

Meeting of the Joint Meeting of the Environment Overview and Scrutiny Committee and Rural and Communities Overview and Scrutiny Committee



SOUTH
KESTEVEN
DISTRICT
COUNCIL

Tuesday, 24 February 2026, 10.30
am

Committee Members present

Councillor Emma Baker
Councillor Pam Bosworth
Councillor Barry Dobson
Councillor Tim Harrison
Councillor Gloria Johnson
Councillor Anna Kelly
Councillor Robert Leadenham
Councillor Bridget Ley
Councillor Nikki Manterfield
Councillor Paul Martin
Councillor Habib Rahman
Councillor Rhea Rayside
Councillor Max Sawyer
Councillor Lee Steptoe
Councillor Elvis Stooke

Officers

Karen Whitfield, Assistant Director (Leisure, Culture and Place)
Patrick Astill, Communications Officer
Ayeisha Kirkham, Head of Public Protection
Phil Swinton, Emergency Planning and Health & Safety Lead
Joshua Mann, Democratic Services Officer

Cabinet Members present

Councillor Rhys Baker
Councillor Ashley Baxter
Councillor Richard Cleaver
Councillor Philip Knowles

Other Members present

Councillor Kyle Abel
Councillor Ben Green
Councillor Ian Selby

48. Election of Chairman

It was proposed, seconded, and AGREED to elect Councillor Nikki Manterfield as Chairman.

49. Election of Vice-Chairman

It was proposed, seconded, and AGREED to elect Councillor Elvis Stooke as Vice-Chairman.

50. Public Speakers

There were none.

51. Apologies for absence

Apologies for absence were received from Councillor James Denniston, substituted by Councillor Anna Kelly.

52. Disclosures of interest

Councillor Habib Rahman and Tim Harrison disclosed as interest in item seven due to their employment.

Councillor Rhea Rayside noted that her spouse held a taxi licence with another authority.

53. Minutes of the meeting held 10 December 2025

The minutes from the meeting held 10 December 2025 were proposed, seconded and AGREED as an accurate record.

54. Small unmanned aircraft (Drone) Policy

The Leader of the Council entered the Chamber.

The Small Unmanned Aircraft (Drone) Policy was introduced by the Cabinet Member for Corporate Governance and Licensing.

The objective of the policy was to set out minimum standards for ensuring the safety of persons using and those affected by SUA/Drone activity undertaken by SKDC and its officers only. This was designed to reduce the risk of works at height and reduce the time and cost of works of associated works.

The policy was designed to ensure compliance with the CAA guidance and increase the safety of officers consequently reducing the risk profile of the organisation.

Any works not within scope must be raised with the corporate safety team and Data and Governance Officer for review of the proposal. The addition of any workstreams required an update of Policy and approval from the appropriate scrutiny committee / Cabinet.

During discussions, Members commented on the following:

- Clarification was sought about the use of the drones and the governance measures in place. It was confirmed to be for the permitted uses listed explicitly within the policy and in emergency response situations. A Member suggested including a more comprehensive list of uses in order to streamline the process and prevent the policy needing committee approval to add additional uses.
- A Member requested that the policy be reviewed at the Governance & Audit Committee following its implementation to monitor its effectiveness. The Emergency Planning and Health & Safety Lead agreed that the policy would be reviewed at least annually by the appropriate committee.
- A Member sought clarification about how the policy coincided with local airfields and no-fly zones. It was confirmed that any drone operators would be required to plan flights around the no-fly zones and all drone use needed to be planned in advance.
- Regarding unlawful activity, the Head of Service (Public Protection) noted that any targeted work would need to link with RIPA policy in line with court authorisation.
- A visiting Member expressed scepticism about the storage of the footage, expressed concern about bystanders being included within footage, and didn't want this to become the first step of a reliance on drone use.
- In the event that neighbours disagreed on the use of drones around the immediate vicinity of their property, the Emergency Planning and Health & Safety Lead noted that he would consult with the GDPR professionals.

Following discussions, it was proposed, seconded, and AGREED to recommend the Small Unmanned Aircraft (Drone) Policy to Cabinet for approval, with the amendment incorporated that neighbouring residents would be notified prior to drone use around the immediate vicinity of their property.

55. Body Worn Video Policy

The Body Worn Video Policy was introduced by the Cabinet Member for Corporate Governance and Licensing.

It was identified by officers and senior managers that Body Worn Video would be a useful tool to support officers' personal safety, reduce incidents of abuse or aggression, provide an accurate record of events, and increase transparency and accountability and where necessary to capture best evidence.

This use of this Policy applied to functions carried out within the following regulatory services:

- Public Protection (this includes Environmental Health, Environmental Protection, Private Sector Housing, Community Safety (Neighbourhoods) and Licensing)
- Development Management
- Building Control
- Finance
- Tenancy Services

This BWV Policy supports compliance with legal standards, including the Regulation of Investigatory Powers Act 2000 (RIPA), the Data Protection Act 2018 (DPA), and the UK General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR).

