South Tyneside Council

Borough Council
19 May 2026

Borough Council Minutes

26 February 2026

Present: Councillors Smith (*in the Chair*), Berkley, Brenen, Brown, Carter, Clare, Coombes, Cunningham, Davies, Dawes, P Dean, S Dean, Dixon, Foggon, Ford, Foreman, Francis, Guy, Gynn, Hamilton, Harrison, Herbert, Keegan, Kennedy, Kilgour, Lamonte, K Maxwell, N Maxwell, McCabe, McHugh, McKeown, Meling, Myers, Owens-Palmer, Porthouse, Proudlock, K Roberts, T Roberts, Robertson, Stonehouse, Strike, J Taylor, R Taylor, Traynor, Welsh, Wood, Yare.

47

Apologies: Councillors Curtis, Ellison, Gibson, Leask, Potts and Thompson

7

The Chair reminded the public that the meeting was being recorded and live streamed.

Members were reminded of the Code of Conduct and Council Procedure Rules.

1. **Declarations of Interest**

There were no declarations of interest.

2. **Minutes of the Meeting of Council 15 January 2026**

Resolved: That the minutes of the Meeting of Borough Council held on 15 January 2026 be approved.

3. **Mayor’s Communications**

The Deputy Mayor informed Council of the sad death of former Councillor Jim Sewell, who served as an Elected Member for the Monkton ward from May

1999 to May 2022. Jim also served as the Mayor of South Tyneside over the Municipal year 2011-2012.

A minute's silence was observed for former Councillor Sewell.

4. Medium Term Financial Plan 2026-2031 Draft Budget Recommendations

Submitted: Report of the Director of Business and Resources

Councillor Foreman, Lead Member for Governance, Finance and Corporate Services, introduced the report which outlined the proposed budget and Capital Investment Strategy 2026-31. The Treasury Management Strategy 2026/27 was also attached for Member's consideration and had been compiled alongside the Council's budget.

Councillor Robertson raised concern that some Councillors were not declaring interests and dispensations. The Deputy Mayor noted that it would be up to each individual Councillor to declare any interests required.

Councillor Foreman moved the following:

(i) That the Council's Medium Term Financial Plan for 2026-31, as described in the document appended to the report be agreed;

(ii) The Director of Business and Resources, in consultation with the Leader of the Council be authorised to amend the budget recommendations to reflect any changes arising should the actual Fire and Civil Defence Authority and Police and Crime Commissioner precepts differ from the amounts included in the report;

(iii) The Director of Business and Resources, in consultation with the Leader of the Council be authorised to amend individual budget lines, shown in Appendix 1 of the Medium Term Financial Plan and school budgets to take into account the allocation of budgets currently held centrally or any changes to funding following the formal acceptance by Parliament of the Local Government Finance Settlement;

(iv) The Capital and Investment Strategy for 2026-31 be approved;

(v) That the Minimum Revenue Provision Policy Statement for 2026-31 be approved;

(vi) That the Treasury Management Strategy 2026/27 be approved;

(vii) That the Pay Policy Statement for 2026-2027 for South Tyneside Council be approved;

(viii) That the Rent Setting Policy 2026, which will be kept under review in response to legislative and regulatory changes, be approved;

(ix) That the following Council budgets be approved: -

a. The Council's revenue budget for the year 2026/27 be agreed as £248.228m;

b. The Council's revenue spending limit, for planning purposes, for the year 2027/28 be agreed as £248.788m, for the year 2028/29 be agreed as £247.036m, for the year 2029/30 be agreed as £253.520m, for the year 2030/31 be agreed as £260.279m.

