

MINUTES

COUNCIL
THURSDAY, 3 MARCH 2011
2.00 PM



PRESENT

Councillor Mrs Margery Radley Chairman

Councillor Bob Adams
Councillor Ray Auger
Councillor Harrish Bisnauthsing
Councillor Pam Bosworth
Councillor Christine Brough
Councillor Robert Broughton
Councillor Paul Carpenter
Councillor Mrs Frances Cartwright
Councillor George Chivers
Councillor Michael Cook
Councillor Alan Davidson
Councillor Mike Exton
Councillor Mrs Joyce Gaffigan
Councillor John Harvey
Councillor Robert Hearmon
Councillor Bryan Helyar
Councillor David Higgs
Councillor Trevor Holmes
Councillor Reginald Howard
Councillor Sam Jalili
Councillor Mrs Maureen Jalili
Councillor Ken Joynson
Councillor Mrs Rosemary Kaberry-Brown
Councillor Jock Kerr

Councillor Vic Kerr
Councillor Reg Lovelock MBE
Councillor Peter Martin-Mayhew
Councillor Stuart McBride
Councillor Andrew Moore
Councillor Mrs. Linda Neal
Councillor John Nicholson
Councillor Alan Parkin
Councillor Bob Russell
Councillor Susan Sandall
Councillor Bob Sandall
Councillor Trevor Scott
Councillor Ian Selby
Councillor Mrs Judy Smith
Councillor John Smith
Councillor Ian Stokes
Councillor Mike Taylor
Councillor Jeff Thompson
Councillor Frank Turner
Councillor Andrea Webster
Councillor Graham Wheat
Councillor Mike Williams
Councillor Avril Williams
Councillor Paul Wood
Councillor Raymond Wootten

OFFICERS

Chief Executive (Beverly Agass)
Strategic Director (Daren Turner and Tracey Blackwell)
Head of Legal and Democratic Services (Lucy Youles)
Head of Finance (Richard Wyles)

OFFICERS

Head of Assets (Paul Stokes)
Community Safety and Licensing Service Manager (Mark Jones)
Principal Democracy Officer (Jo Toomey)
Licensing Officer (Pam Robinson)

72. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Miss Channell, Craft, Dawson, Stephens, Spencer-Gregson and Tom Webster.

73. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Councillor Smith declared a personal and prejudicial interest in the capital programme element of agenda item 6 'Determination of budget requirement for 2011/12 and indicative for the three years thereafter'. His interest was as a member of a club that meets in Bourne Core Area in premises leased from South Kesteven District Council. This interest would come into effect if the Core Area was discussed and Councillor Smith stated he would not stay in the room for the vote on the capital programme.

Councillor Wootten declared a personal and prejudicial interest in agenda item 12 'Notices of Motion', motion 3 because he was a member of Lincolnshire County Council.

Councillors Exton and Carpenter both declared personal and prejudicial interests in agenda item 12 'Notices of Motion', motion 3 because they were members of Lincolnshire County Council and sat on the Children and Young People's Scrutiny Committee, which dealt with the items mentioned in the motion.

Councillor Mrs Bosworth declared a personal interest in agenda item 12 'Notices of Motion', motion 3 because she was a member of Lincolnshire County Council.

Councillor Joynson declared a personal interest in agenda item 12 'Notices of Motion', motion 3 because he was a governor at Stamford College in his capacity as the district council's representative.

Councillor Adams declared a personal interest in agenda item 12 'Notices of Motion', motion 3 because he was a governor at Kesteven and Grantham Girls' School

Councillor Williams declared a personal and prejudicial interest in agenda item 12 'Notices of Motion', motion 3 because he was a governor at Grantham College.

Councillor Smith declared a personal and prejudicial interest in agenda item 12 'Notices of Motion', motion 3 because he was a governor at a school with a sixth-form.

74. MINUTES OF THE MEETING HELD ON 9 DECEMBER 2010

The minutes of the meeting held on 9 December 2010 were confirmed as a correct record of the meeting.

75. COMMUNICATIONS (INCLUDING CHAIRMAN'S ANNOUNCEMENTS)

A copy of the Chairman's engagements from 3 December 2010 to 3 March 2011 were circulated for information and noted.

