ISSN 2753-2771

## Relative relief about Epsom and Ewell's debt?

**Epsom and Ewell Borough Council**'s debt is about average with all 381 United Kingdom local authorities. UK councils owe a combined **£97.8bn** to lenders, equivalent to **£1,455** per resident, as of September 2023. Epsom and Ewell's debt per person is £795. From highest debt per person to lowest Epsom and Ewell ranks 195 out of 381.

In the national league table of debt shame other Surrey Boroughs occupy the leading positions: Woking is first with debt of £18,756 per resident followed by Spelthorne in second place at £10,415. Guildford is 5th.

Taking into account all types of local authorities, such as police and crime commissioners and combined authorities, the debt pile rises to £122bn.

The 11 boroughs of Surrey are ranked in the table below. Highest debt per resident to lowest.

Standing in Surrey	Borough	Population	Total amassed debt 2023-24 Q2 (£)	Debt per person 2023-24 Q2 (£)	National standing out of <b>381</b>
1	Woking	103,889	1,948,583,000	18,756	1
2	Spelthorne	102,995	1,072,698,000	10,415	2
3	Runnymede	87,739	637,900,000	7,270	5
4	Guildford	143,929	178,826,000	1,242	132
5	Mole Valley	87,608	102,850,000	1,174	147
6	Waverley	128,878	149,771,000	1,162	151
7	Tandridge	88,143	99,415,000	1,128	156
8	Surrey Heath	90,645	98,695,000	1,089	162
9	Epsom and Ewell	80,998	64,427,000	795	195
10	Elmbridge	139,369	50,358,000	361	276
11	Reigate and Banstead	151,423	0	0	37 others

Dame **Meg Hillier**, the chair of the House of Commons Public Accounts Committee, said some examples of debt were "staggering".

But council leaders say years of under-funding mean they have been forced to take out loans and invest in commercial properties just to keep services running.

In recent years, various commentators have warned that the debts held by councils – which must balance their budgets every year – are unsustainable. In 2020, chair of the Public Accounts Committee Dame Meg Hillier said the Government was "blind to the extreme risks" of council borrowing levels.

Since then, six more councils have had to issue section 114 notices declaring themselves effectively bankrupt: Croydon, Slough, Thurrock, Birmingham, Woking and Nottingham.

In the case of Croydon, Slough, Thurrock, Woking and Nottingham – those effective bankruptcies could be directly linked to failed investments and spiralling debts. Thurrock's £469m funding black hole, for example, was caused by a series of failed investments in solar farms.

Dame Hillier added: "Small district councils have very little room for manoeuvre when finances are squeezed, relying on charges (such as parking fees) for a lot of their income. Unitary authorities are facing the demographic pressures on social services, social care and special educational needs.

"But beyond these day to day pressures, the PAC warned in 2020 that some councils had not only pursued strategies of commercial investment exposing them to high levels of risk, but normalised behaviour and optimistically believed that there was

ISSN 2753-2771

little downside to commercial activity. Add to this the delay in public sector audits and many councillors and taxpayers were blind to the risk."

Cllr **Julie Morris**, (College Ward) Leader of the Liberal Democrat Group on Epsom and Ewell Borough Council said "There is no evidence that central government is likely to assist with the broader financial issues affecting local authorities, so we need to budget carefully and 2025/26 is likely to be crunch time. We need a complete review of both mandatory services and those which are discretionary. And central government needs to wake up to what is facing government at local level."

Cllr **Neil Dallen**, (RA Town) Chair of Strategy & Resources Committee said: "As a council, Epsom & Ewell's investments are performing as planned. The debts are considered sustainable, with sums set aside each year to ensure they can be repaid at maturity. Through taking a proactive approach to our finances, we have a strong track record of meeting the considerable financial challenges the past decade has brought for local government through reduced central government funding, and we are looking ahead to 2024/25 and beyond to ensure that we remain a financially sustainable council."

The other parties have also been invited to comment.

### Underinvestment hits most vulnerable

The "most vulnerable" people in Woking will be made to find new homes after their extra care facility failed vital fire safety checks and was "all but condemned". Brockhill Extra Care Housing, in Clifton Way, has space for 48 apartments over two floors with a waiting list to get in.

