

MINUTES

COUNCIL
THURSDAY, 1 MARCH 2018
2.00 PM



SOUTH
KESTEVEN
DISTRICT
COUNCIL

PRESENT

Councillor George Chivers Chairman

Councillor Bob Adams
Councillor Ashley Baxter
Councillor Michael Cook
Councillor Kelham Cooke
Councillor Nick Craft
Councillor Felicity Cunningham
Councillor Barry Dobson
Councillor Mike Exton
Councillor Helen Goral
Councillor Breda Griffin
Councillor Graham Jeal
Councillor Mrs Rosemary Kaberry-Brown
Councillor Michael King
Councillor Matthew Lee
Councillor Charmaine Morgan

Councillor Dr Peter Moseley
Councillor Nick Neilson
Councillor Robert Reid
Councillor Nick Robins
Councillor Ian Selby
Councillor Jacky Smith
Councillor Peter Stephens
Councillor Judy Stevens
Councillor Adam Stokes
Councillor Ian Stokes
Councillor Dean Ward
Councillor Martin Wilkins
Councillor Paul Wood
Councillor Linda Wootten
Councillor Ray Wootten

OFFICERS

Chief Executive (Aidan Rave)
Strategic Director (Debbie Mogg)
Assistant Director, Legal & Democratic
(Lucy Youles)

OFFICERS

Assistant Director, Finance (Richard
Wyles)
Principal Democracy Officer (Jo Toomey)

69. PUBLIC OPEN FORUM

Question 1

A question was put to the Cabinet Member for Communities by Stephen Hewardine from Grantham.

What does the flexible homeless support scheme money do to alleviate/help people that are homeless of which SKDC received in 2017 £122,376 and in 2018/2019 received £130,123?

The Cabinet Member for Communities responded stating that the Flexible Homelessness Support Grant was ring-fenced for an initial period of two years. During that time it could only be used to prevent or deal with homelessness. Reference was also made to the Homelessness Reduction Act, which was being implemented in 2018 and provided opportunities to intervene earlier to prevent homelessness.

An indication was given of the items on which the funding would be spent, including the recruitment of additional staff to deal with the Council's homelessness prevention responsibilities, the development of a fit for purpose IT system that would comply with new reporting requirements and improve the case management and training staff on the new requirements stemming from the Homelessness Act. The remainder of the grant would be used to encourage private sector landlords to work with SKDC through schemes including rent deposit and rent guarantee, and making payments to clear arrears to prevent homelessness.

Question 2

Mr Hewerdine put a second question, which was also addressed to the Cabinet Member for Communities.

What are the Council doing to build more affordable single housing in Grantham which single people are the lowest priority on the housing list?

The Cabinet Member thanked Mr Hewerdine for raising the matter. He explained that new duties under the Homelessness Reduction Act would enable the Council to help and assist all housing register applicants. He added that the Council would shortly be finalising a 5-year housing strategy that clearly outlined the need to deliver a more balanced housing market with a range of tenures. 1-bed housing would form a key feature of future programmes.

Reference was made to the Council's Housing Development Programme, with the Cabinet Member stating that the Council needed to focus on the issue of single occupancy and identify sites on which one-bed units could be developed.

The Cabinet Member stated that the Council was reviewing its current housing stock to ensure that it met current and future housing needs and suggested that there was the potential to remodel some properties for use by single occupants.

In addition to the Housing Development Programme being delivered through the Housing Revenue Account, Gravitas, the Council's Local Authority Controlled Company, provided further housing delivery opportunities. Reference was made to Gravitas' first development project at Wherry's Lane, Bourne.

The public open forum closed at 14:15.

70. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Ashwell, Benn, Bosworth, Broughton, Mrs Cartwright, Coutts, Dilks, Evans, Forman, Kingman, Manterfield, Mapp, Powell, Russell, Sampson, Judy Smith, Sarah Stokes, Brenda Sumner, Brian Sumner, Trollope-Bellew, Turner, Webster and Westropp.

Decision:

To approve Councillors Ashwell, Mrs Cartwright and Powell's absence until the next full meeting of Council as a result of the inclement weather conditions.

