

## Extraordinary Council – 21 February 2023

---

Minutes of the meeting of **Extraordinary Council** held on **21 February 2023** when there were present:-

Chairman: Cllr M J Steptoe  
Vice-Chairman: Cllr Mrs J E McPherson

Cllr Mrs D L Belton	Cllr J R F Mason
Cllr Mrs L A Butcher	Cllr G W Myers
Cllr M R Carter	Cllr J E Newport
Cllr Mrs T L Carter	Cllr L J Newport
Cllr R P Constable	Cllr Mrs C E Roe
Cllr J E Cripps	Cllr D W Sharp
Cllr A G Cross	Cllr Mrs L Shaw
Cllr D S Efde	Cllr D J Sperring
Cllr A H Eves	Cllr Mrs D P Squires-Coleman
Cllr I A Foster	Cllr C M Stanley
Cllr Mrs E P Gadsdon	Cllr I H Ward
Cllr J N Gooding	Cllr M J Webb
Cllr Mrs J R Gooding	Cllr M G Wilkinson
Cllr M Hoy	Cllr A L Williams
Cllr R Lambourne	Cllr S A Wilson
Cllr J L Lawmon	Cllr Mrs V A Wilson
Cllr Mrs J R Lumley	Cllr S E Wootton
Cllr Mrs C M Mason	

### **APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**

Apologies for absence were received from Cllrs T D Knight and R Milne.

### **OFFICERS PRESENT**

J Stephenson	Chief Executive Officer
S Summers	Strategic Director
E Yule	Strategic Director
P Barnes	Director, Assets & Investments
M Hotten	Director, Environment
A Hunkin	Interim Director, People & Governance
T Lilley	Director, Communities & Health
T Willis	Interim Director, Resources
C Cox	Finance Manager
H Boyd	Civic Officer
K Sims	Corporate Services Officer

### **DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

Members were reminded that the Monitoring Officer had issued a dispensation to all Members covering the setting of council tax or a precept under the Local Government Finance Act 1992.

### 41 2023/24 BUDGET AND MEDIUM TERM FINANCIAL STRATEGY

Council considered the report of the Interim Director of Resources setting out the proposed 2023/24 Budget and Medium Term Financial Strategy (MTFS) for the period 2023/24 to 2025/26 for Council's approval.

The Leader of the Council reminded Members that this meeting was one of the most important in the municipal year as it was vital that the Council had a robust and sustainable financial plan for the future in order to continue to deliver the many important services the Council provides – both statutory and non-statutory. The key strategic goal as a Council is to be a modern, accessible and financially sustainable Council delivering excellent value for money services to residents and businesses in the district at a proportionate and reasonable cost from the taxes and charges we levy as an authority.

The Leader stated that this was a balanced budget with no funding gap and therefore no need to have any subsidy from reserves. No debt, no interest payments, no capital repayments, no lending, no cuts to services, support to the financially vulnerable through council tax support and hardship funding. Community grants, capital investment in the Council's buildings' estate, a commitment to make the Mill Arts and Events Centre a jewel in the crown for local residents as well as developing community and office facilities in the Freight House. The proposal to increase council tax by 2.97% - equivalent to £7.29p per year – an extra 14p per week on a Band D property was significantly less than inflation.

The Leader thanked the former and current S151 Officers for all the briefings they had given to all Members to support and help understanding on Council finances.

The Leader emphasised that he genuinely believed that there was a lot to be positive about, but also wanted to be honest about some of the challenges and to explain that to govern was to choose, and there were serious consequences resulting from those choices.

The Leader stated that this time last year a balanced budget for 2022/23 had been put in place, but there had been a predicted budget gap for 2023/24 and 2024/25. However, the pay award in 2022 turned out to be a lot higher than expected – adding around 7% to the pay bill; and there had also been no anticipation of Russia's invasion of Ukraine and the effect this would have on inflation. Despite this, through careful financial management, the forecast was to more or less break even this financial year but inflation would have a large impact on next year's budget.

