



*Meeting:* **Scrutiny Commission**

*Date/Time:* **Monday, 27 January 2025 at 10.00 am**

*Location:* **Sparkenhoe Committee Room, County Hall, Glenfield**

*Contact:* **Mrs J Twomey (Tel: 0116 305 2583)**

*Email:* **joanne.twomey@leics.gov.uk**

### Membership

Mr M. T. Mullaney CC (Chairman)

Mr. N. D. Bannister CC	Mr T. Gillard CC
Mr. T. Barkley CC	Mr. M. Hunt CC
Mr. M. Frisby CC	Mr. J. Morgan CC
Mrs. H. J. Fryer CC	Mrs. R. Page CC
Mr. S. J. Galton CC	Mr. T. J. Richardson CC

### SUPPLEMENTARY AGENDA PACK

<u>Item</u>	<u>Report by</u>
11. Medium Term Financial Strategy 2025/26 - 2028/29 - Consideration of responses from other Overview and Scrutiny Committees.	(Pages 3 - 22)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Health Overview and Scrutiny Committee (meeting held on 15 January 2025)</li><li>• Highway and Transport Overview and Scrutiny Committee (meeting held on 16 January 2025)</li><li>• Adults and Communities Overview and Scrutiny Committee (meeting held on 20 January 2025)</li><li>• Children and Families Overview and Scrutiny Committee (meeting held on 21 January 2025)</li><li>• Environment and Climate Change Overview and Scrutiny Committee (22 January 2025)</li></ul>	



This page is intentionally left blank



**SCRUTINY COMMISSION 27<sup>th</sup> JANUARY 2025**

**MEDIUM TERM FINANCIAL STRATEGY 2025/26 – 2028/29**

**AGENDA ITEM 11 – CONSIDERATION OF RESPONSES FROM OTHER  
OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEES**

Minute extracts from the following Overview and Scrutiny Committees are attached for consideration under Agenda Item 11:

- Health Overview and Scrutiny Committee (meeting held on 15<sup>th</sup> January)
- Highway and Transport Overview and Scrutiny (meeting held on 16<sup>th</sup> January)
- Adults and Communities Overview and Scrutiny Committee (meeting held on 20<sup>th</sup> January)
- Children and Families Overview and Scrutiny Committee (meeting held on 21<sup>st</sup> January)
- Environment and Climate Change Overview and Scrutiny Committee (meeting held on 22<sup>nd</sup> January)

This page is intentionally left blank

**HEALTH OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE**  
**15 JANUARY 2025**

**MEDIUM TERM FINANCIAL STRATEGY 2025/26-2028/29**

**MINUTE EXTRACT**

Public Health Medium Term Financial Strategy 2025/26-2028/29.

The Committee considered a joint report of the Director of Public Health and the Director of Corporate Resources which provided information on the proposed 2025/26 to 2028/29 Medium Term Financial Strategy (MTFS) as it related to Public Health. A copy of the report, marked 'Agenda Item 8', is filed with these minutes.

The Chairman welcomed Mrs. L. Richardson CC, Cabinet Lead Member for Health, and Mr. B. Champion CC Cabinet Support Member, to the meeting for this item.

Arising from discussions the following points were noted:

- (i) Funding for Public Health came solely from the Department of Health and Social Care, not Council tax. The Public Health Grant for 2025/26 had not yet been announced but was expected soon. As the funding details had not yet been received an assumption had been made by the department that there would be a 2% increase in the Grant for 2025/26.
- (ii) The Public Health Grant could only be spent on public health functions. The department had specific statutory duties, as well as an overall statutory duty to take steps to improve the overall health of the population. The Public Health Grant was also used by other departments within the County Council for discretionary services that could be described as fulfilling the Public Health department's overall duty to improve the health of the population. Should further savings have to be made by Public Health, that funding to other departments could have to be withdrawn.
- (iii) Leicestershire County Council spent less on lifestyle services, such as stop smoking, weight management etc, than other authorities. It was not mandatory for Public Health departments to fund lifestyle services so in theory they could be cut. However, this would be difficult in practice as those services contributed to the department's overall duty to improve the health of the population and had a positive impact.
- (iv) The MTFS covered a 4 year period but the benefits of health interventions often took longer than that to become apparent.