The Leader referred to the requirement that Councillors attend one meeting in a 6-month period or they automatically cease to be a Member of the authority unless their non-attendance was for a reason approved by Council. He therefore proposed that the Council approve the absences of Councillors Ashwell, Mrs Cartwright and Powell until the next full meeting of Council because of the inclement weather. The proposition was seconded and, on being put to the vote, carried.

71. DISCLOSURE OF INTERESTS

No interests were disclosed.

72. MINUTES OF THE MEETING HELD ON 25 JANUARY 2018

The minutes of the meeting held on 25 January 2018 were proposed, seconded and agreed as a correct record.

73. COMMUNICATIONS (INCLUDING CHAIRMAN'S ANNOUNCEMENTS)

The Council noted the Chairman's engagements.

74. PAY POLICY STATEMENT AND COLLECTIVE AGREEMENT

Decision:

- 1. The Council adopts the Pay Policy Statement 2018-19 as attached at Appendix 1 to report number TC010**
- 2. The Council adopts the Collective Agreement for Local Pay as attached at Appendix 2 to report number TC010**

The Chairman of the Employment Committee proposed the recommendations in report number TC010. He explained that the Pay Policy Statement was an item that was considered annually but this was the first time that it had been presented in its own right; in previous years it had been appended to the Budget report. He stated that the report had received cross-party support when

it was considered by the Employment Committee. He drew Members' attention to an addition made by the Committee that would allow the use of performance-related pay which could help the Council to move towards a more commercial approach. The proposal was seconded.

When one Member asked a question about a specific employment issue he was directed to address the query to the Head of Paid Service.

A vote was taken on the proposition, which was carried.

75. BUDGET 2018/19 AND COUNCIL TAX SETTING

Decision:

Part A

In relation to the General Fund - Revenue

- a. To set a General Fund budget requirement of £11.872M for 2018/19 shown at Appendix A of report number CFM453 (inclusive of special expenses) taking into consideration the savings and efficiencies shown at Appendix B of report number CFM453 and capacity bids shown at Appendix C of report number CFM453
- b. To approve a Council Tax increase of £5 (Band D equivalent) for 2018/19
- c. To note the indicative base estimates for 2019/20 and 2020/21 as detailed in the summary at Appendix A of report number CFM453
- d. To approve the fees and charges as shown at Appendix G of report number CFM453

In relation to the General Fund – Capital

- e. Approve the General Fund Capital programme for 2018/19 to 2020/21 detailed at Appendix D of report number CFM453
- f. Approve the Capital Financing statement detailed at Appendix D of report number CFM453

In relation to the General Fund - Reserves and Balances

- g. To approve the use of reserves as detailed at Appendix E of report number CFM453

Treasury Management Strategy and Prudential Indicators

- h. To approve the Treasury Management Strategy provided at Appendix F of report number CFM453

In relation to the Housing Revenue Account - Revenue

- i. To approve a dwelling rent decrease of 1% providing an average rent of

- £78.43 (an average rental decrease of 78p per week)
- j. To approve an increase in garage rents of 3%
 - k. To approve an increase of 3% in service charges for communal facilities and community rooms
 - l. To approve an increase in shared ownership rents by 4%
 - m. To approve the Housing Revenue Account for the year 2018/19 and indicative years 2019/20 and 2020/21 shown at Appendix H of report number CFM453

In relation to the Housing Revenue Account - Capital

- n. Approve the indicative Housing Investment Programme for 2018/19 to 2020/21 detailed at Appendix I of report number CFM453
- o. Approve the Capital Financing statement detailed at Appendix I of report number CFM453

In relation to the Housing Revenue Account - Reserves and balances

- p. Approve the use of the reserves as detailed at Appendix J of report number CFM453

Part B

That it be noted that the Council calculated the following amounts for the year 2018/19 in accordance with the Local Government Finance Act 1992 as amended)

- (a) The Council calculated the Council Tax Base for 2018/19 as 46,519.3 [Item T in the formula in section 31B of the Local Government Finance Act 1992, as amended by the Localism Act 2011]
- (b) For dwellings in those parts of the District to which a Parish Precept relates as detailed in Appendix A to Part B of the addendum to of report number CFM453
- (c) The Council Tax requirement for the Council's own purpose for 2018/19 (excluding parish precepts and special expenses) is £6,534,566
- (d) That the following amounts be calculated by the Council for the year 2018/19 in accordance with sections 31 to 36 of the Act:
 - (i) £65,649,281 being the aggregate of the amounts which the Council estimates for the items set out in Section 31A(2) of the Act (including special expense and parish precepts)
 - (ii) £56,865,365 being the aggregate of the amounts which the Council estimates for the items set out in Section 31A(3) of the Act
 - (iii) £8,783,916 being the amount by which the aggregate at (i) above

exceeds the aggregate at (ii) above, calculated by the Council in accordance with Section 31A(4) of the Act as its Council Tax requirement for the year (Item R in the formula in Section 31B of the Act)