The Leader reminded Members that a business plan was in place which set out key achievements, including the Rochford Norse Joint Venture, the #OneTeam partnership with Brentwood Borough Council, four major Connect projects, support to residents with a cost of living campaign, investments of £100,000 in the Hockley Woods Play Space and Hockley Woods Car Park,

the purchase of £2.2m of refuse vehicles, and the Rochford District Matters magazine.

The Leader continued that the proposed budget contained a small contribution to reserves next year. Although any increase in council tax placed an additional burden on households, it was modest when compared to inflation; inflation had had a significant impact on the Council's own expenditure. The contribution to reserves was to maintain a working balance of £1.2m.

There had been no need to salami slice savings in services. Instead, the way we planned to deliver savings over the next three years was primarily through the strategic partnership. The new shared teams would deliver services more efficiently but always preserving the sovereignty of this Council.

The Leader stated that the Council had been able to reduce the amount paid into the pension fund each year by £395,000. The Council had also benefitted from business rates re-evaluations worth £680,000 and the New Homes Bonus Scheme of £840,000.

The Leader emphasised there was predicted to be an extra £250,000 income from investments and this was due to the Council's good financial management.

Turning to the Capital Programme the Leader emphasised that major investment plans needed to be funded and this wasn't through borrowing; that was not to say that borrowing would never be considered to fund the right project.

The Leader set out provisions in the Community Safety Fund, emphasising the shift in CCTV funding. He also highlighted the £1,000 available to all town and parish councils to hold events marking the King's Coronation.

The Leader concluded by saying he was proud to be presenting this budget and that there were very many councils that were facing far tougher decisions. The Leader commended the budget to the Council with a summary of a 2.97% increase in council tax, no service reductions, continuing to support the most vulnerable in the district, no debt, a corporate strategy delivery to build on the strategic partnership with Brentwood Borough Council and future years' uncertainty that had to be acknowledged; however, a balanced medium term financial strategy had been achieved.

The Leader of the Council moved a Motion, seconded by the Portfolio Holder for Finance, Economy & Climate, to approve the recommendations set out in paragraph 17.1 of the report.

In seconding the Motion, the Portfolio Holder for Finance, Economy & Climate referenced the rise in most fees and charges bringing Rochford in line with inflation; but that car parking charges had not been increased and neither had

cemetery charges. The Portfolio Holder for Finance, Economy & Climate added that she was exceptionally proud of the work the Council had done to support local businesses and was delighted to be able to provide a budget to allow this vital work for the Council's economy to continue, along with the ambitious task of becoming carbon neutral by 2030 with funds available for ideas, and to be able to employ a sustainability officer to ensure that those ideas were able to come to fruition. In summary, the Portfolio Holder for Finance, Economy & Climate emphasised that for an additional 14p per week, not only could cuts to services be prevented but that a plan had been set out to increase them, along with resources, to keep improving the services for residents.

A Member thanked the Leader for his detailed report but had concerns with some aspects. The capital programme for the Asset Delivery Programme had reduced by £1.5m as a result of funding for the Mill Arts & Events Centre being removed in light of the decision not to develop it, and a re-assessment of the other elements in the Asset Delivery Programme, including a reduced amount for the Freight House redevelopment. £622,000 was added to the revenue budget to fund payment to GB Partnerships so the reduction in the Asset Delivery Programme between the 2023 budget and the 2023/24 budget was not redeployed. The Asset Delivery Programme was currently being reviewed to reflect the revised investment strategy so it was too early to specify how the £4.2m would be spent. It was a provision available to fund the revised asset strategy which would be presented to Council at a future date. The uncertainty and lack of proper project plan led the Member to find it difficult to support this aspect of the budget. Added to that was the proposed increase of £50,000 to general reserves and £290,000 to earmarked reserves for investments at a time when residents were suffering from unprecedented cost of living increases. The Member believed that this budget would create further hardship for many members of the community and therefore with reluctance she could not and would not support it.