c. The Council's capital budget (including the Housing Programme) for the year 2026/27 be agreed as £71.350m;

d. The Council's provisional capital budget (including the Housing Programme) for the year 2027/28 be agreed as £48.285m, for the year 2028/29 be agreed as £46.163m, for the year 2029/30 be agreed as £45.533m and for the year 2030/31 be agreed as £45.164m;

e. The Council's net housing revenue account budget for the year 2026/27 be agreed as £3.439m;

f. The Council's net housing revenue account budget, for planning purposes, for the year 2027/28 be agreed as £1.011m, for the year 2028/29 be agreed as (£0.792m), for the year 2029/30 be agreed as £0.107m and for the year 2030/31 be agreed as (£0.161m);

g. The detailed 2026/27 revenue and capital budgets identified in Appendices 1 and 4 of the Medium-Term Financial Plan (attached) be agreed;

h. The Tyne and Wear Pension Fund budget (approved by the Pensions Committee on the 27 January 2026) for the year 2026/27 be agreed as £246.905m.

(x) That in line with Government policy the following housing rent and service charge changes be approved:

a. Individual Council house dwelling rents for 2026/27 to be set in accordance with latest Government rent policy guidance to achieve an average increase across all dwellings of 4.8% per week with effect from 1st April 2026;

b. Garage rents to increase by £2.00 per week with effect from 1st April 2026;

c. That the housing services charges, Landlord service, guest room charges, heating charges, temporary accommodation charges and leaseholders management fees are changed as per the details included in the MTFP.

(xi) That the update of the risk-based reserves strategy, including the planned use of Council reserves (as described in the MTFP) be approved.

(xii) That it be noted that the Council calculated, in accordance with Section 31b of the Act, the Council Tax Base 2026-27 for the whole Council area as 39,661 (item T in the formula in Section 31b (1) of the Act).

(xiii) That the Council Tax requirement for the Council's own purposes for 2026/27 is £83.883m

(xiv) That the following amounts be calculated for the year 2026-27 in accordance with sections 31 to 36 of the Local Government Finance Act 1992:

a. £248.228m being the aggregate of the amounts which the Council estimates for the items set out in Section 31A(2) of the Act**;**

b. £164.345m being the aggregate of the amounts which the Council estimates for the items set out in Section 31A(3) of the Act;

c. £83.883m being the amount by which the aggregate at 11.8(a) above exceeds the aggregate at 11.8(b) above, calculated by the Council in accordance with section 31A(4) of the Act as its Council Tax requirement for the year.(Item R in the formula in Section 31B(1) of the Act);

d. £2,114.98 being the amount at 11.8(c) above (item R), all divided by the amount at 11.6 above (Item T), calculated by the Council, in accordance with Section 31B(1) of the Act, as the basic amount of its Council Tax for the year;

e. The South Tyneside Council Tax for the year 2026/27 for each category of dwelling shown as follows:

2026/27 BOROUGH COUNCIL TAX South Tyneside Council's Proportion	Band Weighting	South Tyneside Council 2026/27
Band A Properties	6/9	**£1,409.99**
Band B Properties	7/9	**£1,644.99**
Band C Properties	8/9	**£1,879.99**
Band D Properties	1	**£2,114.98**
Band E Properties	11/9	**£2,584.98**
Band F Properties	13/9	**£3,054.97**
Band G Properties	15/9	**£3,524.97**
Band H Properties	18/9	**£4,229.96**

f. That it be noted that for the year 2026/27, that the Tyne and Wear Fire and Civil Defence Authority and Northumbria Police and Crime Commissioner approve the following precepts amounts issued to the Council for each of the following categories of the dwellings shown as follows:

2026/27 BOROUGH COUNCIL TAX Fire and Police Proportion	Band Weighting	Fire Authority 2026/27	Police Authority 2026/27
Band A Properties	6/9	**£70.07**	**£142.89**
Band B Properties	7/9	**£81.75**	**£166.71**
Band C Properties	8/9	**£93.43**	**£190.52**
Band D Properties	1	**£105.11**	**£214.34**
Band E Properties	11/9	**£128.47**	**£261.97**
Band F Properties	13/9	**£151.83**	**£309.60**
Band G Properties	15/9	**£175.18**	**£357.23**
Band H Properties	18/9	**£210.22**	**£428.68**

g. That, having calculated the council tax for South Tyneside Council and based on the agreed precepts for Tyne and Wear Fire and Civil Defence Authority (£5.00 change) and Northumbria Police and Crime Commissioner (£18.50 change), the Council hereby sets the following amounts as the amount of council tax for the year 2026-27 for each category of dwelling shown below:

2026/27 Borough Council Tax	Band Weighting	Borough Council Tax 2026/27
Band A Properties *Annual Increase* *Weekly Increase*	6/9	**£1,622.95** *£82.16* *£1.58*
Band B Properties *Annual Increase* *Weekly Increase*	7/9	**£1,893.45** *£95.87* *£1.84*
Band C Properties *Annual Increase* *Weekly Increase*	8/9	**£2,163.94** *£109.55* *£2.11*
Band D Properties *Annual Increase* *Weekly Increase*	1	**£2,434.43** *£123.25* *£2.37*
Band E Properties *Annual Increase* *Weekly Increase*	11/9	**£2,975.42** *£150.64* *£2.90*
Band F Properties *Annual Increase* *Weekly Increase*	13/9	**£3,516.40** *£178.03* *£3.42*
Band G Properties *Annual Increase* *Weekly Increase*	15/9	**£4,057.38** *£205.41* *£3.95*
Band H Properties *Annual Increase* *Weekly Increase*	18/9	**£4,868.86** *£246.50* *£4.74*

It was seconded by Councillor Dawes.

Councillor Kennedy recognised that budgeting in Local Government was currently difficult as demand and costs rise. He stated that the funding system was stacked in a way that left Council's like South Tyneside trying to do more with less year on year. He thanked officers for the work undertaken in preparing the papers presented today. Nationally the fair funding review had not been fair to South Tyneside, it had abandoned places such as this, the scale of cuts would damage the Borough for years to come.

This budget means the people of South Tyneside are being asked to accept paying more for less. It is squeezing more from households who are already struggling whilst things people notice day to day are being reduced, scaled back or put at risk. There are reductions in support that are important to families including reductions in school meal subsidies, pressures and cuts hitting women's health support and cuts to public events which build community life and bring people together. They all form part of how to prevent isolation support wellbeing and maintain pride and place. It was felt that if the leadership could not say now what services were being reduced, by how much and what residents will experience as a result of the cuts then it was difficult to make sense of what was being offered. It was not fair on the opposition councillors or the public. The opposition councillors have been involved in the Scrutiny of this budget throughout, but they will reject the budget, as a budget of this scale and level of impact can't be supported on the above basis or with partial information. The National Funding settlement is harmful to residents unless it changes, Cabinet should govern transparently, show workings and not hide behind in-year operational decisions when Members are being asked to approve a framework to drive such decisions.

Councillor Davies submitted and presented an amended budget on behalf of the Green party set out below.

The amended budget was as follows:

Green Group Amendment to the MTFP 2026-2027

1. Fundamentally, this is another austerity Medium Term Financial Plan (MTFP). It delivers a significant reduction in the number of staff across the Council at a time when officers are already carrying increased workloads and responding to rising demand.

2. It places an above-inflation increase on council taxpayers, while the Fair Funding Settlement continues to assume the Council will set the maximum permissible council tax rise every single year.

3. These amendments seek to realign the MTFP with what matters most: Healthy and Well communities, tackling anti-social behaviour, and addressing the persistent concern that "there's nothing for kids to do around here". It also restores a clear spend-to-save measure, recognising that prevention and early intervention reduces long-term costs.

4. To meet these spending priorities, there is a significant rebalancing of councillor allowances and Special Responsibility Allowances (SRAs). Independent assessments of the Council have advised the Constitution Committee that, for a council of our size, there are too many positions attracting SRAs. By cutting Vice-Chair allowances and deleting a Cabinet position, we save £54,500. As per appendix 1 with over 150 council Full Time Equivalent roles to be lost this year, we must look to ourselves and consider

whether it is legitimate to increase or even maintain councillor allowances at their current level. This amendment therefore freezes the core allowance, saving £25,000, and reduces SRAs by 20%, saving a further £48,000.