(iv) £188.82 being the amount at (iii) above (Item R), all divided by Item T (2(a) above), recorded in minute CO93 of the Cabinet meeting of 7 December 2017, in accordance with Section 31B of the Act, as the basic amount of its Council Tax for the year (including Parish Precepts and Special Expenses)

(v) £2,249,487 being the aggregate amount of the Parish Precepts and Special Expenses referred to in Section 34(1) of the Act

(vi) £140.47 being the amount at (iv) above less the result given by dividing (v) above by Item T (2(a) above), as the basic amount of its Council Tax for the year in those parts of the area to which no Parish Precept or Special Expense relate

(vii) Part of the Council's Area

Being calculated by adding to the amount at (vi) above the amounts of special item or items relating to dwellings in those parts of the Council's area mentioned above at (v), divided in each case by the individual tax bases as recorded in minute 33 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 one or more special item relates as detailed in Appendix A to Part B of the addendum to report number CFM453 (i.e. Band D Council Tax including all special expense and parish precepts)

(viii) The amounts on the attached schedule (Appendix A to Part B), being the amounts given by multiplying the amounts at (vi) and (vii) 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

(e) That it be noted that for the year 2018/19, Lincolnshire County Council and the Police and Crime Commissioner have issued precepts to the Council in accordance with Section 40 of the Local Government Finance Act, 1992, for each of the categories of dwellings shown in the following table

Valuation Bands								
	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H
	£	£	£	£	£	£	£	£
Lincolnshire County Council	820.98	957.81	1094.64	1231.47	1505.13	1778.79	2052.45	2462.94
Police and Crime Commissioner	144.96	169.12	193.28	217.44	265.76	314.08	362.40	434.88

- (f) That the Council in accordance with Section 30 and 36 of the Local Government Finance Act 1992, hereby sets the aggregate amounts shown in Appendices A and B to the addendum to Part B of report number CFM453 as the levels of Council Tax for the year 2018/19 for the each part of its area and for each categories of dwellings
- (g) That the Council's basic amount of council tax for 2018/19 is not excessive in accordance with the principles approved under Section 52ZB Local Government Finance Act 1992 and that the referendum [provisions in Chapter4ZA] do not apply for 2018/19. As the billing authority, the Council has not been notified by a major precepting authority that its relevant basic amount of Council Tax for 2018/19 is excessive and that the billing authority is not required to hold a referendum in accordance with Section 52ZK Local Government Finance Act 1992.

Councillor Adams had left the meeting prior to consideration of the Budget item.

The Chairman drew Members' attention to an addendum to Part B of report number CFM453, which incorporated precept information for Lincolnshire County Council and the Police and Crime Commissioner, both of which had determined their requirements after the report had been issued. It was proposed and seconded that article 4.11.4 of the Constitution, which restricted the maximum amount of time a member could speak to five minutes, be suspended during consideration of this item only and that Members be allowed to speak for a maximum of ten minutes. This proposition was seconded and on being put to the vote, carried.

The Cabinet Member for Finance presented report number CFM453 which contained the Cabinet's Budget recommendations for 2018/19 and indicative budgets to 2020/21 for the General Fund, Housing Revenue Account and associated Capital Programmes. He proposed the recommendations relating to Part A of the Budget as presented in report CFM453 and the recommendations relating to Part B of the Budget as listed in the addendum to the report.

In presenting the report, the Cabinet Member referred to the Council's reputation for financial prudence and how it was working towards self-sufficiency against a back drop of reducing funding. The Budget proposals that were being presented had been designed to put Council Tax payers' money to work, providing funding both to continue service delivery and provide for transformation. The proposals would allow for investment in priorities and included a number of efficiencies and savings that

would be delivered to accommodate this.