A Member thanked the Leader and his administration for the time and effort it had obviously taken to prepare this budget. Historically the Member had supported the budget, recognising that as costs increased, income needed to increase in line with it. In addition, there had always been investment. The Member was concerned with the increase from the usual 2% to 2.97%; and that it seemed that the only reason was to put an extra £70,000 into reserves – and that he couldn't support. The Member emphasised that there was a lot of good financial management that went on in this Council, but equally there was some bad financial management and there had been some wasted money, as yet still undisclosed, to GB Partnerships. The Member summarised that whilst he did agree with a rise, he could not support an increase where part of it was simply going into reserves.

A Member stated that the largest number of complaints he received from residents related to planning and enforcement and asked the Portfolio Holder for Strategic Planning & Assets to confirm that the proposed budget was

sufficient to enable the recruitment of experienced planners to boost the performance of the planning and enforcement department.

The Portfolio Holder for Strategic Planning & Assets responded that he was looking to begin a performance management service review in March. A budget was in place and reasonable needs identified in the upcoming review. The Connect Project would greatly support the planning department leading to a better, improved service for all residents.

A Member stated that 50% of the budget was everyday Council supply, delivery and general goings on for the Council, supported by an in depth cost explanation. Section 13 dealt with numerous risks, but the mitigation measures were explained in some detail. With regard to the capital budget, section 14 talked about the robustness of the budget estimate and all the various criteria that needed to be met. However, the new waste treatment project of £1.7m had no schedule, milestones or risk management. There was no funding, timeline or risks for the Mill Arts & Events Centre as there was a need for a new outline business case. The Asset Delivery Programme got two different mentions and the sum of £4.2m appeared to be a residual amount of the original outline business case redeployed or left over. But neither reference acknowledged the independent audit that was carried out some months ago that summarised in five points - three critical and two urgent - that would change the scope of that statement and therefore it recommended a new outline business case. The Member asked that the Interim Director of Resources set some deadlines for the outline business cases in the near future.

The Interim Director of Resources responded that section 14 was to give reassurance to Members that reserves were sufficient and that the budgeting processes were adequate. The current policy was to set aside 10% of net revenue expenditure in case of emergencies and reflected the increase in council tax that would ensure that balance was sufficient and underpinned some of the assurance statement. With regard to the lack of detail around how the capital programme would be spent, the capital programme was projects that the Council aspired to do. There was a degree of uncertainty as specifications needed to be written and procurement carried out; and there was also inflation. The Interim Director of Resources concluded that he was relaxed about that as it was not untypical for a Medium Term Financial Strategy at this stage.

A Member asked for reassurance that following the Leader's comments on CCTV, the money carried forward for Rayleigh Town Council would reflect what Rayleigh Town Council wanted.

The Leader responded that there was no difference between what the Council and Rayleigh Town Council wanted – a robust system which served the community and did its job. He made it clear that funding wouldn't be withdrawn if Rayleigh Town Council was at a contractual stage of implementing a scheme. However, that was not the case, and the intention

was that the Council would pick up 100% of the capital costs with the Town Council picking up revenue costs.

A Member stated that she fully supported the budget and was very proud of what had been achieved, especially with regard to the Rangers Service. She thanked all Members and officers involved.

A Member asked why increases in council tax were forecasted at 2% in future years and also queried why there was no mention of risks around devolution and why there seemed to be very little funding available for tourism.

On the first two points, the Interim Director of Resources responded that the government had set a threshold of 3% for 2023/24 because of extremely high costs, but he anticipated that the threshold would then come down to 2%. There were risks on devolution, but the risk could not be quantified at this stage – especially with regard to financial risks.

On the third point, the Portfolio Holder for Finance, Economy & Climate responded that we have a vibrant district with a wealth of culture, history and heritage and should be looking to work on that. We have the Shared Prosperity Fund and the Community Investment Plan, so there were budgets for tourism.