- (v) In response to concerns raised by a member about the impact of cuts on services, some reassurance was given that services commissioned and delivered by Public Health were given an efficiency score and those services which had the biggest impact for the largest number of people were prioritised. The department's approach was to redesign commissioned services so that as good a service could be provided at a reduced cost. The Homelessness Service was one example of this.
- (vi) With regards to measuring the impact of services, regular modelling took place. There was a Public Health Outcomes Framework which contained 36 indicators related to public health priorities and delivery.
- (vii) The NHS was no longer funding any pay increases for providers commissioned by the local authority therefore Public Health was facing a cost pressure resulting from the NHS Agenda for Change pay rises. However, subsequent to the report for the meeting being published the department had received £868,000 additional funding to cover those costs.
- (viii) In response to concerns raised by a member regarding people feeling isolated and lonely, particularly the elderly, it was explained that the First Contact Plus and Local Area Co-ordinator services helped with this issue. A report on this topic would be considered at the next meeting of the Committee.
- (ix) Public Health funded the Health Check programme which was delivered by General Practice. There had been an increase in demand for the service which was a positive because it meant that more people were getting checked but this did add cost pressures to the department.
- (x) The council held a contract with Soldiers', Sailors' and Airmen's Families Association (SSAFA) to provide support to ex-service personnel. The contract was due to end in March 2025 and the service was being reviewed. A large amount of data relating to the service, particularly referral outcomes, was being analysed. No decision had been made yet on whether the service would be recommissioned or cut. Members emphasised that it was important to provide some support to armed forces veterans. In response it was clarified that work with veterans would still take place even if the SSAFA contract was not renewed but consideration would have to be given to whether it should be carried out by organisations other than SSAFA. An alternative could be for the support to be provided by Local Area Co-ordinators and First Contact Plus. There were also other charities that worked with military veterans. A member emphasised that working age veterans and older veterans had different needs.

RESOLVED:

- (a) That the report and information now provided be noted;
- (b) That the comments now made be forwarded to the Scrutiny Commission for consideration at its meeting on 27 January 2025.

**HIGHWAYS AND TRANSPORT OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY  
COMMITTEE - 16 JANUARY 2025**

**MEDIUM TERM FINANCIAL STRATEGY 2025/26 – 2028/29**

**MINUTE EXTRACT**

Medium Term Financial Strategy 2025/26 – 2028/29

The Committee considered a joint report of the Director of Environment and Transport and the Director of Corporate Resources which provided information on the proposed 2025/26 to 2028/29 Medium Term Financial Strategy (MTFS) as it related to the Highways and Transport side of the Environment and Transport department. A copy of the report marked 'Agenda Item '8' is filed with these minutes.

The Chairman welcomed Mr. O. O'Shea CC, Cabinet Lead Member for Highways and Transport, to the meeting for this item.

Arising from discussion, the following points were noted:

Growth

- (i) Street lighting reactive maintenance jobs had increased by 257% since 2022/23 due to aged assets. Aged Assets referred to columns and cables that had a life expectancy and needed maintaining. Members queried whether any scoping exercises had been carried out to see if alternative sources of power could be utilised which were more sustainable. In response, Officers explained that the current approach was to switch to LED lighting and that replacement programme was underway on what was a large scale. Assets needed to be reliable and alternative sources were taken on board as the technology improved over time.

SEN Transport

- (ii) Assisted Transport was a significant part of the department's budget and the spend on it was continuing to increase. A member acknowledged that the money needed to be spent and forecasts and provision for the future needed to be made. However, Members suggested that as this was an issue affecting local authorities across the country it should be addressed nationally by government.
- (iii) The Council had a statutory duty to deliver the SEN Transport service and the department's growth would continue to be dominated by increased demand for SEN Transport. Members noted that the Council was able to increase the Adult Social Care precept by 2% without requiring a referendum and submitted that until the government addressed the SEN Transport issue nationally the County

Council would have to keep increasing the precept by the maximum amount each year.