76. DETERMINATION OF BUDGET REQUIREMENT FOR 2011/12 AND INDICATIVE FOR THE THREE YEARS THEREAFTER

Decision:

That the Council:

General Fund (Revenue)

- a. sets a General Fund budget requirement of £14.612M for 2011/12 (inclusive of special expenses but excluding of parish precepts)
- b. approves a Council Tax freeze for 2011/12 (including special expense areas)
- c. approves the original base estimate for 2011/12 and indicative base estimates for 2012/13, 2013/14 and 2014/15 as detailed in the summary at Appendix A page 1;
- d. approves increases in Fees and Charges for 2011/12 as set out in Appendix D
- e. approves the movement in Revenue Reserves and the statement contained at Appendix C

Capital and investment Programmes

- f. approves the General Fund Capital programme for 2011/12 to 2014/15 detailed at Appendix B page 1
- g. approves the indicative Housing Investment programme for 2011/12 to 2014/15 detailed at Appendix B page 2
- h. approves the Capital Financing statement detailed at Appendix B page 3
- i. approves the Capital Reserves statement contained at Appendix C

Housing Revenue Account (HRA)

- j. sets dwelling rent increases in accordance with Government guideline rent providing an average rent of £66.03 (and an average rental increase of 6.67%)
- k. sets an increase in garage rents of 4.6%

l. increases service charges by 4.6%

m. approves the Housing Revenue Account for the year 2011/12 and indicative years 2012/13 and 2014/15 shown at Appendix A page 7

Treasury Management and prudential indicators

n. to approve the Treasury Management Strategy at Appendix E to report HOF148

Decision:

PART B: Council Tax setting 2011/12

- 1) **That the following amounts be calculated by the Council for the year 2011/12 in accordance with Sections 32 to 36 of the Local Government Finance Act 1992 (as amended)**
 - a) **£89,525,000 being the aggregate of the amounts which the Council estimates for the items set out in Section 32 (2) (a) to (e) of the Act (including special expense and parish precepts).**
 - b) **£73,504,000 being the aggregate of the amounts which the Council estimates for the items set out in Section 32 (3) (a) to (c) of the Act.**
 - c) **£16,021,000 being the amount by which the aggregate at a) above exceeds the aggregate at b) above, calculated by the Council, in accordance with Section 32(4) of the Act, as its budget requirement for the year.**
 - d) **£8,380,000 being the aggregate of the sums which the Council estimates will be payable for the year into its General Fund in respect of redistributed Non-Domestic Rates and Revenue Support Grant increased by the amount of the sum to be transferred from the Collection Fund to the General Fund**
 - e) **£163.46 being the amount at c) above less the amount at d) above, all divided by the Council's tax base of 46,744.4 as recorded in minute 42 of the cabinet meeting of 6 December 2010, in accordance Section 33(1) of the Act, as the basic amount of its Council Tax for the year 2011/2012.**
 - f) **£1,902,222 being the aggregate amount of all special items referred to in Section 34(1) of the Act.**
 - g) **£122.76 being the amount of e) above, less the result given by dividing the amount of f) above by the Council's tax base relating to special items as set on 6 December, 2010 calculated by the Council in accordance with Section 34(2) of the Act, as the basic amount of its Council Tax for year for dwellings in those parts of its area to which no special item relates.**

h) Part of the Council's area

Band D equiv.

<u>Parish</u>	<u>Band D Equival ents</u>
	No.
Grantham	11118.9
Stamford	7077.1
Bourne	4908.1
Allington	360.9
Ancaster	590.5
Aslackby & Laughton	114.2
Barholm & Stow	36.5
Barkston & Syston	261.4
Barrowby	732.0
Baston	538.3
Belton & Manthorpe	205.9
Billingborough	487.3
Bitchfield & Bassingthorpe	56.6
Boothby Pagnell	64.2
Braceborough & Wilsthorpe	136.1
Ropsley, Humby, Braceby & Sapperton	334.9
Burton Coggles	39.6
Careby, Aunby & Holywell	70.1
Carlby	211.6
Carlton Scroop & Normanton	127.9
Castle Bytham	303.8
Caythorpe	540.3
Claypole	510.4
Colsterworth, Gunby & Stainby & N. Witham	723.3
Corby Glen	405.3
Counthorpe & Creeton	34.6
Deeping St James	2436.9
Denton	120.8
Dowsby	61.7
Dunsby	46.1
Stoke Rochford & Easton	87.2
Edenham	115.0
Fenton	54.1
Folkingham	299.4
Foston	215.3

