

## RHONDDA CYNON TAF COUNTY BOROUGH COUNCIL

# **RECORD OF DECISIONS OF THE EXECUTIVE**

DECISION MADE BY: Cabinet DATE DECISION MADE: 3<sup>rd</sup> March, 2016

Agenda Item 2

**SUBJECT:** 

Council Fees and Charges 2016/17

# **Cabinet Members Present County Borough Councillors:**

A.Morgan (Chairman), R.Bevan, A.Crimmings, M.Forey, E. Hanagan, G. Hopkins K. Montague, J. Rosser & M Webber.

Other County Borough Councillor(s) in Attendance:-T Leyshon & P Jarman

#### 1. DECISION MADE:

## Agreed -

- 1. To the proposed revised levels for all Council fees and charges as set out in Appendix 1 of the report.
- 2. To note the freezing of Fees and Charges as outlined within the report in respect of:-
  - Parking Charges
  - Summer & Winter Playing Fees (Sports Clubs)
  - Domiciliary Care (Adults)
  - Trade Refuse (Recycling)
  - School Meals

**N.B** With the permission of the Chairman, County Borough Councillor P Jarman spoke on this item.

# 2. REASON FOR THE DECISION BEING MADE:

- In line with the Council's decision on the 26<sup>th</sup> February 2014 in respect of the Council's budget strategy, to increase fees and charges, in total by an average of 3% above the Retail Price Index per annum for 2014/15 and for each subsequent year to 2017/18.
- To enable the Council to generate the additional income from fees and charges as included on the 2016/17 Budget Strategy.

### CONSULTATION UNDERTAKEN PRIOR TO DECISION BEING MADE:

N/A

### 4. PERSONAL INTERESTS DECLARED:

None

| 5. D   | ISPENSATION TO SPEA   | AK (AS GRAN | TED BY STANDAR | RDS COMMITTEE): |
|--|---|-------------|----------------|-----------------|
| In accordance with the Code of Conduct, County Borough Councillor P Jarman stated that "On 26th November, 2015, following a request I made to the Standards Committee, I was granted a dispensation to speak and vote on all matters for the duration and adoption of the 2016-17 budget process in my capacity as Leader of an Opposition Group." |   |             |                |                 |
|  |   |             |                |                 |
| 6. (a) IS THE DECISION URGENT AND NOT TO BE THE SUBJECT OF ANY CALL-<br>IN BY THE OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE:   |   |             |                |                 |
|  |   | YES         | NO √           |                 |
| <b>Note:</b> This decision will not come into force and may not be implemented until the expiry of 5 clear working days after its publication i.e. <b>11<sup>th</sup> March 2016</b> to enable it to be the subject to the Call-In Procedure in Rule 17.1 of the Overview and Scrutiny Procedure Rules.  |   |             |                |                 |
| 6. (b) IF YES, REASONS WHY IN THE OPINION OF THE DECISION-MAKER THE  |   |             |                |                 |
| DECISION IS URGENT: N/A  |   |             |                |                 |
| C<br>R<br>A  | CONFIRMING AGREEMENT THAT THE PROPOSED DECISION IS REASONABLE IN ALL THE CIRCUMSTANCES FOR IT BEING TREATED AS A MATTER OF URGENCY, IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY PROCEDURE RULE 17.2: |             |                |                 |
|  |   | N/A         |                |                 |
|  |   | (Mayor)     |                | (Dated)         |