months of funding where it was originally for one quarter. With regards to museum and tourism in order to protect the services it was proposed to bring them together in one location. HR and ICT had done an excellent job during the pandemic to support our staff and allowing service provision to continue. She mentioned a huge thank you to staff who had maintained excellent services.

The Lead Member for Public Protection and Parking said he would not go over parking again as this had already been discussed. Apart from removing the rural parking charges he also mentioned that it was planned to remove some one street parking metres. Community wardens were being restructured but community engagement would continue, this had been consulted with the police. There had been an increased pressures on licencing due to the pandemic.

The Lead Member Transport and Infrastructure said that the relevant proposals had been discussed at scrutiny. It was proposed to reduce the pool cars which given current usage was sensible. Further down the road we would look into more sustainable transport. There were plans for a revised street cleaning schedule that was based on need rather than frequency. The Heathrow challenge line was to be removed due to the latest announcements and the pandemic. Three were plans to trial increased resources for enforcement on street works, this was expected to become net natural.

The Lead Member for Housing, Communications and Youth Engagement informed Cabinet that there had been an increase in pressures due to temporary accommodation requirements and due to the pandemic an increase in the number of people requiring housing support. He mentioned that the service had responded remarkably well during this difficult time. There was excellent support from our partner organisations and the government had continued with its policy of ensuring all vulnerable people were housed during the pandemic. With the pressures on the economy the borough will continue to need temporary accommodation and more affordable rent. He gave a firm commitment to driving up the numbers of social rented units. He also mentioned that with regards to the advantage card they were working with Windsor Castle to ensure the discounted access for residents would continue. He also highlighted the success of the digital message to residents and how this would be developed.

The Lead Member for Finance and Ascot informed that the Corporate Overview and Scrutiny Panel requested that face to face meetings for advice from the Revenue and Benefit specialist in complex cases should continue to be available in Windsor. He would be talking to the Head of Revenue, Benefits, Libraries and Resident Services to see how this request may be met.

He had attended all four overview and scrutiny panel meetings where growth bids, savings, fees and charges and capital were debated and was surprised at the Corporate O&S panel meeting that an attack on the Council was made by Cllr Werner and he wished to comment on this.

The Lead Member said that Cllr Werner had said there was evidence to show that insourcing provided better services at lower cost and complained we had not looked at insourcing

options, arguing had we done so an analysis would have been produced and would be available.

Cllr Werner may be ideologically attracted to Insourcing but in reviewing contracts this administration would consider all options such as working to gain enhanced performance from existing contractors, changing contractors, shared services with other Councils as well as bringing services in house.

As a small unitary authority there are advantages in outsourcing not least that one works with a much larger organisation that can afford expensive capital equipment, has greater expertise in depth as well as industry contacts and access to the latest thinking and technology in the area of concern.

Cabinet would also recall that as we entered lockdown, we were asked by Government to continue to support our contractors. With businesses focussed on survival and many of our staff working to support our residents through the pandemic the past year has not been the time for a string of formal contract reviews.

However, in early 2020 before the lockdown CIPFA was commissioned to provide an independent review of delivery options for both AfC and Optalis. We part own these companies and they deliver children's and Adult service, representing over 60% of the Council's spend. Seemingly this was of little interest to Cllr Werner.

These reviews were published in June, discussed at Cabinet and reviewed by O&S. Strangely this important piece of work did not register with Cllr. Werner. But with some suggested actions, the reviews recommended retaining these contractual arrangements. This good advice is supported by the fact that Children's Services are rated good by Ofsted and more recently the YOT were too. But it gets better still, the AfC MTFs shows the cost of children's care in 2018/19, the most up to date information available, was the 7th lowest of roughly 60 unitary authorities. In my opinion if there were an inspection regime for Adult Services, I am sure that Optalis would be rated good alongside AfC.

He also said that Cllr Werner accused Cllr Johnson of not charging CIL on the Nicholson Centre and throwing good money away. The process to create a CIL charging schedule goes back to early 2015 when, following a viability study that covered the whole of the Borough a Preliminary Draft charging schedule was published in April 2015. Establishing a CIL policy required the generation of viability information, a series of consultations with the development Industry on that information and examination of the proposed policy by an examiner from the planning inspectorate. The Inspectorate require a strong evidence base to support the charging schedule and having been given a green light the Council adopted the CIL charging policy in August 2016.