Fulbeck	220.1
Greatford	125.5
Great Gonerby	804.2
Great Ponton	134.4
Haconby	191.6
Harlaxton	339.1
Heydour	154.1
Honington	71.3
Horbling	168.4
Hougham	81.1
Hough on the Hill	165.6
Ingoldsby	117.9
Irnham	105.5
Kirkby Underwood	83.4
Langtoft	757.5
Lenton, Keisby & Osgodby	66.6
Little Bytham	115.8
Little Ponton & Stroxton	72.8
Londonthorpe & Harrowby Without	1736.7
Long Bennington	885.2
Market Deeping	2046.3
Marston	150.3
Morton	824.0
Old Somerby	93.0
Pickworth	77.8
Pointon & Sempringham	201.5
Rippingale	343.8
Sedgebrook	142.3
Skillington	137.6
South Witham	491.4
Stubton	74.7
Swayfield	146.0
Swinstead	92.2
Tallington	199.7
Thurlby	817.9
Toft, Lound & Manthorpe	138.5
Uffington	314.9
Welby	80.0
Westborough & Dry Doddington	153.7
West Deeping	125.2
Witham on the Hill	100.0
Woolsthorpe	151.2
Wyville cum Hungerton	19.5

being calculated by adding to the amount at (g) above the amounts of special item relating to dwellings in those parts of the Council's area, divided in each case by the individual tax bases as recorded in minute 49 in accordance with Section 34(3) of the Act, as the basic amounts of its Council Tax for the year for dwellings in those parts of its area to which special item relates.

- i) The amounts on the attached schedule (Appendix A to Part B), being the amounts given by multiplying the amounts at g) above and h) above by the number which, in the proportion set out in Section 5(1) of the Act, 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.
- j) That it be noted that for the year 2011/12 Lincolnshire County Council has stated the following amounts as a precept issued to the Council in accordance with Section 40 of the Local Government Finance Act, 1992, for each of the categories of dwellings shown below:-

Valuation Band

A £	B £	C £	D £	E £	F £	G £	H £
710.46	828.87	947.28	1065.6 9	1302.5 1	1539.3 3	1776.1 5	2131.3 8

- k) That it be noted that for the year 2011/12 Lincolnshire Police Authority has stated the following amounts as a precept issued to the Council in accordance with Section 40 of the Local Government Finance Act 1992, for each of the categories of dwellings shown below:-

Valuation Band

A £	B £	C £	D £	E £	F £	G £	H £
TBC	TBC	TBC	TBC	TBC	TBC	TBC	TBC

- l) That, having calculated the aggregate in each case of the amounts at i), j) and k) above, the Council, in accordance with Section 30 (2) of the Local Government Finance Act 1992, hereby sets the amounts in Appendix B to part B as the levels of Council Tax for the year 2011/12 for the categories of dwellings shown in Appendix A to part B.

The Chairman proposed a motion that Council Procedure Rule 14.4, which states no speech may exceed five minutes be suspended for this agenda item, to allow speeches for a period not to exceed ten minutes. The motion was seconded, voted upon and was carried.

An addendum to report number HOF148 was circulated at the meeting. The Head of Finance summarised the key changes for Members:

- The Grantham precept had been amended to £4.23
- Revised charges for Langtoft Special Expense Area
- Charges for licensing would remain at the same level as 2010/11, pending a review and consultation the proposed increases
- Information in respect of the Lincolnshire Police Authority precept, which was not available when papers were circulated.

The Head of Finance explained that the budget process had been particularly challenging, with work starting in May 2010. Working with budget holders had driven out a lot of savings through the centralisation of budgets, smarter procurement, looking at different ways of working and vacancy management. The Council had undertaken consultation with residents to identify their priorities for service provision, which were predominantly around the cleaner, greener, safer agenda.

The Council's Section 151 officer confirmed that in his opinion the budget was constructed on sound principles and was sustainable. He highlighted the risks of a four-year plan, particularly as the council only had details on two years of grant settlement. He thanked Members and officers for their support and hard work throughout the budget process.

The Portfolio Holder for Assets and Resources proposed the council adopt the recommendations as detailed within report number HOF148. He stated that the budget had been prepared in challenging circumstances. He explained that preparations, underway from May 2010, were cognizant of the wider economic impact of any proposals on the district's most vulnerable residents. The impact of increased fuel, energy and general costs were also highlighted.

The general fund was predominantly funded through council tax and government grant. The Council's grant settlement constituted a reduction in funding of approximately 14% in 2011/12. The council also faced reductions in areas including car parking income and building control fees. This left a funding gap in excess of £2million over the next two to three years. There was also a requirement for the Council to make arrangements to cover increased service costs in some areas. Councillor Taylor thanked the Resources Policy Development Group for their support.

The proposed budget included a Council Tax freeze in 2011/12. South Kesteven District Council's share of the council tax still represented one of the lowest levels in the country.