In February this year **Surrey Fire and Rescue** conducted a review of the home prompting Woking Borough Council to introduce a Waking Watch - where trained people continually patrol a building and its perimeter to detect fires and raise alarms.

The facility changed its emergency procedures from Stay Put to Evacuate. The council also upgraded its fire detection systems. Many still can't evacuate the building fast enough, leaving the bankrupt council with the decision of spending £5.8 million on a complete refit, or closing the fire trap.

A meeting of its executive committee, on Thursday, December 14, concluded the home open was no longer viable, regardless of the council's finances, and residents, families and other stakeholders would be consulted over the closure of the Brockhill Extra Care Housing scheme. According to papers presented to councillors, the building appears to have had limited investment with only minor works carried – meaning it now requires "major capital works over the next two years and beyond".

Its' boiler failed a year ago causing "considerable inconvenience and discomfort to residents and staff" and is beyond repair.

Residents currently rely on a temporary heating but the entire system is "aged and in poor condition and requires upgrading and renewing. Since then, no new people have been allowed to move to the home, occupancy has dropped to 68 per cent and, where possible, the council has tried to moved residents to the ground floor to aid evacuation.

The anticipated total capital expenditure required on Brockhill over the next 10 years is forecast to be about £5.8 million, according to the report.

Deputy leader of the council, Cllr Will Forster, said: "The fire risk assessment has all but condemned that building. Particularly with the clients that we have in there. They are just so vulnerable, they have to leave the building so quickly in the event of a fire, because of the type of building it is. And that's just not humanly possible for them."

Any decision around Brockhill will have implications and put additional cost pressures on adult social care budgets with the council admitting that this will be difficult and upsetting for people living and working Brockhill, as well as the families of residents living there.

Leader of the Council, Cllr Ann-Marie Barker said: "Its obviously heartbreaking for me to see this.

"I know what a well loved and valued facility it is." She added: "But we have had a significant fire risk arising from a fire brigade assessment. We've known some of this work was needed we've been working in the last year we've done work on fire doors fire alarms, having a waking watching place to protect residents but the fire services have now determined that its just not safe for the most vulnerable and it's so urgent that those most vulnerable people do need to move as soon as possible."

Cllr Ellen Nicholson (LD, Mount Hermon) said: "The residents there are some of the most vulnerable in Woking and I find it incredibly sad that the chronic underprovision and the legacy of mismanagement has led to these fire risks and these safety risks

ISSN 2753-2771

for these incredibly vulnerable people."

Image Brockhill care home - Google

# Surrey Borough running up big debts

**Runnymede Borough Council** has been served formal notice over its "significant debt" and an over reliance on commercial income to support its services. The Department for Levelling up, Housing and Communities (DLUHC) has written to the council after the borough borrowed 71 times its core spending power to fund an "investment strategy that produces a less than 1 per cent return".

DLUHC's Best Value Notice was issued after the Chartered Institute for Public Finance and Accountancy raised concerns in July. The council can still receive, and be awarded, government funding while under the 12 month notice.

Writing to the Runnymede Borough Council (RBC) was Suzanne Clarke, DLUHC's deputy director of finance. She said: "Ministers remain concerned as to Runnymede Borough Council's capacity to comply with its Best Value Duty under the Local Government Act 1999."

Mrs Clarke added: "The authority has significant debt relative to its size, as of March 31, 2023, it had borrowing 71 times their core spending power, which has been used predominantly to invest in the authority's property portfolio. This level of debt poses the authority with capacity challenges, particularly in asset management, commercial and regeneration activity.

"Commercial income represents a substantial revenue source for RBC and is used to support both core and discretionary services, which exposes the authority to significant financial risks should anticipated income fail."

She said the borough has engaged constructively and openly with the accountants and indicated it was taking steps to address the concerns raised in the review.

Responding to the notice, Councillor Tom Gracey, Leader of Runnymede Borough Council said: "It is right that effective scrutiny must be in place around investment and spending decisions to ensure value for money. I am proud of the track record we have delivered in Runnymede in not only providing investment in our social housing, regeneration across communities, and funding services valued by our residents, but also in our sound risk and financial management."