He explained that the big challenge for the Council was to be self-sufficient by 2020 ahead of 2021, when the revenue support grant paid by central Government would have been reduced to zero. It was hoped that the fairer funding formula would be in place by that time.

Members were reminded that the Council had consulted on three options for Council Tax: an increase of £5 on a band D property, a 3% increase and no change. 56% of the respondents to the consultation supported an increase of £5 on a band D property, which was carried through to the Budget proposals.

Income from the New Homes Bonus continued to be a key income stream, with receipts used to fund one-off projects. Reference was also made to a business rate retention pilot in which Lincolnshire was a participant that could see increased receipts for the Council.

Reference was made to arrangements for fees and charges; no charge increases were proposed for car parks. The Cabinet had felt that income could be optimised with the current price structure through better signage, monitoring, ticketing and layout.

The speech also outlined some of the steps that had been taken to help the Council become more commercial, including creating investment to support local business and attract inward investment, exploring new ways to offset costs and generate income including commercial acquisitions, and the creation of Gravitass.

A brief overview was given in relation to proposals affecting the Housing Revenue Account; property rents would continue to reduce by 1% annually to 2019/20 in line with the Government directive. Garages were not included in the rent reduction and so inflationary increases were proposed. It was also proposed that the £25m maturity loan be re-financed to allow resources to be diverted from the loan repayment to allow a step-up in the build programme.

An outline was also given of planned activity coming out of the Capital Programme, which included investment in the new multiplex cinema for Grantham and investment in Council assets.

Finally, reference was made to the Council's reserves and balances. It was proposed that the Council continue to maintain a General Fund working balance of £1.588m. Members were advised that the Community Fund reserve had been increased to fund the Cabinet proposals of continuing the scheme and a pilot Member Ward Budget scheme. The Local Priority Reserve was also being used to fund the Big Clean however it was intended that in future years funding for the project would come from the main budget.

The proposition was seconded.

Members of the Council began to debate the Budget proposals. Some members expressed their concern about the use of reserves, specifically the pension reserve,

which they felt could leave the Council vulnerable at the next triennial review.

Members were also interested in the increase in payroll costs and the impact of the local government pay award.

Some doubt was also expressed about whether the projected savings were achievable, specifically cited was those fees and charges related to car parking. This caused some concern about the potential impact on services and jobs if the budgeted savings and efficiencies were not achieved. Further concerns were expressed about the required £345k saving on corporate costs and whether this would lead to cutting staff and, if so, the impact on the morale of the remaining staff members.

There was a recognition that the proposed budget was very different to other budgets that the Council had previously set.

There was general support for a number of elements of the budget, specifically mentioned were the Big Clean, enforcement of enviro crime, capital investment and the introduction of Ward budgets. The housing investment programme was also commended however a comment was made about slippage in the programme that had been experienced in previous years.

During debate, support was expressed for the proposal to increase Council Tax by £5 on a band D property.

As a result of concerns about whether the projected income from car parking would be achievable, an amendment was proposed:

To revise car park charges according to the following table:

	2017/18	2018/19	Proposed Increase	% increase
	£	£	£	
Short Stay (except Wharf Road)				
30 mins	£ 0.50	£ 0.50	Nil	0%
1 hour	£ 0.80	£ 1.00	£ 0.20	25%
2 hour	£ 1.30	£ 1.50	£ 0.20	15%
3 hour	£ 1.80	£ 2.00	£ 0.20	11%
4 hour	£ 3.00	£ 3.50	£ 0.50	17%
4+ hours	£ 4.00	£ 5.00	£ 1.00	25%
Short Stay (Wharf Road)				
30 mins	£ 0.50	£ 0.50	Nil	0%
1 hour	£ 0.80	£ 1.00	£ 0.20	25%
2 hour	£ 1.30	£ 1.50	£ 0.20	15%
3 hour	£ 1.80	£ 2.00	£ 0.20	11%

4 hour	£ 6.00	£ 6.50	£ 0.50	8%
4+ hours	£ 8.00	£ 8.50	£ 0.50	6%

Long Stay

Up to 3 hours	£ 1.80	£ 2.00	£ 0.20	11%
Up to 4 hours	£ 2.50	£ 3.00	£ 0.50	20%
More than 4 hours	£ 3.00	£ 3.50	£ 0.50	17%

NB This increase of no more than 20p/hour would raise an additional £182k annual revenue funding. Due to statutory requirements the fee increase is unlikely to take effect until July 2018 so the actual impact in the financial year 2018/19 will be around £136k.