### Savings

- (iv) A Member raised concerns about a lighting in urban areas and questioned whether increasing the amount of lighting was a cost worth paying. In response it was explained that a substantial saving had been made as a result of dimming street lighting and the saving would have to be made elsewhere were it not made from street lighting, but The department was aware that dimmed street lighting might not be suitable for all areas and would take feedback from the ongoing pilot scheme and address the concerns where necessary.
- (v) As many electric vehicles were heavier than other vehicles due to the weight of the battery, Members queried whether this resulted in more deterioration of the roads. In response it was acknowledged that there had been an acceleration in deterioration on the network in recent years and that there were many factors that impacted this such as weather. The fact that EV's were heavier and heavier vehicles had an impact on the road network was an area that would need addressing nationally.
- (vi) Members raised concerns regarding high volumes of traffic around Junction 21 of the M1. It was suggested that the government's requirements of local authorities to increase housing growth should come with additional investment in the transport infrastructure as the existing road networks would not be able to cope with additional growth.

### Capital Programme

- (vii) In response to a Member query about Zouch Bridge highlighted in the report it was noted that the bridge had been identified as an asset that needed replacing as it was a key link on the strategic network. Works would continue towards completion in 2027 which members welcomed.
- (viii) A member raised concerns regarding maintenance of the existing highways network. Some maintenance had originally been planned to be funded through the Network North funding but this is no longer available under the new Government and monies that had already been accelerated to carry out some of maintenance would now be accounted for in expected multi-year settlements from DfT over the period of the MTFS. It was noted that this highlighted the need for ongoing planned maintenance so the department could make the best use of available funding while managing the risks attached to this as a result of current uncertainty in funding.
- (ix) The amount of future contributions to be received by the department from developers under Section 106 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 were hard to predict so could not yet be allocated in the budget until confirmation was received. However, upcoming Section 106 funding was closely monitored to maximise the use of this funding.



## RESOLVED:

- a) That the report on the Medium-Term Financial Strategy 2025/26 -2028/29 be noted;
- b) That the comments now made be forwarded to the Scrutiny Commission for consideration at its meeting on 27 January 2025.

This page is intentionally left blank

**ADULTS AND COMMUNITIES OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE**  
**20 JANUARY 2025**

**MEDIUM TERM FINANCIAL STRATEGY 2025/26 – 2028/29**

**MINUTE EXTRACT**

Adults and Communities Medium Term Financial Strategy 2025/26 – 2028/29

The Committee considered a joint report of the Director of Adults and Communities and Director of Corporate Resources which provided information on the proposed 2025/26 to 2028/29 Medium Term Financial Strategy (MTFS) as it related to the Adults and Communities Department. A copy of the report marked 'Agenda Item 8' is filed with these minutes.

The Chairman welcomed Mrs. C. M. Radford, Cabinet Lead Member to the meeting for the item.

Arising from Discussion, the following points were made:

Proposed Revenue Budget, Other Changes and Transfers

Growth

- i. The current negative growth position of -£1.8million for 2025/26 was an unusual position to be in. However, this had been due to the substantial increase in the number of people approaching the Department for services in 2023/24, and the increase in size, scale and cost of care packages, which had resulted in the Council having to put in substantial additional growth for 2024/25. Over the past 12 months, the Department had contained that growth to manage costs, and had successfully negated the requirement for further growth for the current financial year. The Director highlighted, however, that whilst the Department would continue to work towards containing costs, the position was dynamic and could change over the next year.
- ii. Members noted that with an increase in the number of people using services, it was expected that there would be an increase in income as people contributed to their cost of care, and income from the NHS to support people in receipt of services, which could be balanced against the overall growth figures.
- iii. Members queried the older people demand budget and how modelling had resulted in a projected budget of £2million for the 2025/26 rising to £15million for 2028/29. The Director explained that modelling was based on information held at a point in time, and by using national models (Office of National Statistics (ONS), Poppi and Pansi) data, which provided an estimated figure over the four-year

period. The growth averaged out at 2-3% each year which was in line with the demographic growth in the elderly population in Leicestershire. The budget for 2024/25 had not been over-modelled, but the Department had worked hard to mitigate demand and contain costs over the year.