Andrew Pritchard, chief executive of Runnymede Borough Council said the notice reflected the next step in their ongoing and positive dialogue with DLUHC and that most borrowing had been locked in while interest rates were at an historic low. He added: "This borrowing enabled us to fund a mix of commercial investment, improvements to our social housing stock, and complete the regeneration of Addlestone and Egham – all of which now benefits residents."

Councillor Don Whyte, group leader of the Liberal Democrats told the Local Democracy Reporting Service that the council had been waiting a considerable time for DLUHC's decision. He said: "The decision removes a degree of uncertainty and provides some clarity of what it needs to do. The areas that Runnymede are specifically charged with improving are justified, most notably decision making and scrutiny processes, and capacity and capability.

"An example of this is that the Conservative administration have always ensured that the chair of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee is a Conservative, marking their own homework, and not one of the opposition which is deemed best practice in local government."

He added that the Government needed to "take a significant amount of responsibility for the position" local authorities are in "given that loans amounting to billions of pounds were provided by the Public Works Loans Board with minimal due diligence".

Cllr Robert King, Labour group leader, said: "Runnymede can not go on throwing good money after bad at underperforming investments".

He added that questions had been raised about "the investment strategy which produces a less than 1 per cent return" with only "partial plans" for "paying back the debts principle, not just the interest. Something which should have been reviewed long ago, and not just now or with a future peer review from the Local Government Association".

Image: Cllr Thomas Gracey (image Runnymede Borough Council) and Runnymede Borough Council (Grahame Larter)

ISSN 2753-2771

### Tory leader pleads with Tory Government

Taxpayers in Surrey are likely to be hit with a 5 per cent rate rise because the one-year Government funding package won't cover the county council's £13.5 million budget gap, its leader said.

**Surrey County Council** will need to make tough decisions on services as it tries to protect money for children, adults and roads, because they "matter most to residents".

In November the county council passed its draft budget which showed the huge gap between income and the cost of providing services. Leader of the Council, Councillor **Tim Oliver** had hoped to convince government officials of the need to increase funding to local authorities that suffered a decade of austerity. The Government's decision means the county council must now "see how it gets to a point where its budget is balanced".

Cllr Oliver, speaking at the Tuesday, December 19 executive committee, said: "It had been my hope and expectation that money would have come from the Government in the form of new money. That would have enabled us to have delivered the services that we want to deliver. The improved service."

He said the Government's offer of a 6.5 per cent increase would normally have been "very welcome" but that it had been an "unusual year". He told the meeting "I'm afraid for the foreseeable future things are going to be considerably more difficult than they have been."

Much of that was due to the double-digit inflation figures, huge increases in demand for services, and wage growth which have seen council costs surge. He said: "We are now faced with the situation where we have the £13.5m gap and I'm afraid the consequence of that is we will no longer be able to restrict council tax increase by 3.99 per cent which was the proposal in our budget last month.

"We will now have to raise council tax by the maximum we are allowed to do which is 5 per cent, 3 per cent on the base and 2 per cent for social care precept. There needs to be recognition from this Government, and indeed any future Government, that the services we provide are the services that are the most in demand."

Council tax in Surrey is made up of three parts, the largest goes to the county council, with an additional amount paying for policing. About 12 per cent of the overall bill goes to the borough or district councils. If the county council were to raise its share by 4.99 per cent it, a Band D property would jump from £1,675.08 to £1,758.67.

That would mean residents in Woking, who are facing a potential 10 per cent increase in their local share would have to pay about £2,338.65 - before any increase from the Police and Crime Commissioner.

Cllr Oliver said there simply needed to be more money going into the system, adding: "We are talking about services for the most vulnerable in our communities. I would implore this government to recognise the issues we have raised. I would implore them to sit down with us and re-evaluate exactly what our needs are. These are issues that are outside of our control and we can not go on with this hand to mouth approach." Further investment, he said, simply won't be possible.

#### Related reports:

Surrey County chief talks to the BBC

County CEO's pay rise triggering strikes?

## Top salary for bottom borough

Woking Borough Council's new managing director will be tasked with navigating its "grave" and "extremely vulnerable position" – and be paid more than any other council CEO's salary while they do so.