Cllr Werner said we are not charging in Maidenhead. Within the Maidenhead Area Action Plan Area which is a tight area in central Maidenhead he is correct. This reflects the requirement to drive forward the Maidenhead Regeneration project taking into account the impacts on viability of additional development costs such as demolition and remediation so that developers would be able to deliver both market and affordable housing. My understanding is that the CIL charges would be reviewed once the BLP is adopted.

The Chairman invited the three registered public speakers to address Cabinet starting with Lisa Hughes.

Lisa Hughes said that with regards to the consultation the Disability and Inclusion Forum, which she was the vice-chairman, had contact with a number groups around the borough. One of these groups had been contacted as a stakeholder as part of the consultation. It was not until January that the Forum found out about the consultation and had to rush to get information from the groups we were in contact with. She had raised concern that Cabinet were reviewing interim consultation results that were not complete. Her other area of concern was regarding a couple of budget cuts were the impact had been acknowledged in the report

but down played in the equality impact assessment forms. One concern was the increased use of digital services as a high proportion of adults with disabilities and the over 75's were not internet users or had mobile phones let alone smart phones. The proposals could result in people having to travel further to access council services or make payments. She also raised concern about proposed budget cuts around adults with learning disabilities as they were amongst some of the most vulnerable in society. Last year there were cuts to the employment support budget and this year there were proposed cuts of £900,000. The equality impact assessment forms did not so the affects of the cuts.

The Chairman responded that the full consultation results would be part of the Council papers. He asked the Lead Member responsible for adult social care to respond. Cllr Carroll said that a significant proportion of the service had been brought in house into Optalis and that was why there was a difference in expenditure, the policy decision had been heavily scrutinised at the time. The responsible Director informed that they were reviewing all the feedback that had been received and would be reviewing the equality impact assessments as well as the other comments.

Andrew Hill addressed Cabinet and informed that at Cabinet on 17th December it was minuted that Cllr Price asked if the voluntary section would be consulted and she was told that they would be. However the paper tonight only features response from the Smile charity who stated the benefits of keeping people in their own homes. Cllr Price had also mentioned that post Covid the 3rd sector would be a shadow of themselves and a month later we see SportsAble holding an emergency campaign for £46,000, he asked if they had been part of the consultation. He mentioned that the report said £500,000 could be saved by quoting correctly what residents had to pay towards their care, is this not a fault of the providers. Was there any evidence that the review would find any overspend. He was concerned about the impact on residents with learning disabilities and asked if a buffer could be used for this area as it had for parking. He felt the paper lacked robust evidence from voluntary groups and recommended the paper be withdrawn.

The Chairman thanked Mr Hill but said the paper would not be removed and there was a timetable to keep to. The Director responsible for adults health said that they had undertaken analysis work around care packages and it was believed the savings were achievable and a robust process will be in place. With regards to Smile and SportsAble the Lead Member said that officers and herself had engaged with them. Smile was an independent charity that delivered a number of different activities, however some of their work had been impacted by Covid restrictions. She would be meeting with them to discuss work after Covid and the possibility of working with public health. They had also met with SprotsAble and would be meeting with the new trustees.

Mr Ed Wilson addressed Cabinet and informed that the he felt it was a great move having the community football pitch in Deadworth coming under the control of Leisure Focus and hoped it could be a catalyst for a sports centre. Local residents need more facilities and not just more houses. He mentioned that he had given the budget papers to three chartered accountants and asked them about the Covid costs, they came back with five different answers. He asked how much had Covid cost the borough, how much was recovered from government and how much would it cost next year. He noted the £2.8 million contingency in the budget but questioned why this had not been challenged by councillors when the borough could no longer afford the garden in bloom competition or a few planters around the borough.

In response to the comments about leisure services the Led Member said that they had been hit hard by the pandemic and had resulted in Leisure Focus had taken over the contract from Parkwood Leisure, however this did offer more flexibility. She was very excited about the suite of facilities at Deadworth School. The Lead Member for Finance said that with regards to Covid costs these were contained with the Finance Update report that went to January Cabinet and as said earlier were cost natural although there had been an impact on other areas. The Director of Resources and S151 officer said that we were in a cost neutral position

with Covid. It was expected that further funding would come from government for the first quarter of next year. There was an underspend this year that had been rolled forward as a one off reserve to cover Covid costs. The Council paper would have an additional section from her as the S151 officer saying that there were a suitable level of reserves.

The Chairman thanked the members of the public for their questions and said he would now take questions from non Cabinet Members but these would be limited as the report was due to be considered at Council.