The Portfolio Holder for Customer Services, Legal & Leisure added that in his opinion tourism had been underfunded but it was good that we now had earmarked funds from the Shared Prosperity Fund - the first tranche of which needed to be spent very soon.

Cllr M Hoy felt that the budget process could be improved. Also, with regard to savings - investment income of £250,000 and pension re-evaluation of £395,000 - these were not within the Council's control. Cllr M Hoy declared his membership of the Essex County Council Pension Board. Cllr M Hoy stated that he didn't disagree with everything in the budget and knew that it was a difficult process. With regard to general reserves, guidance from CIPFA was that these should be 5% to 10% and we should aim for the lower amount. He also didn't think that the additional council tax should just be put into reserves – and they were too high.

Cllr M Hoy moved a Motion for the following recommendations to be added to the recommendations on page 3.24. This was seconded by Cllr S A Wilson.

1. To assist those in need most during the cost of living crisis to provide them with a subsidy of £80. For ease of identification everyone on the LCTS would receive this amount. This is not to be seen as part of the LCTS, but as a method for identifying people and making payments to them. The cost is £291,200 and would be paid for out of general reserves.
2. Park Home site fees to go up by 14.1% rather than the 11.1% proposed.

3. That Councillors can claim only one special responsibility allowance. At the moment they can claim multiple ones. This will obviously have a budgetary effect with a reduction in the amount paid overall to Councillors. This matter to be referred to the Constitution Working Group.

Cllr M Hoy had also been considering submitting a recommendation for a freeze to Mill Arts & Events Centre prices. However, there was some confusion, with some users of the hall saying that they had gone up and officers saying that they were lower. He asked that present and past prices be clarified.

The Interim Director of Resources responded that charges had been levied by Fusion, and VAT had been added. Now that the charges were levied by the Council, VAT wasn't charged. The customer was therefore charged less, but the amount received by the Council was the same. For example, the weekend 48 hours fee for the main hall was £500 through Fusion and £475 by RDC. The Interim Director of Resources had previously responded to Cllr M Hoy on various prices.

A Member spoke in favour of proposed recommendation 1 but felt that there was a need to ensure the figures were correct, and whether recipients under the LCTS were the right group as they were already receiving payments. Perahia, a cross party task and finish group, should look at this.

Another Member concurred with this view and also spoke in favour of proposed recommendation 2. She felt that proposed recommendation 3 should be dealt with by the Independent Remuneration Panel and that a review was due this year.

A Member spoke in favour of all three proposed recommendations and supported the idea of a working group for proposed recommendation 1.

Another Member spoke in favour of proposed recommendation 1 and suggested that a timescale be set for the work to be carried out.

Another Member spoke in favour of proposed recommendation 1 and concurred with the view that a working group be set up.

Cllr M Hoy added that he had arrived at the £80 figure with officers earlier in the year, but the figure may need to be reviewed.

Cllr M Hoy and Cllr S A Wilson made amendments to the proposed additional recommendations 1 and 2.

That the Overview and Scrutiny Committee sets up a time limited working group to determine whether payments should be made to residents within the district affected by the cost of living crisis including to whom, how, sources of funding and financial amounts.

A Member asked about the impact on the budget. The Interim Director of Resources responded that this would be covered by the deliberations of the working group.

A Member asked that the working group give due regard to data held by the cost of living group.

The proposed recommendation as amended, was declared carried upon a show of hands.

(This was unanimously agreed.)

Park Home site fees to go up by 14.1% rather than the 11.1% proposed.

The proposed recommendation was declared carried upon a show of hands.

(This was unanimously agreed.)

That Members can claim only one special responsibility allowance and to refer the matter to the Independent Remuneration Panel.

The proposed recommendation, as amended, was declared carried upon a show of hands.

(34 Members voted in favour, 0 against and 3 Members abstained.)