In moving the amendment, the proposer referred to a recent proposal that had been considered and rejected by the Cabinet which would see the introduction of a leisure tariff at Welham Street car park in Grantham. They indicated that a small increase could help optimise income.

The proposition was seconded.

Some Members expressed their concerns about the impact the proposed amendment might have on local businesses if people avoided the town centres because of car parking charges. When considering ways to optimise the usage of Council-owned car parks, reference was made to competition from free car parks operating in towns, the lack of available on-street parking and providing a facility that was affordable for workers, particularly those with low incomes.

A number of members commented that car parking charges could not be looked at in isolation. While reviews of car parking charges would be ongoing, any proposals should be developed to support a clear policy direction about how the Council wanted to influence behaviour of people using its car parks. A suggestion was made that it may be appropriate to make some car parks more attractive to workers and others to shoppers and visitors. One member also reminded members that councils had historically received criticism for using car parks solely as a source of income.

Those members who spoke in support of the amendment stated that they recognised the balance between getting charges right to optimise income but not put people off visiting. A comment was made that fees had remained static for 7 to 8 years. It was suggested that members of the public may find the rounded up pricing structure advantageous as it means that they would not have to look for change for the ticket machines. A suggestion was made that it might be helpful to offer low-cost season tickets for those workers on the lowest income who were employed in the town centres.

The proposer of the original motion was given the opportunity to respond to the proposal and comments that had been made. A recorded vote was taken.

For	Against	Abstain
------------	----------------	----------------

Councillor Baxter Councillor Cook Councillor Stevens Councillor Wood	Councillor Chivers Councillor Cooke Councillor Dobson Councillor Exton Councillor Goral Councillor Griffin Councillor Jeal Councillor Kaberry- Brown Councillor King Councillor Lee Councillor Morgan Councillor Dr. Moseley Councillor Neilson Councillor Reid Councillor Robins Councillor Selby Councillor Jacky Smith Councillor Stephens Councillor A Stokes Councillor I Stokes Councillor Ward Councillor Wilkins Councillor L Wootten Councillor R Wootten	Councillor Craft Councillor Cunningham
4	24	2

The amendment was lost.

A further amendment was proposed:

To make the following changes to the budget:

<i>Sub-amendment</i>	<i>Description</i>	<i>Page no.</i>	<i>Anticipated saving/revenue (£'000s)</i>
<i>a</i>	<i>Combine proposed "Innovation Team" with proposed "Transformation Team" and reduce budget by 25%</i>	<i>p58 (App C)</i>	<i>54</i>
<i>b</i>	<i>Reduce proposals for six new IT staff by 10%</i>	<i>p58 (App C)</i>	<i>15</i>
<i>c</i>	<i>Delete "Advertising" expenditure</i>	<i>p58 (App C)</i>	<i>36</i>
<i>d</i>	<i>Delete "Facilities Management"</i>	<i>p58 (App C)</i>	<i>30</i>
<i>e</i>	<i>Reduce "Leisure and heritage strategy" by 20%</i>	<i>p58 (App C)</i>	<i>70</i>
<i>f</i>	<i>Increase target "reduction in consultancy" to</i>	<i>p55 (App</i>	<i>5</i>

	<i>10% of total</i>	<i>B)</i>	
<i>g</i>	<i>Further reduce utilities expenditure by target reduction of actual energy consumption at some sites by 6%</i>		<i>10</i>
	TOTAL REDUCTION IN BUDGET REQUIREMENT		220

NB If agreed, this amendment will favourably alter the use of reserves as outlined in recommendation g and Appendix E.

The proposer stated that he felt that the proposed Budget was spending too much of Council Tax payers' money. He explained that his amendment was designed to reduce the budget requirement. The amendment was seconded.

One Member who spoke against the amendment stated that the Council could not cut its advertising expenditure as there were a certain number of notices that it was statutorily required to place in local newspapers. Another Member added that advertising would also be an important tool to promote the district. Consequently the proposer of the amendment removed the line regarding advertising from his proposition.