- iv. Members queried if the demand management target of -£4million was a control of costs by limiting services. Members were reassured that whilst the Department would seek to limit expenditure and contain growth through a series of initiatives, it had not been at the expense of services provided. For example, additional resources had been targeted into reviewing people's care needs to ensure the support being offered was meeting need in an equitable way, to ensure people had a fair outcome from the assessment process, and that people were as independent as they could be. In terms of eligibility of services, this was set nationally and had been laid out under the Care Act.
- v. Members heard there would be growth in the numbers of people requiring services as they moved from Children's into Adult Social Care placements, but numbers would potentially peak around the year 2030 following which they were expected to fall due to a decline in birth rates.
- vi. Members questioned whether the impact of the Fair Outcomes policy had levelled off. The Director commented that the policy had been in place for around 10 years, and that a panel had been set up to provide added assurance to the Department that assessments and provision of services were being made in accordance with the policy. As the panel had been in place for just over 12 months, the requirement to attend the panel was being stepped down as teams were showing evidence that they were commissioning at the right level in terms of support packages for individuals. Performance would continue to be monitored over the course of the next few months to ensure progress was maintained.
- vii. It was noted with concern that the previous year's growth was over 3.5% and this had been a level of growth not seen before by the Council. The Director highlighted that this outstripped the growth that was being seen by other councils at the time. The growth figure was now around 1.5% and this was consistent with other councils in the country.
- viii. The Director reported the numbers of placements of older adults in residential care had seen a small increase from 868 for 2023/24 to approximately 880 for 2024/25. This was not considered an alarming figure. It was noted that the majority of people in residential care required 24-hour care, otherwise they would be supported to remain independent at home. In terms of people with higher support needs being able to move into Extra Care as an alternative was something being looked into over the next MTF period. The majority of people in Extra Care, however, would not require a higher level of care.
- ix. A Member queried if, with recent Government financial announcements of increased National Insurance contributions, future changes to taxation, and impending changes to inheritance tax, consideration had been given to people in isolated rural areas. The Director reported that the budget did not include uplifts in terms of the cost of care through inflation, and rising National Insurance, as the

Council had a corporate reserve that was applied to the budget after this was set. This accounted for all inflationary increases across all departments. In terms of income, the status quo was assumed at the point of modelling the budget.

- x. It was acknowledged that the National Insurance increase would be a big change for the next financial year, and all councils were tasked with modelling what might be an appropriate increase going forward based on intelligence of the local workforce.

#### Adult Social Care – Savings

- xi. A Member questioned what support was in place to support Personal Assistants employed directly by a service user. It was noted that services were in place and if required would ensure cover, for example, for leave or sickness. The service was monitored on a regular basis to ensure people had the right support and were not put at risk. It was believed that having a personal assistant to a more traditional form of service could be beneficial in terms of well-being and gave people more control of their services.
- xii. A representative from Healthwatch requested service users be involved so far as possible when any review of services was undertaken. It was noted that the Department engaged with more people to support the co-production of future services and an engagement panel had been established which included people with lived experience which provided useful additional feedback.
- xiii. It was noted that whilst some of the savings outlined in Appendix C might appear as being the same each year this was likely due to it being the last year of delivery, and so there would not be an increase each year going forward but had to be shown over the four years on the MTFs. The budget was assessed each year with the savings the Department needed to make, having regard to inflationary rises.

#### Communities and Wellbeing

- xiv. A Member questioned under \*\*AC16 (Eff) – Implementation of revised service for Communities and Wellbeing, if there was an end point whereby the Record Office in Wigston could no longer take any more records. The Director reported that the end point had already been reached, and there were many records being stored in other locations outside of the Record Office, in a non-compliant manner. The National Archive had given the County Council until May 2026 to show it had a compliant method of storage.

#### Health and Social Care Integration

- xv. Given the Government's plan to speed up the throughput of people being treated in the NHS, members queried what impact this would have on adult social care services, for example, in undertaking assessments for people requiring onward care, or supporting people in their own homes. It was noted that regular conversations were being had with the NHS at a strategic level, particularly around the flow of people through the urgent and emergency care system, and

how to improve outcomes for people to ensure they were receiving the right service on discharge. It was further noted that the city and county had the highest number of people in receipt of social care services across the East Midlands where the route of access was hospital which was managed as a system.

RESOLVED:

- a) That the report regarding the Medium Term Financial Strategy for 2025/26 to 2028/29 and the information now provided be noted;
- b) That the comments now made be forwarded to the Scrutiny Commission for consideration at its meeting on 27 January 2025.