5. On councillor travel, most members have no requirement to travel outside the borough on official business. While some travel is necessary to learn from best practice and share the good work undertaken here, this budget ensures such travel is undertaken shrewdly and at the lowest reasonable cost.

6. The Council has reconsidered its offer for summer concerts within this MTFP, and this amendment seeks to align that with civic events throughout the year. A £17,500 saving would be delivered through a significant scaling-back of events such as Mayor Making and Freedom of the Borough ceremonies. Lost revenue could be offset in part through increased sponsorship, as demonstrated by the PROUD Awards, which are already nearly 25% sponsor-funded.

7. Providing greater clarity within the MTFP, this amendment highlights the Integrated Transport Block (ITB). The ITB funds small transport improvements such as road safety schemes, traffic signals and public transport infrastructure. It is a discretionary grant from central government. This amendment prioritises a portion of that funding to improve connections between homes, schools and places of work, rather than focusing predominantly on road capacity for drivers.

8. School meals remain heavily subsidised. This is a cost increase that impacts a majority of households with School age children, by reducing councillor compensation we are able to reduce the proposed rise by 5p, setting the new charge at £2.85 per meal helping families with the cost-of-living. We are also able to freeze green waste charges at a cost of £32,000, supporting many households during continued cost-of-living pressures.

9. This amendment restores the Green Exercise programme, which has an outstanding record of outreach to residents facing disadvantage. Restoring funding, plus inflation, ensures continued support for residents to live healthy, happy lives.

10. Much of the Youth Work team works short shifts balancing other commitments. This amendment funds an additional full-time equivalent Youth Worker to strengthen the excellent diversionary work already being delivered and to expand collaborative outreach into our communities.

11. In summary, this amendment makes different choices. It asks elected members to share in restraint at a time of staff reductions. It prioritises prevention, connected communities and practical support for families over ceremonial largess. It delivers £147,000 of internal savings, redirects 20% of ITB funding toward active travel and connectivity, and introduces targeted investment in youth services, public health and cost-of-living support.

Cost area	Savings
Reduce Special Responsibility Allowances (SRAs) by 20%	£48,000.00
Remove all 11 Vice – Chair SRAs	£41,000.00
Remove the 3.5% rise in councillor allowances	£25,000.00
Reduce Civic Celebration Budget	£17,500.00
Delete a Cabinet role	£13,500.00
Restrict long distance members travel on public transport to the cheapest available option	£2,000.00
Total	**£147,000.00**
Revenue	**Income**
Integrated Transport Block (ITB)	£751,000.00
Total	**£751,000.00**
Expenditure	**Cost**
From ITB: Accessible Crossings and a Stronger Connected active travel network: connecting work and school to home	£150,000.00
ITB as proposed	£601,000.00
School Meals Subsidy reduce the rise by 5p, to £2.85	£42,500.00
Freeze Green Waste Charges	£32,000.00
Restore Green Exercise programme + inflation	£31,000.00
1 FTE Youth Worker	£41,500.00
Total	**£898,000.00**

Councillors Harrison and Robertson suggested through points of order that the amendment should not be heard as it relied on changes that could only be made at Constitution Committee. The Leader stated that she was also concerned as Chair of the Constitution Committee and proposed that the points in the amendment be considered at a Constitution working group following which, any proposals would be presented to the Constitution Committee and the draft revised Constitution containing the proposed required changes be presented to the annual meeting.

The Deputy Mayor informed Council that there were no legal or procedural rules that would prevent this amendment being heard. He noted that the revised budget proposed does rely on other matters falling into place in terms of changes being presented to and being approved by Constitution Committee and noted that Members could take this into consideration when voting.