The latest government report into the state of the council's debt recovery was published this week when it was also confirmed who would succeed Julie Fisher as Chief Executive.



ISSN 2753-2771

Epsom and Ewell Times receives frequent reports on the appalling financial plight of Woking Borough Council. Its debt is £2.6 billion. We seek to select those that may be of greatest interest.

Mrs Fisher announced in November her decision to quit, less than two years after stepping into the top job in April 2021. Her replacement has been announced as Richard Carr who will take on the role as Managing Director Commissioner on an interim basis.

According to the letter sent to Woking Borough Council, Mr Carr will be "entitled to a fee" of £1,100 for each day he is there, up to 260 days, as well as expenses. This is more than any other council CEO's salary, not including pention contributions. Other CEOs once pension packets are included – would receive a higher total package.

This works out as £286,000 if he stayed for the period, and it "is the council's responsibility to meet these costs", the report reads. Anything above this needs prior approval of the Secretary of State.

Surrey County Council's CEO Joanna Killian receives a salary of £234,600 and oversees a larger budget. Comparable Surrey borough councils Runnymede, Spelthorne and Elmbridge pocket £138,000, £142,000, and £145,220 respectively. [The UK Prime Minister's salary is £164,951.]

In a letter to outgoing CEO Julie Fisher, the commissioners said: "Your authority has worked collaboratively and cooperatively with the commissioners. That being said, the situation remains grave.

"The first report, published on October 19, made it clear that the scale of the challenge at your Authority 'should not be underestimated'.

"In their second report the commissioners continue to paint a stark picture of the challenges, noting that the authority remains in an extremely vulnerable position due to its overhanging debt and historical lack of rigour in its commercial activity. In the short-term, tough decisions need to be made, requiring clear leadership across the authority, and a steady hand at the wheel. In the longer term, innovative solutions need to be developed to tackle Woking's financial position and organisational model.

"With this in mind, coupled with your resignation as chief executive, the Secretary of State deems that any corporate leadership gap in Woking poses too great a risk to the integrity of the authority. The Secretary of State has therefore made the decision to increase the capacity of the commissioner team to enable focus on the long-term challenges the authority faces and has appointed a managing director commissioner to join."

Once his appointment begins, Mr Carr will be responsible for day-to-day operations of the council, provide strategic direction, and implement "efficiencies".

The letter continued: "It remains clear that, although progress has been made, the most difficult phases of the authority's recovery are still yet to begin, and there is still much work to be done to ensure Woking Borough Council can again meet its best value duty independently."

Cllr Ann-Marie Barker, leader of Woking Borough Council, said: "I'm pleased that the Commissioners have recognised the council's hard work and the progress we have made in their second report, while setting out clearly the very significant challenges the council continues to face." She added: "I'm delighted that Julie Fisher has kindly agreed to stay on as chief executive until April to ensure that the council has the senior leadership it needs over that period and to enable an effective handover to Richard."

# **Epsom and Ewell Council staff awarded 6%**

Epsom and Ewell Borough Council 12th December agreed to award its staff a 6% increase to their salaries. Councillors had been advised that despite inflation moderating to some extent through 2023, there have been widespread strikes and industrial action across the public sector in response to pay deals. For 2024/25, the government has accepted the recommendations from a number of independent pay review bodies to award millions of public sector workers including police officers and teachers, pay awards in the range of 5-7%.

Additionally the Council was warned the cost of any deal is crucial, with the council already facing a budget deficit of £1.1m in 2024/25. In budget planning for the medium-term financial strategy pay has been assumed to be 3% for the next 4 years, therefore any award above 3% will increase the council's projected deficit and result in additional, compensating service income

ISSN 2753-2771

or savings having to be identified.

Cllr Robert Leech (RA Nonsuch) said "I support the 6% pay rise. In recent years, we've given the staff 3%, which is less than the rate of inflation. This means that in real terms, our officers have taken a pay cut. I do not think it's sustainable for a third year. I realize that the rate of inflation has come down, but that only partly compensates for the reductions in previous years."