In respect of the Housing Revenue Account, proposals were under consultation that would see councils take on a proportion of the national housing debt instead of making negative subsidy payments. If the reform was passed, it was likely that any debt-related costs would be lower than the level of negative subsidy the Council had to bear. The Council remained on track to deliver against the decent homes standard.

Items within the capital programme were reviewed as a matter of course on a case-by-case basis and adapted to focus around priorities. It was sustainable on a medium-term basis without having to borrow. Officers had been asked to bring forward a more challenging asset disposal policy. The Housing Investment Programme continued to deliver significant investment in the housing stock.

The Assets and Resources Portfolio Holder commended the budget to Council for adoption. The motion was seconded by the Leader of the Council, who explained that the Council had taken a managed approach in preparing its budget, protecting frontline services. The Council had also introduced a range of new initiatives around town centre street-cleaning, continued commitment to CCTV and initiatives to support businesses. The new programmes were based on the outcome of consultation with communities in South Kesteven. A key feature of investment was encouraging people into the district's town centres.

Members then had the opportunity to debate the budget. Several Members praised the budget, which was put together under challenging conditions and congratulated all those who had been involved. One Member questioned why the Council had not challenged the grant settlement. One Member highlighted a report by Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government and suggested the Council should consider capping the pay of its senior officers. Other Members disputed this and stated that pay for officers in South Kesteven was low when compared to similar authorities. Members noted that the Council still had approximately £6m in reserve, which could only be directed at specific projects, rather than serving as a general float. The suggestion was made that quarterly reports on progress against the budget be closely scrutinised to ensure the Council was on track. Members noted the savings that had been achieved over the past four years.

In summing up, the Portfolio Holder thanked Members for their support. A request was made for a recorded vote. In accordance with Council Procedure Rule 16.4, this request needed the support of ten Members. A show of hands indicated more than ten Members supported the request.

A recorded vote was taken on recommendations a) to e) in HOF148

<u>For</u>	<u>Against</u>	<u>Abstain</u>
Councillor Adams		Councillor Davidson
Councillor Auger		Councillor Holmes
Councillor Bisnauthsing		Councillor Selby
Councillor Mrs Bosworth		
Councillor Brough		
Councillor Broughton		
Councillor Carpenter		
Councillor Mrs Cartwright		
Councillor Chivers		
Councillor Cook		
Councillor Exton		
Councillor Mrs Gaffigan		
Councillor Harvey		
Councillor Hearmon		
Councillor Helyar		

Councillor Higgs
 Councillor Howard
 Councillor Mrs Jalili
 Councillor Sam Jalili
 Councillor Joynson
 Councillor Mrs Kaberry-
 Brown
 Councillor Jock Kerr
 Councillor Vic Kerr
 Councillor Lovelock
 Councillor Martin-Mayhew
 Councillor McBride
 Councillor Moore
 Councillor Mrs Neal
 Councillor Nicholson
 Councillor Parkin
 Councillor Mrs Radley
 Councillor Russell
 Councillor Bob Sandall
 Councillor Susan Sandall
 Councillor Scott
 Councillor Smith
 Councillor Mrs Smith
 Councillor Stokes
 Councillor Taylor
 Councillor Thompson
 Councillor Turner
 Councillor Andrea
 Webster
 Councillor Wheat
 Councillor Avril Williams
 Councillor Mike Williams
 Councillor Wood
 Councillor Wootten

47

0

3

Recommendations a) to e) in report HOF148 were adopted.

15:15 Having declared a personal and prejudicial interest in aspects of the Capital Programme, Councillor Smith left the meeting

The Council took a recorded vote on recommendations f) to i) in report number HOF148. Councillor Bisnauthsing was not in the room when this vote was taken.

For

Against

Abstain

Councillor Adams
 Councillor Auger
 Councillor Mrs Bosworth
 Councillor Brough
 Councillor Broughton

Councillor Carpenter
 Councillor Mrs Cartwright
 Councillor Chivers
 Councillor Cook
 Councillor Davidson
 Councillor Exton
 Councillor Mrs Gaffigan
 Councillor Harvey
 Councillor Hearmon
 Councillor Helyar
 Councillor Higgs
 Councillor Holmes
 Councillor Howard
 Councillor Mrs Jalili
 Councillor Sam Jalili
 Councillor Joynson
 Councillor Mrs Kaberry-
 Brown
 Councillor Jock Kerr
 Councillor Vic Kerr
 Councillor Lovelock
 Councillor Martin-Mayhew
 Councillor McBride
 Councillor Moore
 Councillor Mrs Neal
 Councillor Nicholson
 Councillor Parkin
 Councillor Mrs Radley
 Councillor Russell
 Councillor Bob Sandall
 Councillor Susan Sandall
 Councillor Scott
 Councillor Selby
 Councillor Mrs Smith
 Councillor Stokes
 Councillor Taylor
 Councillor Thompson
 Councillor Turner
 Councillor Andrea
 Webster
 Councillor Wheat
 Councillor Avril Williams
 Councillor Mike Williams
 Councillor Wood
 Councillor Wootten

48

0

0

Recommendations f) to i) in report HOF148 were adopted.