Cllr Bhangra said that he was pleased to see the support package for Norden's Farm as it was a fantastic community asset. He said he would continue to lobby government for contingency funding for the arts and culture. He was pleased to see that the rural parking charges would be reviewed.

Cllr Jones asked Cabinet that if there had been additional funding from government what would have been their priorities for allocation given the number of proposed cuts. How would you balance public services with the need to support the back office. She also mentioned that we continued to have low levels of reserves that would not cover shortfalls and asked when we would see the impact of the transformation strategy rather than service cuts.

The Lead Member replied that Cllr Jones was right as the issue of reserves remained one of the objectives to build them up. The difficult decisions taken over the last 12 months has resulted that we were in a position to put back into reserves. If additional funds were available they would be put into reserves to protect services. With regards to transformation this was already happening and had helped during the pandemic with future benefits coming through the pipeline.

Cllr Del Campo said she was delighted to see extra funding had been found to support the arts, although this was more of a stay of execution. There had been a mistake in the consultation that meant residents were not asked if they supported the arts. She was pleased Cabinet had listened to residents regarding rural parking. She mentioned a local campaigner in Boyne Hill who had worked on a petition against the parking proposals. She also mentioned concern about equalities issues as there had not been sufficient consultation with stakeholders as previously raised during the meeting.

The Chairman mentioned that he felt a 'stay of execution' was a bit doom and gloom and mentioned that although he was aware of the local campaigner he was not aware that he had made any submission as part of the consultation.

Cllr Baldwin said that he was surprised by Cllr Hilton's comments regarding CIL and Maidenhead Town Centre as he seemed to be the only Lead Member for Finance who did not want to charge a lawful tax and that he was not putting pressure on Cabinet to review it. The Lead Member for Finance reiterated that the right time to review CIL was when the Borough Local Plan was in place. It was important to keep the town centre projects viable especially affordable housing provision.

Cllr Werner said that he was pleased to see the Lead Member back down over parking, he also congratulated the residents who had signed the aforementioned campaigners petition. He raised concern that we were still losing community wardens, the council was consulting on the closure libraries such as Boyn Grove. The grant to Norden's Farm was being reduced, he was glad that there had been an extension of funding to try and get it through Covid. It was even proposed to cut funding to Smile. Remember the cuts were for life not just Covid. If we keep on slicing soon there would be nothing left. He proposed insourcing, making better use of assets and invest to earn. He said he had not seen such a catalogue of disaster in 25 years that was changing the nature of the council. He asked if the Leader was concerned about the council becoming separated from its residents and as money had been found for the change in car parking why can't the same happen for libraries.

The Chairman and Cabinet members raised concern about the negativity in Cllr Werner's comments rather than engaging in the budget consultation and offering alternative suggestions. The budget had been set in the backdrop of the pandemic and residents accepted that there were difficult decisions to be made. He still had until council to put forward viable amendments.

Cllr Baldwin raised concern that during the discussion there had been a number of references to a local campaigner yet he was not at the meeting to respond, re made reference to a previous Cabinet meeting where he had been told he could not talk about an individual in a public meeting. The Managing director said that it was never preferable to name an individual at Cabinet or other council meetings when they do not have the right to reply.

Cllr Price addressed Cabinet and informed that she was concerned that by approving this budget the council's long term objectives could be harmed, as laid out in the Transformation Strategy, especially areas such as working with our stakeholders. We have had two residents raising concern about the consultation with charitable organisations. There was insufficient responses from stakeholders to make a decision on a budget that was supposed to be at the heart of the community. The only feedback received from voluntary organisations, as shown at this meeting, was from Smile. She mentioned that digital technology was central to future service delivery but there was no capital investment. It was important that with the digital revolution and plans such as reducing library provision that no one was left behind. Will this budget deliver the long term vision of the authority.

The Chairman said that this was Cabinet's recommended budget to Council, further amendments would be made to reflect this meeting and the final consultation results. The Lead Member for Finance said that a balanced budget had to be presented and as mentioned there was a lot about supporting the vulnerable members of our society.