Cllr Alison Kelly (LibDem Stamford) said "I agree that we need to support the 6%. We must make sure that all our staff are feeling that they're well-treated and they shouldn't be looking elsewhere just to be able to live. With staff retention being such an issue for all councils, I think it's vital that the pay is appropriate."

Cllr Hannah Dalton (RA Stoneleigh) said "I want to use this opportunity to thank all of our officers for all that they do. They work really very, very hard for us. If Councilor Beckett was here, he would be reminding us how many officers there were when he first joined the council, and it's significantly reduced."

The recommendation was carried by a majority in the Council Chamber.

Related report

Council staff to get 6% pay increase?

## **Epsom and Ewell Council goes East**

Councillors at Epsom & Ewell Borough Council voted last night to undertake the relocation of the council's Town Hall accommodation. Staff currently located at the Town Hall will move to 70 East Street, a modern purpose-built office building in central Epsom.

The move will bring about a number of significant benefits:

- Financial benefits: Remaining in the Town Hall building would require it to have extensive, costly refurbishment over the coming years to comply with energy efficiency and fire regulations, along with general maintenance of existing building structures which are reaching end of life, which would cost more than twice as much as the cost of relocating. In addition, the move will create significant operating cost savings into the long term, with annual operating costs expected to reduce by over 50%. These future costs savings will help sustain key service delivery.
- $\cdot$  Environmental benefits: The new building will be more energy efficient and sustainable with a smaller carbon footprint, enabling the council to deliver on its ambitions to be a greener council and to become carbon neutral by 2035.
  - Service benefits: The move will provide a modern and fit-for-the-future workplace that will best serve the Borough.

The East Street building is already owned by the Council. It is a five-minute walk to the High Street and bus stops are located directly outside the building, providing easily accessible public transport. The building also provides its own parking, serving visitors and those with mobility issues.

It is intended that 70 East Street will not accommodate the Council Chamber, and instead a separate proposal is being developed to locate this in Bourne Hall, Ewell.

Cllr Neil Dallen, Chair of the Strategy & Resources Committee, said:

"Our focus must always be on what is best for our residents, and the significant financial and environmental benefits of this move are clear. The current Town Hall building is expensive to run and contains a significant amount of unused space. The new building is smaller and will be far more cost-efficient. The costs involved with the move are far outweighed by the savings that we will make through avoiding the Town Hall refurbishment and through significantly reduced running costs into the long-term.

"Just as importantly, the move will allow us to progress towards our target to become a carbon-neutral council by 2035. We believe the relocation will provide multiple benefits to the borough."

Jackie King, Chief Executive of the council, said:

"Relocating council staff to a smaller, modern and fit-for-purpose building aligns strongly with our ongoing determination to be a modern, forward-looking organisation that can best meet the needs of our residents. We are excited to progress with this move and improve value for money for our taxpayers as well as continue to provide the best services possible to the community."

ISSN 2753-2771

Work continues to look at options for the existing Town Hall site and this will form the subject of a separate report to the council's Strategy and Resources Committee in due course.

The image is the creation of Epsom and Ewell Times not Epsom and Ewell Borough Council

Related reports:

A new Town Hall for Epsom and Ewell?

### Local Plan costs eat into Council reserves

An officers' report to the Council advised a further £629,000 is required to progress the Local Plan 2022-2040. The matter was considered by Epsom and Ewell Borough Council's Strategy and Resources Committee Tuesday 13<sup>th</sup> December.

The report provided an update on the financial position on advancing the Local Plan toward submission and subsequent adoption, aligning with the timelines outlined in the recently published Local Development Scheme (November 2023). Following a public consultation on the draft plan earlier this year, an extraordinary Council meeting in March 2023 decided to temporarily halt the Local Plan. It was subsequently resumed in October 2023, accompanied by an updated timetable.

The financial crunch, estimated at £629,000, revolves around progressing the plan to Regulation 19 and concluding the Local Plan Examination. To address this, the Licensing and Planning Policy Committee recommended allocating £629,000 from the Corporate Projects Reserve. However, this move comes with significant financial implications, as it would reduce the reserve balance from £2.98 million to £2.35 million. If an additional request to use this reserve, hinted at in reference to a matter concerning the Council's commercial property – which was excluded from public and press scrutiny, is approved, the balance would further decrease to £1.85 million.