Some support for the amendment was expressed in respect of the combination of innovation and transformation; Members felt that separating the two could lead to duplication. A counter argument was presented which suggested that reducing the funding that was available for transformation and innovation would prevent the Council from moving forward, including its ability to operate commercially.

A recorded vote was taken on the amendment.

For	Against	Abstain
Councillor Baxter	Councillor Chivers	
Councillor Cook	Councillor Cooke	
Councillor Craft	Councillor Dobson	
Councillor Cunningham	Councillor Exton	
Councillor Morgan	Councillor Goral	
Councillor Stevens	Councillor Griffin	
Councillor Wood	Councillor Jeal	
	Councillor Mrs Kaberry-Brown	
	Councillor King	
	Councillor Lee	
	Councillor Dr Moseley	
	Councillor Neilson	
	Councillor Reid	
	Councillor Robins	
	Councillor Selby	
	Councillor Jacky Smith	
	Councillor Stephens	
	Councillor A Stokes	

	Councillor I Stokes Councillor Ward Councillor Wilkins Councillor L Wootten Councillor R Wootten	
7	23	0

The amendment was lost.

An amendment was proposed:

*To retain the **Discretionary Reserve for “Hardship and Welfare”** (currently £50k) and only to use it for its original intended purposes.*

The proposer considered that this reserve was a valuable tool for officers to provide support for the most vulnerable.

The amendment was seconded.

During discussion of the amendment one Member referred to the experiences of a resident in their Ward who had had their monthly income cut from £750 to £400 as a result of welfare changes. The fund was viewed as a safety net that provided a tool for officers to offer extra support to those people who needed it. A further comment was made that the changes to welfare arrangements and the impact of the Homelessness Reduction Act had not yet been fully realised and to remove the fund at this stage would be premature.

Members who spoke against the amendment explained that there were other policies and funding pots from which officers could draw to provide support and that the availability of those avenues meant that there had been no call for this fund to be used since its creation five years previously.

A recorded vote was taken on the amendment:

For	Against	Abstain
Councillor Baxter Councillor Cook Councillor Cunningham Councillor Morgan Councillor Stevens	Councillor Chivers Councillor Cooke Councillor Dobson Councillor Exton Councillor Goral Councillor Griffin Councillor Jeal Councillor Mrs. Kaberry-Brown Councillor King Councillor Lee Councillor Dr Moseley Councillor Neilson Councillor Reid	Councillor Craft Councillor Selby Councillor Wood

	Councillor Robins Councillor Jacky Smith Councillor Stephens Councillor A Stokes Councillor I Stokes Councillor Ward Councillor Wilkins Councillor L Wootten Councillor R Wootten	
5	22	3

The amendment was lost.

An amendment to the budget was proposed:

South Kesteven District Council will set aside £1k from the Local Priorities Reserve in order to match fund donations from local residents to take legal advice regarding the night closure and future plans for Grantham & District Hospital Accident & Emergency Department.

The amendment to the budget is as follows:-

*Agenda Item 7
Recommendations - pg25*

*In relation to the General Fund-Revenue (Recorded Vote)
a. to set a General Fund budget requirement of **£11.873m** for 2018/19 ...*

*In relation to the General Fund - Reserves and Balances
g. to approve the use of reserves as detailed at Appendix E
with amendment to the Local Priorities budget of an additional £1k spend.*

*pg 61 Appendix E
General Fund Reserves Statement*

*Amendment
Column: Forecast Balance as at 31 March 2019
Row: Local Priorities Reserve - amend £6676 to £5676*

The amendment was seconded.

The proposer made reference to some information that she had received that indicated that United Lincolnshire Hospitals Trust had started briefing staff on proposals that the hospital would only provide elective care and that accident and emergency services would not be restored. She said that in similar positions, other Councils had taken a lead role in protecting their local accident and emergency departments, going to court and paying for legal advice. She said that agreeing to incorporate the amendment into the Budget would provide a clear demonstration of the Council's support for the campaign. She added that she had heard that changes,

on which there had been no public consultation, were already underway and that the only way to suspend activity was through a legal act.

She explained that the £1,000 she was requesting would match-fund contributions made by private individuals and would be used to pay for a barrister to provide a review of the options available and the likelihood of success. Reference was also made to a statement made by the Cabinet Member in his speech proposing the Budget when he had said that they wanted best-use of council tax payers' money to support the people living in the area. She felt that including £1,000 in the Budget for this purpose was a clear demonstration of this.