15:19 *Councillor Smith returned to the meeting*
 15:21 *Councillor Bisnauthsing returned to the meeting*

The Council took a recorded vote on recommendations j) to n) and part 2 (Council tax setting) of report number HOF148. Councillor Holmes chose not to cast a vote.

For

Against

Abstain

Councillor Adams
Councillor Auger
Councillor Mrs Bosworth
Councillor Brough
Councillor Broughton
Councillor Carpenter
Councillor Mrs Cartwright
Councillor Chivers
Councillor Cook
Councillor Exton
Councillor Mrs Gaffigan
Councillor Harvey
Councillor Hearmon
Councillor Helyar
Councillor Higgs
Councillor Howard
Councillor Mrs Jalili
Councillor Sam Jalili
Councillor Joynson
Councillor Mrs Kaberry-
Brown
Councillor Jock Kerr
Councillor Vic Kerr
Councillor Lovelock
Councillor Martin-Mayhew
Councillor McBride
Councillor Moore
Councillor Mrs Neal
Councillor Nicholson
Councillor Parkin
Councillor Mrs Radley
Councillor Russell
Councillor Bob Sandall
Councillor Susan Sandall
Councillor Scott
Councillor Mrs Smith
Councillor Stokes
Councillor Taylor
Councillor Thompson
Councillor Turner
Councillor Andrea
Webster
Councillor Wheat
Councillor Avril Williams
Councillor Mike Williams
Councillor Wood

Councillor Davidson
Councillor Selby

Recommendations j) to n) and Part B of report HOF148 were adopted.

77. LEADER'S REPORT ON URGENT DECISIONS

Report number LDS015 by the Leader of the Council was circulated with the agenda for Members to note.

78. CAR PARKS: RESULTS OF CONSULTATION ON CHANGES TO CAR PARKING CHARGES

Decision:

The Council delegates the decision whether or not to approve the amendments to the South Kesteven District Council (Off-Street Parking Places) (Pay and Display) Order 2010 to adopt the revised schedule of charges (attached to report AFM190 at Appendix 1) to the Portfolio Holder for Economic Development following the completion of public consultation on 4 March 2011

The Leader of the Council presented report number AFM190 and moved the recommendations within. The Council had begun consultation on the proposal and all feedback received up to the time of the meeting had been positive. Unless any untoward comments were received on Friday 4 March 2011, subject to Council's agreement, car parking charges in Grantham and Stamford would be reduced. The motion was seconded.

Councillor Hearmon stated he welcomed the initiative but expressed his concern that consultation had begun prior to a decision of Council. The notices advertising the consultation expressed that the charges would decrease from 1 April 2011. He moved an amendment "that the 30 minute charge be abolished and the charge for 'up to an hour' be reduced to 50p." This was seconded. If, following debate, the amendment was approved, the new proposal would be subject to consultation.

Members supporting the amended motion argued that reducing the price of short-stay car parking in South Kesteven would increase the chances of people visiting the town centres and completing their business within the district. They considered this would be of significant import to communities not served by public transport. Members who opposed the amendment felt that it would only encourage people wanting to stay for a short time. Councillor Hearmon clarified that his amendment was to alter the charges for 30 minutes and 'up to an hour'. The rest of the charges would remain unchanged.

The budgetary impact of the proposal was debated. Members asked what provision had been made in the 2011/12 budget for car parking. The Section 151 Officer confirmed that there was provision within the budget to support the scheme that had initially been proposed. The financial

implications of the amendment would need modelling and had not been provided for in the budget. If Members passed the amendment, the finance team would carry out the modelling work and, subject to consultation and an affirmative decision from Council, a revised budget would be required. Those supporting the motion suggested that the Council's reserves could be used to subsidise any shortfall in car parking income.

The Chief Executive advised that if Members were minded to approve the motion, a further Cabinet decision to restart process of consultation would be required. The Council would need to wait for the consultation period to end before making its decision on whether to adopt the revised charges. Consultation on the revision of parking orders was a statutory requirement.