### **Resolved**

- (1) That the net revenue budget requirement for 2023/24 be set at £12.032m as per paragraph 7.22.

(20 Members voted in favour, 10 Members voted against and 5 Members abstained.)

- (2) That the Capital Programme for 2023/24 set out at Appendix 2 be approved, and the forecasts for the years 2024/25 to 2025/26 be noted.

(18 Members voted in favour, 15 Members voted against and 4 Members abstained.)

- (3) That the Section 151 Officer be authorised to adjust capital project budgets in 2023/24 after the 2022/23 accounts are closed and the amounts of slippage and budget carry forward required are confirmed.

(26 Members voted in favour, 1 Member against and 10 Members abstained.)

- (4) That it be noted that the proposed Council Tax requirement for the Council's own purposes (excluding Parish & Town Councils and Precepts) for 2023/24 is £8.303m as per paragraph 7.22.



- (5) That the 2023/24 Band D equivalent tax base for the purpose of determining council tax charge be agreed as 32,888.9 properties.

(This was unanimously agreed.)

- (6) That the increase in Rochford District Council Tax of £7.29 (2.97%) for 2023/24 be approved by recorded vote.

On a requisition to Council Procedure Rule 17.4 a recorded vote was taken as follows:-

For (19) Cllrs Mrs D L Belton; Mrs L A Butcher; M R Carter; Mrs T L Carter; R P Constable; J E Cripps; D S Efde; I A Foster; Mrs E P Gadsdon; Mrs J R Lumley; G W Myers; Mrs C E Roe; Mrs L Shaw; D J Sperring; M J Steptoe; I H Ward; M J Webb; A L Williams; S E Wootton

Against (18) Cllrs A G Cross; A H Eves; J N Gooding; Mrs J R Gooding; M Hoy; R Lambourne; J L Lawmon; Mrs C M Mason; J R F Mason; Mrs J E McPherson; J E Newport; L J Newport; D W Sharp; Mrs D P Squires-Coleman; C M Stanley; M G Wilkinson; S A Wilson; Mrs V A Wilson

- (7) That the schedule of fees and charges for 2023/24 set out in Appendix 3 be approved.

(32 Members voted in favour, 0 against and 5 Members abstained.)

- (8) That the target minimum General Balance as at 1 April 2024 be set at £1.208m.

(18 Members voted in favour, 16 Members voted against and 3 Members abstained.)

- (9) That the expected earmarked reserves position set out in Section 14 be noted.

- (10) That the statement on the robustness of the estimates and reserves at Section 14 be noted.

- (11) That the advanced payment of £0.093m be approved to fund the tri-annual pension deficit payment in one instalment in 2023/24.

(36 Members voted in favour, 0 against and 1 Member abstained.)

- (12) That the Equality Impact Assessment as set out in Section 12 of this report be noted.

- (13) That the Capital and Treasury Management Strategy for 2023/24, as set out in Appendix 4 including the 2023/24 Prudential Indicators is approved.

(32 Members voted in favour, 0 against and 5 Members abstained.)

- (14) That the Budget Consultation Report at Appendix 5 be noted.

- (15) That the Overview and Scrutiny Committee sets up a time limited working group to determine whether payments should be made to residents within the district affected by the cost of living crisis including: to whom, how, sources of funding and financial amounts.

- (16) Park Home site fees to go up by 14.1% rather than the 11.1% proposed.

- (17) That Members can claim only one special responsibility allowance and to refer the matter to the Independent Remuneration Panel. (IDR)

Recommendations (15) to (17) were voted en bloc.

(35 Members voted in favour, 0 against and 2 Members abstained.)

The meeting adjourned from 9.05 pm to 9.15 pm.

## 42 SETTING THE COUNCIL TAX 2023/24

Council considered the report of the Interim Director of Resources seeking Council's authorisation to set the Council Tax for the year 2023/24.