Several Members spoke against the proposition, stating that they supported the campaign, however they were mindful that the £2,000 total would not cover the cost of a Judicial Review. Reference was made to the proposal for Ward Member Budgets and how Members could choose to use their allocation to make a contribution to support such an action. Several Members stated that they would be prepared to commit their allocation to support the campaign, with some Councillors adding that they had already made individual contributions privately. Those Members who spoke against the amendment stated that this Council had already referred the overnight closure of Grantham Accident and Emergency to the Health Secretary, with further evidence having been sent through the Lincolnshire Health Scrutiny Committee, which had passed resolutions of no confidence in United Lincolnshire Hospitals Trust, that were still awaiting a response.

Members discussed the timeline within which action could be taken; the proposer had indicated that swift action was necessary but those Members who did not support the proposal stated that whether payment was made through the budgetary amendment or Members' Ward allowances, the funding would not be available until the start of the new financial year.

Clarification was given that the funding was to pay for a barrister to provide an assessment of all the options that were available, their potential costs and the likely outcome. The proposer of the amendment stated that Judicial Review was not the only remedy and suggested that other channels might include making a complaint through the General Medical Council of the Parliamentary and Health Ombudsman, both of which would cost nothing.

Those Members who spoke in support of the amendment referred to the need for an Accident and Emergency unit in the town. One Member referred to the snowy and icy weather conditions that were being experienced and how they had meant people who needed treatment were too frightened to travel to Lincoln at night. Reference was also made to the fact that Grantham did not have a town council, which meant that the district council was required to act on the town's behalf. Some Members suggested that the intervention that was being requested was one such instance. One Member suggested making a £10,000 contribution with funding coming from the Hardship and Welfare fund.

The amendment was the subject of a recorded vote:

For	Against	Abstain
Councillor Baxter Councillor Morgan Councillor Selby Councillor Stevens Councillor Wood	Councillor Chivers Councillor Cooke Councillor Craft Councillor Cunningham Councillor Dobson Councillor Exton Councillor Goral Councillor Griffin Councillor Jeal Councillor Mrs Kaberry- Brown Councillor King Councillor Lee Councillor Dr Moseley Councillor Neilson Councillor Reid Councillor Robins Councillor Jacky Smith Councillor Stephens Councillor A Stokes Councillor I Stokes Councillor Ward Councillor Wilkins Councillor L Wootten Councillor R Wootten	Councillor Cook
5	24	1

The amendment was lost.

Further debate ensued on the substantive Budget proposals. Support was expressed for a number of ideas that were incorporated within the Budget, including investment, attracting tourism to the district to create economic growth and the business waste collection scheme. Some concerns were reiterated about the separation of transformation and innovation and the potential to make cost savings if the two sat together. Previous comments about the use of the pension reserve were also echoed.

A response was made in respect of previous comments concerning the use of the Pensions reserve. Members were advised that this would be the fourth year that Budget proposals had used the reserve as a temporary measure to alleviate pressure on service budgets. Officers added that the triennial review of pensions would highlight the required commitment for the use of that reserve in future years.

A number of other comments were made in relation to the Budget proposals, which included the use of reserves to help find savings and help the Council become more efficient and lower the strain on the General Fund. During debate reference was made to some Councils that were in special measures because they had not taken action to meet the challenges of reduced funding. They added that South Kesteven District Council needed to take action to make sure that it would not find itself in the same

position.

Comments were made about the proposed introduction of performance-related pay and how it would be expected as the Council became more commercial in its focus – the specific example was given of the recruitment to a sales post for the trade waste scheme.

Members noted that the Budget proposals included the in-house enforcement of enviro crime. The enforcement officers would need to issue 2.8 tickets daily to achieve a breakeven position. This compared favourably against the private sector.

The proposer of the Budget was given the opportunity to sum up; he stated that this was a very different budget that was developed with a view to making the Council more outward looking so that it became more comparable to a business rather than a public sector entity.