During discussions, Members commented on the following:

- It was queried whether body worn video recordings would be transmitted immediately or would need to be manually downloaded at the end of the shift. Whilst the equipment had not yet been purchased, it was indicated that the cameras in question would usually require the footage downloading at the end of the shift.
- It was confirmed that the Data Protection Impact Assessments would be signed off prior to the scheme's roll out.
- Members debated whether notifying an individual that an officer was turning on their body worn camera would escalate or de-escalate a situation. The Head of Service (Public Protection) confirmed that the rollout would be accompanied by relevant situational training.
- A Member noted that the cameras could be effective in protecting both parties involved. However, noted concern about potential accusations of when the officer chose to turn the camera on and off. Alternatively, the Member suggested the cameras being on for the duration of visits. The Head of Service noted that an operational procedure would be formed, considering this factor.
- Clarity was sought about the service areas that the body worn cameras would predominantly aid. This was confirmed to be visiting and patrolling officers across the district.
- Members noted concern about any underage children being visible in the footage. The Head of Service (Public Protection) acknowledged that this would also be considered during the procedure setting process.
- It was confirmed that any body worn cameras purchased would capture volume and officers would seek to purchase cameras capable of night vision.
- A Member noted that they did not want the use of body worn cameras to encourage dangerous lone working. It was confirmed by officers that this would not be the case.

Following discussions, it was proposed, seconded, and AGREED to recommend the policy to Cabinet for approval.

56. Review of the Street Trading Policy

The Review of the Street Trading Policy was introduced by the Cabinet Member for Corporate Governance and Licensing.

The existing Street Trading Policy was approved by Cabinet in June 2022. It provided a framework upon which the Council delivered its statutory function in relation to street trading activities. Given the size and rural nature of the district, the Street Trading Policy proved difficult to enforce and there had been a reliance on event organisers and traders to apply for a street trading permit. This resulted in the take up being low.

The proposed changes to the Street Trading Policy included the removal of the designation of the whole of the district as consent streets and the introduction of nominated consent street areas in Grantham, Bourne, Stamford and Market Deeping/ Deeping St James. The consent area locations were contained within the draft Street Trading Policy and were based around town centre locations where there was a higher concentration of retail premises and footfall.

Whilst there was no legal requirement, a policy and confirmation of the adopted consent streets provided clarity and a framework which reinforced effective practices, aided transparency and consistent decision making by Officers and Council Members.

Following robust discussion and debate, the Members present at a recent member Street Trading Policy workshop agreed that the Council's Street Trading Policy should not contain the requirement for applicants to undertake a Basic DBS check. This was not a requirement for market traders within the district and street trading consent would have only been a requirement in defined consent street areas.

The Cabinet Member clarified that an amendment had been circulated removing some outdated information from the Policy. This amendment has been appended to the minutes.

During discussions, Members commented on the following:

- A Member expressed opposition to the imposition of any Street Trading Policy, stating that it was not a statutory requirement, SKDC already had other relevant powers, and the Member was not satisfied that there had not been a detrimental impact during the time that the policy had been suspended under review. The Cabinet Member noted that the imposition of a Street Trading Policy had been requested by Councillors. The Assistant Director (Culture, Leisure and Place) noted that SKDC had received legal advice, advising that if a Street Trading Policy was not adopted then a full public consultation would be necessary.

- It was queried and confirmed that the policy would not preside over traders outside of the listed control areas.
- A visiting Member criticised the removal of basic DBS checks from the draft policy and urged members to restore the requirement.
- It was noted that Lincolnshire County Council were a consultee for consent applications.
- A Member disputed the geographical representation of Stamford market pitches within appendix 5 of the policy.

Following discussions, it was proposed, seconded, and AGREED to recommend the updated Street Trading Policy to Cabinet for approval.

57. Hackney Carriage and Private Hire Licensing Policy

Councillors Tim Harrison and Habib Rahman left the chamber for the duration of the item.

The Hackney Carriage and Private Hire Licensing Policy was introduced by the Cabinet Member for Corporate Governance and Licensing.

The Hackney Carriage and Private Hire Licensing Policy was adopted by the 29 January 2026 Full Council as originally drafted but it was suggested that the proposal for the Council to mandate the use of CCTV in taxis and private hire vehicles should be considered by the appropriate scrutiny committee.

As such, the following amendment to the policy was to be considered:

Hackney Carriage and Private Hire Licensing Policy - Part 2, Point 8 – Driver Safety and CCTV – further point 2.8.3.

“Measures such as CCTV are not required as part of the licensing regime, as it is considered that they are best left to the judgement of the owners and drivers themselves.”