Councillor R Taylor seconded the amendment. She stated that the amendment was about prevention, supporting families right now and giving young people something positive, she set out the proposals which provided for this.

Councillor Kennedy stated that he could not support the amendment as drafted due to process and scrutiny. He felt the amendment didn’t change the fundamental picture of the main budget. Councillor Brenen agreed and stated he was unable to support the amendment as he felt it was the same budget with minor proposed changes; he also stated that it was difficult to present an alternative budget without access to all financial material. Councillor Guy agreed and set out the reasons why he was unable to support this amendment, he felt that any potential savings made should have been directed towards the supporting the Council reserves.

Councillor McHugh noted the proposal for a full time Youth worker and informed Council that South Tyneside already had a service providing youth workers across the Borough. Councillor R Taylor clarified the reason for this being included and stated that currently there is only one full time youth worker for the whole of the Borough and the service had suggested that an additional full time youth worker could make a huge difference for the children in the community.

Councillor Francis welcomed the work undertaken by Councillor Davies on the amendment. He stated that as they were not the lead opposition group, they had done the best they could with the information available. He clarified the reasons for the proposals.

Councillor Lamonte responded to the proposals for a Green Gym stating that currently the Council had six new posts in Social Care, Local Area co-ordinators who were working with disadvantaged and vulnerable people across a number of wards in the Borough. They aim to help those who are isolated and getting those involved to appointments until they are able to do things for themselves. She felt the green exercise scenario was being undertaken at the moment through these six positions.

Councillors Hamilton, Robertson and Roberts felt the amendment did not provide substantial savings.

Councillor Robertson asked the following questions:

- The amendment claims to protect services yet no mention of the cost of the Political Advisers, he asked why this was not included and whether the Green party still had a Political Adviser?
- Amendment relies on short term funding switches rather than permanent solutions what happens when the money runs out next year?

- You present this as a responsible alternative budget, yet it contains no officer confirmed delivery plan why should the Council believe it is deliverable and not aspirational?
- How can you reconcile your duty to challenge financial risk and sustainability with supporting an amendment that relies on one off funding and has no long-term funding plan?
- If the amendment does not balance sustainably, does not prevent redundancies and does not have confirmed delivery capacity why should the Council support this at all?

Councillor Davies responded to the questions above:

- The Political Adviser's are temporary contracts which end at the end of the Municipal Year and built into the current MTFP, their roles could be managed through vacancy management.
- The allowances cut is permanent, it is not short term, it lasts year to year and it passes the balanced budget test.
- It is deliverable, in context to the ITB portion, this is a grant received, structured over the next five years from the North East Combined Authority, it is about changing the priority. It was suggested some of this could go towards bus lane enhancements.
- This is funding and deliverable as it comes from devolved money from the combined authority.
- We are here on redundancy management; he acknowledged the reduction to the school meals charge was not a lot of money but an aim to reduce pressure on families. Since Green waste charges were introduced, many residents did not pay to have them emptied.

A named vote was taken on the amendment to the budget submitted by the Green Party, Medium-Term Financial Plan 2026-2031 and the associated recommendations. The votes cast were as follows:

For: 8 (Davies, Ford, Francis, Gynn, Herbert, McKeown, Stonehouse, R Taylor)

Against: 38 (Berkley, Brenen, Brown, Carter, Clare, Coombes, Cunningham, Dawes, P Dean, S Dean, Dixon, Foggon, Foreman, Guy, Hamilton, Harrison, Keegan, Kennedy, Kilgour, Lamonte, K Maxwell, N Maxwell, McCabe, McHugh, Meling, Myers, Owens-Palmer, Porthouse, Proudlock, K Roberts, T Roberts, Robertson, Strike, J Taylor, Traynor, Welsh, Wood, Yare.)

Abstention: 0

The amendment to the motion was not carried.