Before a vote was taken on the amended motion, the Leader was given an opportunity to sum up. The Federation of Small Business stated that parking in the district council's car parks was cheap. The idea of reducing the car parking charges for all bands was encouraging more people to stay for two or three hours. The proposal had been put together to support businesses in the district. The Council had committed to a fundamental review of fees and charges in 2011/12, and she suggested a review of car parking could include the modelling of these proposals.

15:55 *Councillor Avril Williams left the meeting*

There was a request for a recorded vote. However, failing to receive the support of ten Members as per Council Procedure rule 16.4, the request was refused. Having been proposed and seconded, the amended motion "that the 30 minute charge be abolished and the charge for 'up to an hour' be reduced to 50p." was put to the vote and lost.

16:01 *Councillors Jock Kerr and Mrs Gaffigan left the meeting*

A vote was then taken on the original motion, which was carried.

16:02-16:22 *Recess*

79. ADOPTION OF AMENDMENTS TO SCHEDULE 3 OF THE LOCAL GOVERNMENT (MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS) ACT 1982 AS AMENDED BY SECTION 27 OF THE POLICING AND CRIME ACT 2009: POWERS TO REGULATE LAP DANCING CLUBS AND SIMILAR VENUES

Decision:

- 1.1 **That Council resolve to formally adopt the amendments to the provision of Schedule 3 of the Local Government (Miscellaneous Provisions) Act 1982 as amended by Section 27 of the Policing and Crime Act 2009, and**
- 1.2 **That statutory notice of the resolution is published within the specified time periods as outlined within report number ENV516, and**

1.3 That the date for the new provision to take effect should be 8 April 2011.

The Council had before them report number ENV516 of the Chairman of the Licensing Committee requesting the adoption and implementation of amendments to the provision of Schedule 3 of the Local Government (Miscellaneous Provisions) Act 1982 as amended by Section 27 of the Policing and Crime Act 2009. The Chairman of the Licensing Committee moved the recommendations in the report. In doing so, she congratulated the team on its production and commended its adoption to Council. The proposition was seconded.

In response to debate from Members, the Service Manager for Community Safety and Licensing explained that the adoption of the provision would give the authority more control about where such establishments could operate from and allow Members to place more conditions on a premise if it was granted a licence. Within the district, there was only one premise that would be licensable under this provision and there had been no significant crime and disorder issues since it had opened.

The motion, having been proposed and seconded, was put to the vote and carried.

80. AMENDMENTS TO THE CONSTITUTION

Decision:

The Constitution be amended

- 1.1 At clause 10.1 page 124 of the Council Procedure Rules relating to the Public Open Forum to clarify that any question can be asked during the Public Open Forum subject to the provisions of clause 10.5 but any speeches to be made must be relevant to an item on the agenda.**

- 1.2 At clause 1 of page 97 relating to powers delegated to officers be amended to delete reference to the Dogs (Fouling of Land) Act 1996 and include reference to service and enforcement relating to failure to clear up in respect of dog fouling, failure to put a dog on a lead when requested to do so and allowing a dog in to an area from which they are excluded in accordance with The Fouling Of Land by Dogs within the District of South Kesteven Order 2010, The Dogs Exclusion within the District Of South Kesteven Order 2010 and the Dogs on Leads under Direction within the District of South**

Kesteven Order 2010 and in accordance with the Clean Neighbourhood and Environment Act 2005.

- 1.3 At clause 2 on page 97 include reference to failure to put a dog on a lead when requested to do so and allowing a dog into an area from which they are excluded.**
- 1.4 At page 141 Public Speaking at Development Control and Licensing Committees be clarified to confirm that Members of the Council speaking at those Committees are permitted to speak for 5 minutes in accordance with the Council Procedure Rules.**
- 1.5 That applications for uncontested street naming be delegated to the Head of Development and Growth**

The Chairman of the Constitution Committee introduced report number LDS016 and moved the recommendations of the Committee for adoption by Council. The recommendations were intended to clarify the terms of the public open forum at council meetings and public speaking at Development Control and Licensing Committees; adopt clauses relating to dog control under the Fouling Of Land by Dogs within the District of South Kesteven Order 2010, the Dogs Exclusion within the District Of South Kesteven Order 2010 and the Dogs on Leads under Direction within the District of South Kesteven Order 2010 and in accordance with the Clean Neighbourhood and Environment Act 2005 and delegating authority for uncontested street naming to the Head of Development and Growth. The proposal was seconded, voted upon and carried.