The item from which the press and public was excluded concerned drawing half-million pounds of taxpayers' money from the Council's reserves – we quote from the Local Plan item in public view: "Should the separate request to use this reserve at Agenda item 4 also be approved, the reserve balance will further decrease (from £2.35m) to £1.85m." The ground of exclusion was to protect financial information of third parties. Do you think such interests should out-weigh taxpayers' interests in what might justify £1/2 million being taken from reserves? Write to Epsom and Ewell Times.

The Council is facing a projected revenue budget deficit of £1.1m from 2024/25 (as reported to Strategy & Resources Committee in July 2023) and reserves are likely to come under substantial pressure in future years and may fall below the recommended level of £1 million.

The officers' report underscored the importance of maintaining staffing levels and securing external technical support to ensure a robust and timely Local Plan. Any deviation from the Local Development Scheme could amplify costs and resource implications. Despite the financial challenges, the Council was urged to use existing in-house resources wherever possible, given the projected revenue budget deficit.

Cllr **Alison Kelly** (LibDem Stamford) queried whether it was necessary to extend officers' contracts to 2026 when the Local Plan is to be submitted in 2025. The Council was advised that the opportunities for legal challenges and so forth would extend to 2026 and therefore they needed to budget for extending officer employment contracts by two years.

Cllr **Robert Leach** (RA Nonsuch) vented his frustration thus: "I probably have to support this recommendation, but I should do so with gritted teeth. This local plan just seems to be a bottomless pit. I understand that it has cost one and a half million pounds already, and that's probably only half the amount that we will waste. In my opinion, it is a waste of £3 million when the whole project of coming up with a local plan and planning applications could be done more simply. This filled me with horror.

In a recent RA meeting, I pointed out that this worked out at £50 for every household in the country. I asked the people there to put their hands up if they were happy for £50, which is, in effect, their money, to be spent on producing this rather than having £50 to spend on food and energy bills. The number of hands that went up, in round numbers, was a round number. The residents,



ISSN 2753-2771

I think, share my view that we are just wasting money.

I realize that we have to meet a legal obligation, and I would certainly never advocate that the council breaks the law. But I think we should point out that this is being imposed on us by central government. They provide us with no grant at all, apart from perhaps a few specific pet projects of their own. While we have to carry on with the local plan, we should make it clear that we do so reluctantly, only because the law forces us to do so, and that we should make clear to our residents that central government is the villain in this pantomime.

The present government is about to announce a new planning policy. If we have a general election next year with a Labour government, they have said that they will just ride roughshod over local authorities. I shall support the motion, and I shall do so with great reluctance."

Following these two contributions from the Chamber the committee proceeded to unanimously accept the recommendation to draw £629,000 from reserves to fund the ongoing Local Plan process.

The contribution to the prolongation and additional cost of the Local Plan process arising from the unpopularity of the original draft's proposals to develop Green Belt was not mentioned by any Councillor.

#### Related reports:

Local Plan to move forward after passionate debate Local Plan (2022-2040) Un-Pause Recommended Cllr Persand intervenes ahead of Local Plan debate and many many more (search "Local Plan")

### **Surrey County chief talks to the BBC**

Cllr Tim Oliver, Conservative Leader of Surrey County Council was interviewed this morning on BBC Radio 4's Today programme by Amol Rajan. Also Chairman of the County Council Network he welcomed further devolution of financial powers that could lead to a tourist tax and the need for more money to meet burgeoning demands for special educational needs and school transport.

The Epsom and Ewell Times has prepared a tidied up transcript of his interview in full.

Nottingham City Council became the latest local authority to issue what's called a section 114 notice, which means it will halt spending on anything not required by law. Let's talk to Councillor Tim Oliver, who's a Conservative and leader of Surrey County Council. How big a problem are we facing, and what's driving it?

TO: Well, it is a significant problem. We're talking about large councils that deliver social care to our most vulnerable residents. We have seen a huge increase in demand for those services, whether it's for adult social care or for children's services. And we've now got to the point where really well-managed councils are running out of road financially.