The Portfolio Holder for Finance, Economy & Climate introduced the report and explained that it presented the Council Tax resolution for 2023/24 in a standard format, as prescribed by regulations.

The report included the amount for the District's Council Tax of £252.45 for a Band D property as reflected in the Budget report that the Council had just approved.

The Portfolio Holder for Finance, Economy & Climate drew Members' attention to some corrections to the figures in Appendix D and Appendix E. The changes were to all the figures for Council Tax for Band G and Band H properties. The amended appendices showed each figure to be higher by one penny in all cases. The error arose because the original figures were calculated using the notified percentage increases for the police and fire precepts, but when the actual amounts were known, rounding resulted in a fractionally higher figure for the larger bandings. All Council Tax figures in the Budget report, and all other figures in this report, were correct.

The Portfolio Holder for Finance, Economy & Climate moved a Motion, seconded by the Leader of the Council, to approve the recommendation set out at paragraph 5.1 of the report.

The Interim Director of Resources explained that this was a technical report and the financial figures within this report were the background figures that make up the total council tax calculation.

A Member requested assurance from the relevant Portfolio Holders that no charge would be made in Council owned car parks for the NHS Breast Screening Unit; no charge would be made for holders of blue badges in any Council owned car parks and no charge would be made for users of EV chargers for up to three hours while they are charging in Council owned car parks.

The Leader confirmed that there would be no charge made for the NHS Breast Screening Unit in Council owned car parks.

A Member made it known that they would be unable to support proposal (f). It was explained that there was only one recommendation.

### **Resolved**

- (1) £ 30,310,723 being the aggregate of the amounts which the Council estimates for the items set out in Section 31A (2) of the Act taking into account all the precepts issued to it by Parish/Town Councils.
- (2) (£ 20,041,508) being the aggregate of the amounts which the Council estimates for the items set out in Section 31A (3) of the Act.
- (3) £ 10,268,315 being the amount by which the aggregate at (a) above exceeds the aggregate at (b) 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)
- (4) £ 312.21 being the amount at (c) above (Item R), divided by Item T (paragraph 3.1 above), calculated by the Council, in accordance with Section 31 B of the Act, as the basic amount of its Council Tax for the year (including Parish Precepts)
- (5) £ 1,965,513 being the aggregate amount of all special items (Parish precepts) referred to in Section 34(1) of the Act, as detailed above.
- (6) £ 252.45 being the amount at (d) above less the result given by dividing the amount at (e) above by item T (paragraph 2.2 above), calculated by the Council, in accordance with Section 34(2) of the Act, as the basic amount of its Council tax for the year for dwellings in those parts of its area to which no Parish precept relates.

- (7) The amounts set out at Appendix B being the amounts given by adding to the amount at (f) above to the amounts of the special item or items relating to dwellings in those parts of the Council's area as set out in Appendix B divided in each case by Item T (paragraph 3.1 above), calculated by the Council, in accordance with Section 34(2) of the Act, as the basic amounts of its Council Tax for the year for dwellings in those parts of its area to which one or more special items relate.
- (8) The amounts set out at Appendix C being the amounts given by multiplying the amounts at (g) above by the number which, in the proportion set out in Section 5 (1) of the Act, is applicable to dwellings listed in a particular valuation band divided by the number which in the proportion is applicable to dwellings listed in valuation Band D, calculated by the Council, in accordance with Section 36(1) of the Act, as the amounts to be taken into account for the year in respect of categories of dwellings listed in different valuation bands.
- (9) That it be noted that for the year 2023/24 Essex County Council, Essex Police, Fire and Crime Commissioner and Essex County Fire and Rescue have stated the amounts in precepts issued to the Council, in accordance with Section 40 of the Local Government Finance Act 1992, for each of the categories of dwellings as set out at Appendix D:
- (10) That the Council, in accordance with sections 30 and 36 of the Local Government Finance Act 1992, hereby sets the aggregate amounts shown in Appendix E as the amount of Council Tax for 2023/24 for each part of its area and for each of the categories of dwellings. (IDR)

(31 Members voted in favour, 0 against and 6 Members abstained.)