**CHILDREN AND FAMILIES OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY  
COMMITTEE - 21 JANUARY 2025**

**MEDIUM TERM FINANCIAL STRATEGY 2025/26 – 2028/29**

**MINUTE EXTRACT**

Children and Families Medium Term Financial Strategy 2025/26 – 2028/29

The Committee considered a joint report of the Director of Children and Family Services and the Director of Corporate Resources which provided information on the proposed 2025/26 to 2028/29 Medium Term Financial Strategy (MTFS) as it related to the Children and Family Services department. A copy of the report marked 'Agenda Item 8' is filed with these minutes.

The Chairman welcomed Mrs. D. Taylor CC, Lead Member for Children and Family Services, to the meeting for this item.

Children's Social Care Reform

- (i) A question was raised in relation to measures which the Government had outlined in order to improve competition and commissioning within children's social care. The Director outlined that competition was often limited because the market was dominated by a number of large providers, and that this presented a challenge in terms of commissioning social care placements against budget constraints. The proposed reforms would aim to encourage local authorities to improve competition within the system in order to create better placement opportunities for children. The Department had undertaken work locally to develop its own children's homes, through the Children's Innovation partnership (CIP), in order to overcome challenges with competition and to address rising unit costs.

Proposed Revenue Budget

- (ii) The Director emphasised that the central contingency which was being held within the Department would be utilised in order to offset the costs associated with the 2024/25 pay award for directly employed staff. In terms of the expected increase to the rate of National Insurance contributions (NICs) paid by employers, members noted that it was not yet possible to understand the impact that this could have on the Council. The Director agreed to update members on any changes to this position through updates on the Department's budget position.

### Growth

- (iii) Members were pleased that there had been a reduction in the weekly unit cost for supporting Unaccompanied Asylum-Seeking Children (UASC), despite a significant level of demand and continued financial pressures within the system. The Director stated that this had been possible by ensuring commissioning was in line with the needs of UASC and through utilising smarter commissioning strategies. The UASC cohort presented a significant growth pressure over the MTFs period in terms of demand and costs.
- (iv) In response to a concern relating to the cost of providing social care placements, the Director explained that high costs were a result of the complexities within the cohort of young people taken into care. A large number of children within this cohort required additional support as a result of their experience of trauma and previous lived experiences. Members were assured that the Department continued to ensure that each child and young person in care had the correct level of support in place in order to meet their individual needs, regardless of the reason behind the requirement for social care provision.

### Savings

- (v) A member raised a question regarding whether school funding in Leicestershire was comparable to that in other local authority areas. The Director stated that minimum per pupil funding, allocated through the National Funding Formula (NFF), was consistent across all authority areas. However, additional funds were provided to schools based on the level of free school meal eligibility and the number of children with home addresses which triggered deprivation funding. As a result, it often appeared that some schools within other local authority areas were in receipt of higher levels of funding than others.
- (vi) Members noted that government funding to support its policy for a free school breakfast club programme would be allocated to schools directly. The Policy had been announced in the Government's Autumn Budget 2024 and was expected to be delivered from April 2025.
- (vii) In response to a question relating to an expected final visit by Ofsted at a Child Sexual Exploitation (CSE)/Child Criminal Exploitation (CCE) residential home, which had been developed as part of the Children's Innovation Partnership (CIP) with match funding from the Department of Education (DfE), the Director stated that confirmation of the visit date was awaited.

### Capital Programme

- (viii) The Director stated that the majority of the Capital Programme was likely to be funded by external grants such as the Basic Need Grant, the High Needs Provision Capital Grant and the Strategic Maintenance Grant. In addition to



these grants, the Capital Programme would be funded through Section 106 contributions, which were received as a result of housing development.

RESOLVED:

- a) That the report regarding the Medium Term Financial Strategy 2025/26 – 2028/29 and information now provided be noted;
- b) That the comments now made be forwarded to the Scrutiny Commission for consideration at its meeting on 27 January 2025.

This page is intentionally left blank



**ENVIRONMENT AND CLIMATE CHANGE OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY  
COMMITTEE – 22 JANUARY 2025**

**MEDIUM TERM FINANCIAL STRATEGY 2025/26-2028/29**

**MINUTE EXTRACT**

**Environment and Climate Change Medium Term Financial Strategy 2025/26 –  
2/28/29**

The Committee considered a joint report of the Director of Environment and Transport and the Director of Corporate Resources which provided information on the proposed 2025/26 to 2028/29 Medium Term Financial Strategy (MTFS) as it related to the Environment and Waste Management Services within the Council's Environment and Transport Department. A copy of the report, marked 'Agenda Item 8', is filed with these minutes.