A recorded vote was taken on recommendations a to h:

For	Against	Abstain
Councillor Chivers	Councillor Baxter	Councillor Selby
Councillor Cooke	Councillor Cook	
Councillor Dobson	Councillor Craft	
Councillor Exton	Councillor Cunningham	
Councillor Goral	Councillor Morgan	
Councillor Griffin		
Councillor Jeal		
Councillor Mrs Kaberry-Brown		
Councillor King		
Councillor Lee		
Councillor Dr Mosley		
Councillor Neilson		
Councillor Reid		
Councillor Robins		
Councillor Jacky Smith		
Councillor Stephens		
Councillor Stevens		
Councillor A Stokes		
Councillor I Stokes		
Councillor Ward		
Councillor Wilkins		
Councillor Wood		
Councillor L Wootten		
Councillor R Wootten		
24	5	1

The recommendations were approved.

Members voted on recommendations i to p by a show of a hands. A majority of

members supported the recommendations and the proposition was carried.

A recorded vote was taken on Part B

For	Against	Abstain
Councillor Chivers		Councillor Baxter
Councillor Cook		Councillor Craft
Councillor Cooke		Councillor Cunningham
Councillor Dobson		
Councillor Exton		
Councillor Goral		
Councillor Griffin		
Councillor Jeal		
Councillor Mrs Kaberry-Brown		
Councillor King		
Councillor Lee		
Councillor Morgan		
Councillor Dr Moseley		
Councillor Neilson		
Councillor Reid		
Councillor Robins		
Councillor Selby		
Councillor Jacky Smith		
Councillor Stephens		
Councillor Stevens		
Councillor A Stokes		
Councillor I Stokes		
Councillor Ward		
Councillor Wilkins		
Councillor Wood		
Councillor L Wootten		
Councillor R Wootten		
27	0	3

The proposition was approved.

76. APPOINTMENT OF CHIEF EXECUTIVE

Decision:

That the Council approves the permanent appointment of Aidan Rave as the Chief Executive including the duties of Head of Paid Service, the Electoral Registration Officer (in fulfilment of the requirement of s.8 of the Representation of the People Act 1983), the Returning Officer (under the requirements of s.41 of the Local Government Act 1972) and the full range of duties set down in the Chief Executive's job description set out in Appendix A to report number TC009.

16:49 – Aidan Rave left the meeting during discussion of this item of business

The Chairman of the Employment Committee presented the recommendations in TC009 on the appointment of the Chief Executive. In so doing he referred Members to the job description and objectives for the role and the recommendations and minutes from the Employment Committee. Members were reminded of the process that had seen Mr. Rave appointed as Interim Chief Executive for a period of one year with an opportunity to extend the contract for a further year. The Committee had agreed at its meeting on 30 January 2018 that they felt Aidan Rave was the right candidate and determined that he should be offered the role of Chief Executive on a permanent basis.

The proposition was seconded, when it was stated that Mr Rave was a great support to the Leadership in driving the Council forward.

A number of Members spoke in favour of the appointment, referring to their experiences of Mr. Rave and the qualities that he had demonstrated since his appointment.

The proposal was put to the vote and carried.

16:58 – Aidan Rave returned to the meeting

77. COMMUNITY GOVERNANCE REVIEW - CORBY GLEN

Decision:

The Council

- 1. Notes the request from Corby Glen Parish Council to increase the number of parish councillors from seven to nine**
- 2. Agrees to undertake a Community Governance Review of the parish of Corby Glen in relation to increasing the number of parish councillors only**
- 3. Approves the draft Terms of Reference, including the timetable and arrangements for public consultation, set out in appendix A of report number LDS273**
- 4. Agrees that the draft and final recommendations be prepared in consultation with the Ward member and the outcome of the review be determined at a future meeting of the Council**

The Cabinet Member for Communities stated that a formal request had been made by Corby Glen Parish Council, which had asked the District Council to carry out a Community Governance Review to look at increasing the number of members from seven to nine. He proposed the recommendations in report number LDS273, drawing Members' attention to the proposed timetable and the appended terms of reference. The proposition was seconded, when reference was made to the planned growth within the parish over the next twenty years.

During brief debate, support was expressed and the request made that the same diligence be given when the Council was looking at governance arrangements for Grantham.

A vote was taken on the proposition, which was carried.

78. MEETINGS OF THE CABINET

The Leader drew Members' attention to report number LDS268 which provided Council members with copies of the reports submitted to, and the minutes of Cabinet meetings, including decisions taken by individual Cabinet Members.

79. CLOSE OF MEETING

The meeting was closed at 17:04.