Councillor Francis acknowledged the work which had gone into this budget. He was particularly pleased with the changes made in respect of the Library and The Word shop along with the continuing work of community responders. He felt the challenges were due to austerity which was harming our community. He stated that the Council was at serious risk because of the unfair funding review, he had concern for the years ahead, he acknowledged the work done in terms of lobbying by the Council and the North East Combined Authority to try to mitigate against the impact of this, but the result is less money for the next three years.

Councillor Kilgour raised a concern over the Local Plan developers as when discussing the funding of the infrastructure they appeared to be looking towards the Local Authority to find money to fund the infrastructure which national highways also does not have either. She stated that she would strongly object to supporting this as the Council had difficulty in providing the essential and statutory services to residents and therefore should not be supporting funding to assist private developers.

Councillor R Taylor stated that the impact assessments attached to the Medium-Term Financial Plan were not strong enough for decisions of this scale and importance. She felt the information provided made it difficult to understand the real consequences of what was being proposed. She did not feel the library assessments were detailed enough and did not reflect the reality of what libraries really were, she felt this raised concern over the robustness of the process. She felt that formal steps were necessary to strengthen this process.

Councillor Brenen outlined issues throughout his ward and Councillor Myers referred to higher Council tax bills, reduced services and financial pressures being felt by residents. Both stating that they could not support the budget.

Councillor Hamilton asked the following questions:

- The Medium-Term financial plan allows usable reserves to fall significantly below the Council stated minimal level, can you confirm how much financial headroom in monetary terms the Council would have left in 2026/27 to respond to an in year overspend before emergency measures would be required?
- If a material overspend were to arise in 2026/27, can you set out what in year controls or corrective actions Cabinet would expect officers to take and whether these would involve immediate service reductions or use of a one-off funding?
- Can you confirm if Cabinet has agreed any formal trigger points that would require the Medium-Term financial plan to be revisited or reset such as reserve levels demand growth or failure to deliver planned savings?

Councillor Foreman requested that the Councillor provide the questions in writing and he would meet the Councillor to provide the answers.

Councillor Davies stated that Members would like more detail on the Medium Term Financial Plan at an earlier stage, the information provided to the Scrutiny Committee on the budget in January would benefit from a detailed report of this level and not simply a presentation. Councillor McCabe and Carter felt that there was ample opportunity for Councillors to ask questions on the budget and the MTPF.

Councillor Harrison asked the following questions:

- What is the total amount of Council borrowing and other financial liabilities currently outstanding excluding PFI and interest liabilities?
- How much does the Council owe in outstanding PFI payments?
- What is the total amount of interest due on all outstanding borrowing and other financial commitments over the entire term of loans and agreements not just snapshot to suit the purposes of the MTFP?
- When will all the Council's outstanding borrowing and other financial liabilities be paid in full and the Council and people of South Tyneside become debt free?

Councillor Foreman requested that the Councillor provide the questions in writing and he would meet the Councillor to provide the answers.

Councillor Robertson thanked officers and asked the following questions:

- How can residents be asked to accept service cuts and job losses when senior officer's salaries continue to rise, will they be considering a pay freeze?
- He referred to Chief officer posts stating that the payments were subject to satisfactory performance as determined by the Council's Head of Paid Service, and asked who looks at the performance of the Head of Paid service?.
- He stated that more than £200,000 had been spent on external solicitors for complaints and asked whether the budget covered for £200,000 as the number of outstanding complaints were the same going forward? He asked if this was being policed.

Councillor Foreman stated that he would respond directly to the questions but that the policing of this would be the responsibility of the Audit Committee.

Councillor Owens - Palmer referred to Councillor Hamilton's question and informed Council that currently the Council had £5m in reserves with a further £3m being added, the minimum reserves should be £10m so the Council was still substantially under this amount. She noted that demand and costs were rising and the funding system was not working for South Tyneside. Members were being told that funds would be found in year through operational decisions, and she felt that this did not meet the standards of transparency and accountability and therefore she could not support this budget.

Councillor Roberts requested that in the future a cross-party budget be considered.