81. NOTICES OF MOTION GIVEN UNDER COUNCIL PROCEDURE RULE 12:

From Councillor Selby

Decision:

That the Council rejects the motion “that this Council installs a live internet webcast for all full Council meetings and for any other meetings held in the Council Chamber that the Chief Executive Officer feels is appropriate and in the best interests of the general public.”

Councillor Selby proposed his motion “that this Council installs a live internet webcast for all full council meetings and for any other meetings held in the Council Chamber that the Chief Executive Officer feels is appropriate and in the best interests of the general public.” In doing so, he highlighted potential advantages, allowing people who do not live in

Grantham access to the meetings. Members of the public would also be able to access meetings at a time convenient for them. Webcasting would assist the council in improving transparency and accountability. Having spoken to providers of webcasting solutions for other councils, Councillor Selby estimated the start-up cost should be no more than £20,000, with an additional monthly sum, estimated at £600, for hosting and streaming. The proposal was seconded.

Members debated the motion. Those supporting it highlighted issues including access and improved transparency and public confidence. They stated that similar provision in Parliament had helped increase public understanding and accountability of elected representatives. Members speaking against the motion discussed issues including costs (many systems require a member of staff to operate them) and the requirements that would be stipulated within the Localism Bill. Members were concerned that new provisions adopted at this meeting could be redundant after the passage of the Bill. The suggestion was made that costs could be recouped through sponsorship schemes.

Councillor Selby, in summing up, responded to the key points raised during the debate and summarised his meeting with representatives from Leicestershire County Council. The motion was put to the vote and lost.

From Councillor Wootten

Decision:

That this Council congratulate the Conservative-led administration, which in difficult times has produced a budget that ensures growth, low Council Tax and protects frontline services.

Councillor Wootten proposed the motion "That this Council congratulate the Conservative-led administration, which in difficult times has produced a budget that ensures growth, low Council Tax and protects frontline services." The motion was seconded.

Councillor Williams proposed an amendment to the motion, which was seconded. The amended motion: "That this Council congratulate officers and Members, which in difficult times has produced a budget that ensures growth, low council tax and protects frontline services." Members speaking in favour of the amended motion stated that their support of the budget had been clearly documented during discussion on that item and that Members from across political groups worked together to develop the budget. A vote was taken on the amendment, which was lost.

Councillor Wootten summed up his motion.

Prior to the taking of the vote (at 16:59), Councillors Avril Williams, Selby, Sam Jalili, Joynson, Brough, Holmes, Mrs Gaffigan, Davidson, Bisnauthsing and Mrs Jalili left the Chamber.

On being put to the vote, the motion was carried.

From Councillor Hearmon (1/2)

Decision:

That this matter should be referred to the School's Forum and the County Council Children and Young People's Scrutiny Committee indicating that it comes from the district council through its own Scrutiny Committee.

17:02 Having declared a personal and prejudicial interest, Councillors Carpenter, Exton and Wootten left the meeting

1702 Councillors Mrs Jalili, Joynson and Holmes returned to the meeting

Councillor Hearmon proposed the motion:

"South Kesteven District Council notes the consultation on bus transport currently being undertaken by Lincolnshire County Council on proposals which, if effected, would:

1. Increase the annual contribution to students to the cost of transport to their nearest suitable sixth form or college in Lincolnshire where the home to school/college journey is greater than 3 miles from the present figure of £202 per annum to £390.
2. Provide transport only to the nearest or designated further education (FE) college or sixth form, irrespective of course availability.
3. No longer provide transport for students from home to school or college along unsuitable walking routes where the distance is less than three miles.

Council believes the proposals which will have a detrimental effect upon student choice, and potential participation in study after the age of 16, and may lead to students being unable to pursue studies in courses of their choice. Poor public transport in parts of Lincolnshire will further restrict access to colleges and courses of choice if students are only supported as outlined in point 2 above.

Council shares the concern of local colleges and head teachers' concerns about the proposals and requests that the County Council reconsider their proposals which will adversely impact upon the life chances of young people in Lincolnshire."

Councillor Hearmon explained that he had submitted the motion on behalf of the Scrutiny Committee, who had received a presentation from the Principal of New College, Stamford. The motion was seconded.