### **43 ALLOCATION OF SEATS TO COMMITTEES 2022/23**

Council considered the report of the Interim Director of People & Governance inviting Council to agree the allocation of seats to Committees following changes in political composition.

#### **Resolved**

That Members be appointed to serve on Committees for the remainder of the 2022/23 Municipal Year. (IDPG)

(36 Members voted in favour, 0 against and 0 Members abstained.)

## Extraordinary Council – 21 February 2023

---

The meeting closed at 10:06 pm.

Chairman .....

Date .....

If you would like these minutes in large print, Braille or another language please contact 01702 318111.

## APPOINTMENTS TO COMMITTEES – 21 February 2023

COMMITTEE	NOMINATION
Audit (11)	Cllr Mrs L A Butcher (Chairman) Cllr G W Myers (Vice-Chairman) Cllr M R Carter Cllr A G Cross Cllr Mrs E P Gadsdon Cllr M Hoy Cllr J L Lawmon Cllr Mrs C M Mason Cllr R Milne Cllr Mrs L Shaw Cllr Mrs V A Wilson
Chief Officer Appointments Committee (9)	Cllr S E Wootton (Chairman) Cllr Mrs C E Roe (Vice-Chairman) Cllr J Lawmon Cllr G W Myers Cllr J E Newport Cllr L J Newport Cllr Mrs L Shaw Cllr I H Ward Cllr Mrs V A Wilson
Development Committee (13)	Cllr Mrs L Shaw (Chairman) Cllr D S Efde (Vice-Chairman) Cllr Mrs L A Butcher Cllr R P Constable Cllr J E Cripps Cllr A H Eves Cllr I A Foster Cllr Mrs E P Gadsdon Cllr T D Knight Cllr R Milne Cllr C M Stanley Cllr A L Williams Cllr S A Wilson

COMMITTEE	NOMINATION
Licensing & Appeals (15)	Cllr M G Wilkinson (Chairman) Cllr A L Williams (Vice-Chairman) Cllr Mrs D L Belton Cllr A G Cross Cllr D S Efde Cllr Mrs E P Gadsdon Cllr M Hoy Cllr R Lambourne Cllr Mrs C M Mason Cllr Mrs J E McPherson Cllr G W Myers Cllr D W Sharp Cllr Mrs L Shaw Cllr Mrs D P Squires-Coleman Cllr M J Webb
Overview & Scrutiny (15)	Cllr S A Wilson (Chairman) Cllr Mrs J E McPherson (Vice-Chairman) Cllr R P Constable Cllr A H Eves Cllr Mrs E P Gadsdon Cllr J N Gooding Cllr Mrs J R Gooding Cllr R Lambourne Cllr J R F Mason Cllr R Milne Cllr G W Myers Cllr J E Newport Cllr L J Newport Cllr D W Sharp Cllr M G Wilkinson
Planning Policy Committee (7)	Cllr I A Foster (Chairman) Cllr M Hoy Cllr Mrs J R Lumley Cllr J R F Mason Cllr J E Newport Cllr D J Sperring Cllr M J Steptoe

COMMITTEE	NOMINATION
Standards (8)	Cllr Mrs J E McPherson (Chairman) Cllr M G Wilkinson (Vice-Chairman) Cllr D S Efde Cllr T D Knight Cllr Mrs J R Lumley Cllr G W Myers Cllr Mrs D P Squires-Coleman Cllr C M Stanley
Statutory Officer Personnel Committee (9)	Cllr S E Wootton (Chairman) Cllr Mrs C E Roe (Vice-Chairman) Cllr D S Efde Cllr Mrs E P Gadsdon Cllr J L Lawmon Cllr Mrs J R Lumley Cllr Mrs C M Mason Cllr J E Newport Cllr L J Newport