Councillor Foreman responded to the debate. He stated that £11.6m worth of savings was needed to present a balanced budget. He informed Council that Cabinet started the budget process in June 2025, it had been a difficult process with difficult proposals. He informed Council of his retirement and thanked all the residents and all those Councillors of the past 27 years including opposition Councillors.

Councillor Dixon closed the debate. She informed Council that £4.2m had gone back into the reserves from the recovery grant not £3m. She acknowledged that it had been a very challenging eighteen months but outlined some of the benefits being felt by residents. She extended her gratitude to Councillor Foreman and all Cabinet members for preparing this budget with the support of Council officers. She referred to the extra improved financial settlement received outlining the budget needs of the community. Tackling ASB was a top priority received from the feedback from the residents' consultation survey and the investment into Community responders was crucial. The Council had invested in children's services by providing local high-quality accommodation for the young people and investment in regeneration through the emerging College campus and housing at Holborn.

Councillor Robertson asked what the implications were should the budget not be set today, the Deputy Mayor informed Council that if the budget was not agreed then Council would consider it again next week.

Recommendation (i)
A named vote was taken on the original Medium-Term Financial Plan 2026-2031 and the associated recommendations as presented by Councillor Foreman. The votes cast were as follows:

For: 23 (Berkley, Carter, Clare, Cunningham, Dawes, P Dean, S Dean, Dixon, Foreman, Keegan, Kilgour, Lamonte, K Maxwell, N Maxwell, McCabe, McHugh, Meling, Porthouse, Proudlock, Strike, J Taylor, Traynor, Welsh.

Against: 23 (Brenen, Brown, Coombes, Davies, Foggon, Ford, Francis, Guy, Gynn, Hamilton, Harrison, Herbert, Kennedy, McKeown, Myers, Owens- Palmer, K Roberts, T Roberts, Robertson, Stonehouse, R Taylor, Wood, Yare.

Abstention: 0

Given the equal numbers of votes cast, the Deputy Mayor exercised his casting vote. He voted in favour of the motion.
For: 24
Against:23
Abstention:0

The motion was carried.

Recommendation (ii)
Council was asked to agree to authorise the Director of Business and Resources, in consultation with the Leader of the Council, to amend the budget recommendations to reflect any changes arising should the actual Fire and Civil Defence Authority and Police and Crime Commissioner precepts differ from the amounts included in the report. There was no dissenting voice.

The motion was unanimously carried.

Recommendation (iii)
Council was asked to agree to authorise the Director of Business and Resources in consultation with the Leader of the Council, to amend individual budget lines shown in Appendix 1 of the Medium Term Financial Plan and school budgets to take into account the allocation of budgets currently held centrally or any changes to funding following the formal acceptance by Parliament of the Local Government Finance Settlement. There was no dissenting voice.

The motion was unanimously carried.

Recommendation (iv)
Council was asked to approve the Capital Investment Strategy 2026-2031. There was no dissenting voice.

The motion was unanimously carried.

Recommendation (v)
Council was asked to approve the Minimum Revenue Provision Policy Statement for 2026-31.
There was no dissenting voice.

The motion was unanimously carried.

Recommendation (vi)
Council was asked to approve the Treasury Management Strategy 2026-27. There was no dissenting voice.

The motion was unanimously carried.

Recommendation (vii)
Council was asked to agree the Pay Policy Statement for 2026-27.
There was no dissenting voice.

The motion was unanimously carried.

Recommendation (viii)
Council was asked to agree the Rent Setting Policy 2026 which was to be kept under review in response to legislative and regulatory changes.
There was no dissenting voice.

The motion was unanimously carried.

5. To consider any questions received under Procedure Rule 8

No questions in relation to budget setting had been received under Council Procedure Rule 8.

6. To consider any petitions received under Procedure Rule 9

No petitions in relation to budget setting had been received under Council Procedure Rule 9.

7. To consider any Motions received under Procedure Rule 10

No motions in relation to budget setting had been received under Council Procedure Rule 10.