Be replaced with:

“All private hire limousines, taxis and hackney carriages licensed by South Kesteven District Council must be fitted with an approved CCTV system”

- Any CCTV system must be installed and maintained in accordance with relevant data protection legislation and with the Information Commissioner’s Office (ICO) Guidance

- Be operational at all times when the vehicle is being used as a hackney carriage or private hire vehicle

- The purpose of this requirement is to enhance passenger and driver safety,

support safeguarding obligations, deter criminal and inappropriate behaviour, and assist investigations where allegations are made.”

During discussions, Members commented on the following:

- It was queried whether CCTV in taxis would be an issue given that many taxis are used to transport children to school. It was confirmed that education authorities who utilise taxis for school runs have their own regulations for taxi drivers.
- A Member noted concern about the enforceability of mandatory CCTV and feared it would drive consumers to Uber.
- Another Member noted concern that many taxi drivers would get their license from alternative authorities. Therefore, SKDC would have less awareness about the drivers in the district, and this would undermine the point-system that SKDC operated with their licensed taxi drivers.
- The Cabinet Member acknowledged these points but did note there were some perks that drivers would have by remaining licensed by SKDC, such as use of the taxi ranks.
- A Member stated that CCTV cameras were unnecessary as most people could record footage on mobile devices should they feel sufficiently threatened.
- The Head of Service (Public Protection) confirmed that under delegated powers, and in consultation with the Police, they had acted swiftly to revoke two taxi licences previously.
- It was suggested that Members agreed with the principle of the CCTV cameras but believed it to be practically unworkable due to the loopholes identified with the inconsistency across national policy.
- It was suggested that the upcoming English Devolution and Community Empowerment Bill 2024-26 was seeking to update and standardise national policy about CCTV cameras within taxis.
- A visiting Member endorsed the imposition of CCTV within taxis, stating it safeguarded drivers and passengers, it could be done in line with GDPR, and had been adopted by neighbouring Peterborough City Council. Furthermore, there could be a leeway in the installation period, allowing flexibility to spread costs. The indication was given that the costs would likely be approximately £400-1000, plus £52 a year Information Commissioners Office fee. The visiting Member noted that he had engaged with his two Parish Councils on the issue, both of which had indicated support.
- A Member expressed concern about this additional cost for individuals on low incomes.
- A Member was sceptical of the effectiveness that the policy would have prior to Local Government Reorganisation.
- Members suggested that there would be a cost saving to wait for the outcome of the English Devolution and Community Empowerment Bill 2024-26 and utilise transition funding.
- The visiting Member noted that the most commonly used CCTV system would auto-delete footage after a 28-day period.

- The Cabinet Member noted that no other authority in Lincolnshire had adopted mandatory CCTV in taxis.

The meeting adjourned for a five-minute period at 13.09 to allow the Democratic Services Officer to correctly record the proposal wording.

Following discussions, it was proposed, seconded, and AGREED that, due to the national loopholes and local impact, the Joint Committee was not minded to introduce the mandatory instillation and use of CCTV cameras within the Councils Hackney Carriage and Private Hire Licensing Policy at this time.

However, the Joint Committee maintained an open view about the mandatory instillation and use of CCTV cameras within the Councils Hackney Carriage and Private Hire Licensing Policy with the matter to be reconsidered in light of updated national guidance in near future.

58. Any other business which the Chairman, by reason of special circumstances, decides is urgent

The Vice-Chairman encouraged members of the Environment Committee to attend the upcoming Carbon Literacy training.

The meeting was concluded at 13.19.

The exec summary needs to be updated to include (bold part):

In accordance with the Act the Council has designated certain areas as consent streets for the for 4 towns of Grantham, Stamford, Bourne, ~~and~~ Market Deeping **and Deeping St James**. The streets designated as consent streets are shown Appendix 1 and listed. All other streets are not controlled by the District Council under the street trading powers.

These three paragraphs need **removing** from the street trading policy also as they refer to DBS requirements which we no longer have proposed.

6.12 If the ~~DBS~~ application shows convictions, a panel of 2 officers will review the conviction, further details may be requested to decide whether referral to Licensing Committee should be undertaken or if it is acceptable to issue the consent as applied for.

6.13 Subject to the provisions of the Rehabilitation of Offenders Act, convictions involving violence, abuse, exploitation, slavery, grooming, illegal sexual activity or any form of indecency, possession of a weapon, discrimination in any form, dishonesty, theft or drugs will be require the Licensing Committee to approve the granting of the street trading consent applied for.

7.5 Should a conviction be declared the process as outlined in 6.12 & 6.13 will be undertaken.

In Appendix 2 of the Policy, this definition needs amending from:

Street Trading Consent ~~or Street Trading Licence~~: Both terms are used interchangeably within the Policy, they both grant a consent/~~licence~~ holder legal permission to sell goods on the street. As outlined in Schedule 4 - Interpretation of Local Government (Miscellaneous Provisions) Act 1982.

TO

Street Trading Consent: This grants a consent holder legal permission to sell goods on the street. As outlined in Schedule 4 - Interpretation of Local Government (Miscellaneous Provisions) Act 1982.

This page is intentionally left blank