The Chairman welcomed Mr. B.L. Pain CC, Cabinet Lead Member for the Environment and the Green Agenda to the meeting for this and other items.

Arising from discussion, the following points were raised:

**Revenue Budget**

- i) A reduction in residual waste and therefore a saving had been forecast due to the planned introduction of mandatory food waste collections from April 2026. A member questioned what else the Council planned to do to reduce this further. The Director assured members that the Council would continue to deliver existing programmes that sought to encourage recycling and reuse and educating residents on how they could better dispose of their waste as well as continuing to implement the Leicestershire Resources and Waste Strategy. However, Members acknowledged there would always be some demand for residual 'black bin' waste disposal. The Lead Member highlighted that reductions would be countered by rising population and housing growth which were expected to result in more waste being generated. The Authority would monitor the impact of growth against the impact of its programmes and the introduction of mandatory food waste collections and other factors such as changing waste types, which all had to be taken into account when assessing the Council's future waste contract needs.

- ii) A Member raised concern that the Department' s resources of £0.39m to tackle Ash Dieback had been transferred to the Corporate Resources Department. It was noted that this was simply an accounting matter and reflected the fact that the Corporate Resources Department employed the team that looked after trees and woodlands.

### Growth

- iii) The technology currently being used to dispose of residual waste which came at a cost was currently considered the most viable option to dispose of waste at the scale required. A Member challenged whether it was more economical to use and therefore pay landfill tax or to incinerate waste and pay the proposed incineration tax. It was noted that the Council sought to manage waste in accordance with the waste hierarchy at the top of which would be waste prevention, reuse and recycling and landfill at the bottom. It was agreed that there needed to be a push towards repurposing waste in line with the circular economy principals rather than sending it to landfill as there were no benefits from this, in order to limit any damaging impact on the environment.
- iv) A Member commented that the ultimate aim would be to reduce non-recyclable packaging. As previously discussed by the Committee, it was noted that the Government' s introduction of Extended Producer Responsibility for Packaging would now make producers responsible for the costs relating to that packaging from 'cradle to grave' (i.e. from production of the material to its disposal). A scheme administrator had been set up by the Government who producers paid a fee to, and which was now feeding through to the Authority to help it meet the cost of disposing of this type of waste. The Lead Member emphasised that the Council had been indicatively allocated £6m for 2025/26 but that future allocations were unclear. It was intended that this approach would help to manage away non-recyclable packaging materials, which would then in turn reduce the payments having to be made by the industry.

### Savings

- v) Opening hours at recycling and household waste sites (RHWS) were being reduced in the summer but not universally. Sites would no longer be open 9am until 7pm every day through the summer opening period. Some sites would close at 5pm on certain days but on occasion be open later for residents' convenience. Evidence of use showed that sites were used less in the evenings compared to morning usage. However, it was acknowledged that some evening access would still be needed and there would therefore be days when some sites would be open until 7pm, to accommodate this. The Director emphasised that the advice to the public would be to check the Council' s website prior to visiting.

- vi) Fly-tipping was raised as a concern by some Members who queried whether there were links between closing waste disposal sites and an increase in fly-tipping. It was noted that there was currently no data to suggest there was an escalation in fly tipping cases as a result of closed sites. A Member suggested that enforcement action was the biggest deterrent which was the responsibility of district councils. However, the Lead Member emphasised this was not only a district council problem as the County Council had responsibility for disposing of the waste which could be costly. The Council therefore worked closely with district councils and other agencies, such as the Police and the Environment Agency to address what was a criminal offence. Members noted that the cost of disposal had been factored into the budget.

Other Factors Influencing MTFs Delivery/Other Funding Sources

- vii) It was noted that the County Council had responsibility for the ongoing maintenance of a section of the Ashby Canal as a result of the legacy of a proposal a number of years previously to restore and reopen the canal.

RESOLVED:

- a) That the report on the Medium-Term Financial Strategy 2025/26 -2028/29 be noted;
- b) That the comments now made be forwarded to the Scrutiny Commission for consideration at its meeting on 27 January 2025.

This page is intentionally left blank