Councillor Hearmon also moved his second motion and commended it to Council for adoption. The motion was:

“Council note the decision of Lincoln University not to renew its contract with New College, Stamford, and other Further Education Colleges for Higher Education provision starting in autumn 2011. It further notes that Lincoln University has declined to allow support for any new franchised students that are part of Lincoln University’s HEFCE allocation and has also declined to act as the validating university for any students allocated to a college directly from HEFCE; this latter decision being notified as late as 10th January 2011 well after students applying for courses through the UCAS procedure. These actions remove new Higher Education provision in parts of the county and require Further Education colleges to seek partnerships elsewhere. Local residents and non-traditional students will be denied the opportunity to study locally, flexibly and, where appropriate, part-time.

Council recalls that the University of Lincoln was established with support from across the County as a facility to be of benefit to all within the county. Council, therefore, calls upon the Vice-Chancellor to reconsider these decisions in partnership with other education providers to achieve an equitable outcome for all concerned.”

Councillor Nicholson moved an amendment to the motion: “That this matter should be referred to the School’s Forum and the County Council Children and Young People’s Scrutiny Committee indicating that it comes from the district council through its own Scrutiny Committee.” The amendment was seconded.

17:14 Councillor Bisnauthsing re-entered the meeting

Councillor Joynson declared a personal interest as a governor at Stamford College where he served as the district council’s representative. As Chairman of the Scrutiny Committee, he stated the Committee were particularly concerned about young people only receiving subsidised travel at their designated college, regardless of whether it ran the course they wanted to do.

Councillor Williams declared a personal interest as a governor at Grantham College. Councillor Adams declared a personal interest because of his role as a governor at Kesteven and Grantham Girls’ School.

17:11 Councillor Bisnauthsing left the meeting

Members had heard conflicting reports about when the County Council would take a final decision. Some Members were believed a decision would be taken in May, while others understood it would be taken in February.

17:15 Councillors Broughton and Helyar left the meeting

17:16 Councillor Hearmon left the meeting

17:17 Councillor Martin-Mayhew left the meeting

In accordance with Council Procedure rule 9, a vote was taken on whether the meeting should continue, as it was nearing being in progress for three hours. The majority of members present voted for the meeting to continue.

17:20 Councillor John Smith declared a personal and prejudicial interest by virtue of his governorship at a school with a sixth form. He left the meeting.

17:20 Councillors Mrs Jalili, Sam Jalili and Bisnauthsing left the meeting

17:21 Councillor Mike Williams stated he believed his interest may be prejudicial and left the meeting.

Councillor Nicholson clarified that his amendment was only in relation to Councillor Hearmon's first motion.

17:23 Councillors Bob and Susan Sandall left the meeting

The amendment to the motion was put to the vote and carried, which meant it became the substantive motion. On being put to the vote, the new motion was carried.

Decision:

Council note the decision of Lincoln University not to renew its contract with New College, Stamford, and other Further Education Colleges for Higher Education provision starting in autumn 2011. It further notes that Lincoln University has declined to allow support for any new franchised students that are part of Lincoln University's HEFCE allocation and has also declined to act as the validating university for any students allocated to a college directly from HEFCE; this latter decision being notified as late as 10th January 2011 well after students applying for courses through the UCAS procedure. These actions remove new Higher Education provision in parts of the county and require Further Education colleges to seek partnerships elsewhere. Local residents and non-traditional students will be denied the opportunity to study locally, flexibly and, where appropriate, part-time.

Council recalls that the University of Lincoln was established with support from across the County as a facility to be of benefit to all within the county. Council, therefore, calls upon the Vice-Chancellor to reconsider these decisions in partnership with other education providers to achieve an equitable outcome for all concerned.

The second motion moved by Councillor Hearmon on behalf of the Scrutiny Committee was seconded. This issue was raised at a meeting of all East Midlands authorities. A number of other authorities reported experiencing similar problems in their area. The degree courses run at local colleges had become increasingly popular, as they provided a basic service for students near their home. While some universities were spreading the impact of cuts by reducing quotas across the board, Lincoln had withdrawn from providing or supporting courses that were not run from their sites.

Another Member expressed concerns that the East Midlands Development Association (EMDA) and Lincolnshire County Council had provided funding for an engineering and business school, and one of the conditions of that funding was that outreach be provided to districts across Lincolnshire.

The motion was put to the vote, and carried.

82. VOTE OF THANKS

As this was the last meeting of the current Council before the election in May 2011, Councillor Mrs Radley thanked Members for their support. The Council showed their appreciation for the Chairman with a round of applause.

Councillor Lovelock also wished to thank Members, as after 63 years of continuous local government service, he had decided that he would not stand for re-election. He wished South Kesteven District Council well for the future.

83. CLOSE OF MEETING

The meeting was closed at 17:39.