And what sort of situation are you in, Surrey County Council?

TO: I'm also chairman of the County Council's Network, so I represent all of those large councils, and the problems are the same. We've seen a decrease in our budgets and our funding from central government. What's different now is that last year, the chancellor gave us a not inconsiderable sum to support adult social care. But we've seen a huge demand for services to children with additional needs. The cost of placing those children in specialist facilities has risen exponentially. And a particular area of concern for us is the rising cost of home-to-school transport. Across the whole system, that currently costs about a billion pounds a year, and that's projected to increase to about 1 and a half billion by 2028. So these are real day-to-day issues. And our plea to the government is to recognize that we're supporting those most vulnerable members in our communities.

• Would more fiscal devolution help? Do you need more money from the centre, or do you just need more control of the money you get from the centre?

TO: This government had pledged to pursue a devolution agenda, and indeed they have done that. That has been more

ISSN 2753-2771

about controls and levers rather than about fiscal devolution. But yes, I think many of us would welcome that opportunity. That would give us the flexibility to raise taxes locally if that was appropriate, perhaps around tourist tax and so on.

• The Times reported yesterday that middle-class parents are blamed by some councillors for driving the surge in plans for special needs schooling. Is that a problem where you are?

TO: The County Council's Network, and I am certainly not blaming any individual parents or different groups. We absolutely understand that parents want the best for their children. They're going to push for that. It's really important though that we do make sure that the limited funds that are available, that public pound, is used most effectively.

The County Council Network is the voice of England's counties. Representing the local authorities in county areas, the network is a cross-party organisation which develops policy, commissions research, and presents evidence-based solutions to issues on behalf of the largest grouping of councils in England

Image: Tim Oliver credit LDRS - Surrey Live

### Poorest will pay for a Council's mismanagement

Vulnerable people are set to bear the brunt of service charge rises after **Woking Borough Council**'s executive committee agreed to inflation-busting increases. People who receive community meals or extra care facilities will be asked to pay more, as will users of community alarms.

The day-care services, which were previously free, run from The Vyne and St Mary's Community Centre are to be moved to Brockhill and Hale End Court and cost £20 a day. The daycare charge would not include the cost of transportation which is currently undertaken by Woking Community Transport - which in itself is under threat given its loss of funding.

The hit is being forced on residents after Woking Borough Council declared itself effectively bankrupt in June this year, with an unpayable deficit of about £1.2 billion and debt set to soar to £2.6bn. It meant all services the council was not legally obliged to provide would have to pay for themselves.

Other increases recommended for approval included garden waste fees rising by almost 50 per cent to £70 per bin, and community hall fees jumping by 20 per cent.

Decisions on big ticket items, such as Pool in the Park, and parking charges, are still to come as the council awaits consultation results and is not expected until the new year.

Introducing the measures to the Thursday, November 16, meeting, was Councillor Dale Roberts, portfolio holder for financial planning. He described service charges as "a bit of a political football but this is also not like any other year." He said: "This must be done while reducing, removing, the subsidy from discretionary services effectively delivering them cost neutral such that they are affordable, sustainable to this council."

Leader of the council, Councillor Ann-Marie Barker said: "These are non-statutory services, they are services the government doesn't require us to provide. We provide them because they are good and useful services to residents but if we want to continue to provide them we've got to cover the costs, we've got to make them cost neutral. But affordability has to be a key measure as well because we may be impacting people who can't afford to pay them." She added: "It's not easy but it's symptomatic of the situation we find ourselves in."

Opposition members raised flags over the lack of detail in the papers, stating it made approving blanket increases difficult as there was no way to know the extent that they were needed. This was agreed by the executive who said the problem was deeprooted and part of the council's long-term problems.

Cllr Roberts said that officers have worked very hard but that he recognised "that there is missing information, things we would all like, that are just not there". He said: "Councils don't fail because they get into financial difficulty they get into financial difficulty because they failed. The fact that we are absent of some of the information we absolutely need, critical to moving forward, is because this council has failed, its broken."

A formal vote will be taken by a full meeting of Woking Borough Council. It is due to sit on November 30.



ISSN 2753-2771

The Vyne, Woking (Image Google)