Resolved unanimously: that Cabinet considers the report and:

Appendix 1 – Revenue Budget

That Cabinet considers and recommends that Council approves:

- i) The 2021/22 Net Budget of £105.625m, consisting of:**
 - a. The proposed new growth in service budgets of £3.124m as set out in Annex D to Appendix 1;**
 - b. The proposed Covid-19 growth in service budgets of £9.251m as set out in Annex E to Appendix 1;**
 - c. The proposed new opportunities and savings of £5.730m as set out in Annex F to Appendix 1 except for one saving in relation to charging for rural car parks which subject to a review of funding will be removed from the proposals prior to publication of the Full Council papers;**
 - d. The associated contribution from Earmarked Reserves of £3m as set out in paragraph 5.5.1, and the level of contingency as £2.812m as set out in paragraph 5.8.4;**
- i) Council Tax:**
 - a. A Council Tax Requirement of £79.540m.**
 - b. A Band D charge of £1,131.97 for the Royal Borough of Windsor and Maidenhead in 2021/22, reflecting an overall increase of 4.99%, based on:**
 - i. A 1.99% increase in base Council Tax taking the charge to £1,004.19 for 2021/22;**
 - ii. An additional 3% to reflect an increase in the Adult Social Care Precept which is proposed as £127.78;**

- c. The Special Expenses Precept frozen at £34.31 for 2021/22 for the unparished areas of Windsor and Maidenhead in accordance with Section 35 of the Local Government Finance Act 1992, as set out in Annex G to Appendix 1;
- ii) Schools Budget
 - a. The allocation of the £133.918m Dedicated Schools Grant as set out in Annex H to Appendix 1, and delegated authority be given to the Director of Children's Services and S151 officer in consultation with the Lead Members for Finance and Adult Social Care, Children's and Health Services to amend the total schools' budget to reflect the actual Dedicated Schools Grant levels once received;

Appendix 2 – Fees and Charges

That Cabinet considers and recommends that Council approves:

- i) The Fees and Charges for 2021/22 as set out in Annex A to Appendix 2.
Delegated authority is extended to the Director for Adults, Health and Commissioning, in liason with the Lead Member for Adult Social Care, Children's and Health Services, to set the Direct Payments Standard Rate (p20 of Annex A to Appendix 2).

Appendix 3 – Capital

That Cabinet considers and recommends that Council approves:

- i) The Capital Strategy 2021/22 – 2023/24 as set out in Annex A to Appendix 3 of this report.
- i) The draft consolidated Capital Programme for 2020/21 – 2022/23 in Annex B1-3 to Appendix 3 of this report, including previously approved schemes and proposed new schemes as set out in Annexes C & D to Appendix 3 of this report.
- ii) Capital programme slippage to date from 2020/21 to 2021/22 as detailed in Annex E to Appendix 3.

Appendix 4 – Treasury Management

That Cabinet considers and recommends that Council approves:

- i) The Council's Treasury Management Strategy for 2021/22 as set out in Appendix 4 of this report, including
 - a. The proposed Lending Counterparty Criteria;
 - b. the continuation of the current Minimum Revenue Provision Policy for 2021/22.

The Council's Treasury Management Policies as set out in Annex A to Appendix 4 of this report;

The Council's Prudential Indicators as set out in Annex B to Appendix 4 of this report

Appendix 5 – Pay Policy Statement

That Cabinet considers and recommends that Council approves:

- i) The Council's updated Pay Policy Statement Strategy for 2021/22 as set out in Appendix 5 of this report, noting that Sections 2.9, 3.3, 3.4, 4.2, 4.3 and 4.5 of that appendix will be updated following Council's decision regarding the 2021 staff pay award.

Appendix 6 – Proposed Pay Award

That Cabinet considers and recommends that Council approves:

- ii) **The Council's proposed Pay Award for 2021/22 as set out in Appendix 6 of this report.**
- iii) **A revision to the Council's pay structure, with a new minimum pay point of Grade 2, point 20 at a rate of £10 per hour at a cost of £18,382. This would equate to a minimum increase of 2.14% for those paid less than £10 per hour.**
- iv) **A pay award of 2% to those not impacted by the £10 per hour increase, with effect from 1 April 2021 at an estimated cost of £431,426.**
- v) **The increase in the apprentice rates from April 2021, retaining the current differentials between employees who are under 18 and aged 20.**

Appendix 7 – Interim Feedback from Overview and Scrutiny Panels / Public Consultation

That Cabinet considers and has due regard to the contents of Appendix 7 and recommends that Council also gives it due regard.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT ACT 1972 - EXCLUSION OF THE PUBLIC

Item not required.

The meeting, which began at 6.15 pm, finished at 9.20 pm

CHAIRMAN.....

DATE.....