

MINUTES

COUNCIL

THURSDAY, 16 JULY 2020

1.00 PM



SOUTH
KESTEVEN
DISTRICT
COUNCIL

PRESENT

Councillor Jacky Smith Chairman

Councillor Bob Adams
Councillor Ashley Baxter
Councillor David Bellamy
Councillor Harrish Bisnauthsing
Councillor Mrs Pam Bosworth
Councillor George Chivers
Councillor Louise Clack
Councillor Kelham Cooke
Councillor John Cottier
Councillor Helen Crawford
Councillor John Dawson
Councillor Phil Dilks
Councillor Barry Dobson
Councillor Paul Fellows
Councillor Breda Griffin
Councillor Jan Hansen
Councillor Graham Jeal
Councillor Gloria Johnson
Councillor Mrs Rosemary Kaberry-Brown
Councillor Anna Kelly
Councillor Ms Jane Kingman
Councillor Philip Knowles
Councillor Matthew Lee
Councillor Nikki Manterfield
Councillor Annie Mason
Councillor Penny Milnes

Councillor Virginia Moran
Councillor Charmaine Morgan
Councillor Dr Peter Moseley
Councillor Robert Reid
Councillor Nick Robins
Councillor Susan Sandall
Councillor Ian Selby
Councillor Mrs Judy Smith
Councillor Lee Steptoe
Councillor Judy Stevens
Councillor Adam Stokes
Councillor Ian Stokes
Councillor Jill Thomas
Councillor Rosemary Trollope-Bellew
Councillor Sarah Trotter
Councillor Dean Ward
Councillor Hannah Westropp
Councillor Hilary Westropp
Councillor Amanda Wheeler
Councillor Mark Whittington
Councillor Jane Wood
Councillor Paul Wood
Councillor Sue Woolley
Councillor Linda Wootten
Councillor Ray Wootten

OFFICERS

Chief Executive (Karen Bradford)
Strategic Director, Transformation and
Change (Lee Sirdifield)
Strategic Director, Growth (Paul Thomas)
Assistant Chief Executive, Housing
Delivery (Ken Lyon)
Interim Director of Finance (Richard
Wyles)

OFFICERS

Director of Law and Governance (Shahin
Ismail)
Chief Executive Officer InvestSK (Steve
Bowyer)
Head of Leisure (Karen Whitfield)
Head of Governance (Jo Toomey)
Democratic Officer (Lucy Bonshor)

Order of agenda items

A request had been made by some members to bring agenda item 15, Financial Impact of Covid-19 on the Leisure Service, earlier in the agenda. The Chairman stated that this item would be dealt with after agenda item 7.

107. Public Open Forum

Question 1

Question to: Councillor Rosemary Trollope-Bellew, the Cabinet Member for Culture and Visitor Economy

From: Struan Cornell, Bourne

“In light of the Covid-19 pandemic and the vast savings that the Council has made by not spending the money on these planned events, could you please clarify if the said allocated monies for these events are going to be carried over to re-scheduled events next year?”

The Cabinet Member for Culture and Visitor Economy stated that the Council had not made vast savings by not holding the Gravity Fields Festival in 2020. Early preparatory work on the Festival had incurred costs of £24,000, before the decision to postpone the event had been taken. The financial challenges of Covid-19 had meant that the £100,000 savings from not holding the Gravity Fields Festival were likely to be required to support the Council’s shortfall in the budget, due to Covid-19, which was currently £3.4 million. Serious consideration was required in relation to the Council’s funding for the remainder of the year, and the Cabinet Member could not confirm that any events funding would be rolled over for future years.

Mr Cornell appreciated the answer given, but stated that South Kesteven District Council had received monies from central Government to cover shortfalls due to Covid-19. The Cabinet Member for Culture and Visitor Economy responded that Government funding received did not cover costs for events.

Question 2

Question to: Councillor Rosemary Trollope-Bellew, the Cabinet Member for Culture and Visitor Economy

From: Struan Cornell, Bourne

“Could you please clarify if there are any plans for the Bourne CiCLE Festival to restart next year (2021) and run for three consecutive years, as was originally planned?”

The Cabinet Member for Culture and Visitor Economy recognised that festivals and events were inclusive and valued by communities and helped to make South Kesteven an attractive place to live and visit. Festivals required a lot of planning and needed to demonstrate value for money. The Council provided many services to residents and businesses within South Kesteven and a review of festivals would be taking place to see how and where money was spent. The Bourne CiCLE Festival

could not be wholly supported by the District Council and there had been no proposition demonstrating how funding provided by the Council would be used to secure match-funding from other sources.

Key festivals that the Council held were Gravity Fields Festival in Grantham and the Georgian Festival in Stamford which were held in alternate years. The events had to be inclusive, benefit the wider residents, business communities, and demonstrate value for money. The Cabinet Member for Culture and Visitor Economy stated that she would welcome a sound business case for any event to enable it to be considered through the right processes. Any business case needed to demonstrate the economic and social benefits of the event and the staging and funding sought, not just from the Council, but stakeholders and sponsors. The business case should also include support from residents and the business community. The Council would take business cases for events into consideration when setting its budget for the next financial year.

Mr Cornell asked for the date that a business plan and proposals should be submitted to the Council for a consecutive year's event.

The Cabinet Member for Culture and Visitor Economy stated that events were not undertaken in consecutive years and that information should be sent to the Council by 31 August 2020.

108. Register of attendance and apologies for absence

The Chief Executive took a register of attendance of all Members. Apologies were received from Councillor Broughton, Councillor Exton and Councillor Goral. Apologies for late attendance were received from Councillor Robins.

109. Disclosure of Interests

The Chairman of the Council declared a disclosable pecuniary interest in relation to agenda item 7 and left the meeting during the debate and voting on this item.

110. Minutes of the meeting held on 14 May 2020

The minutes of the meeting held on 14 May 2020 were proposed, seconded and agreed as a correct record.

111. Minutes of the meeting held on 1 July 2020

Members had received two sets of minutes for 1 July 2020 as part of their agenda packs. Clarity was asked about which set Members were agreeing for accuracy.

It was **AGREED**:

To defer the Minutes of 1 July 2020 to later in the agenda to allow Democratic Service Officers to determine which set of minutes was correct.

As the extended time of the meeting did not allow consideration of this item, it was deferred until the next ordinary meeting of the Council.

112. Communications (including Chairman's Announcements)

The Council noted the Chairman's engagements. The Chairman highlighted the flag raising for the RAF which was the first time that the flag had been raised in Grantham and the tree planting in the Heroes Orchard.

The Chairman also wished to place on record her thanks to Councillor Chris Benn for his work and contribution to the Council, following his resignation earlier in the year.

The Chairman also made members aware that the Council had been shortlisted in two categories of the Local Authority Building Control Excellence Awards 2020. The first category was the Best Large Commercial Project for the Savoy Cinema and the second category was the Best High Volume New Housing Development for Phase 2 at Wherry's Lane, Bourne. Decisions would be made at a virtual awards ceremony on 27 August 2020.

113. Future High Street Fund: Budgetary Provision

As the Chairman had disclosed a pecuniary interest in relation to the item, she left the meeting and took no part in the debate or vote.

Vice-Chairman in the Chair

The Vice-Chairman reminded members that Appendix 6 to the report contained exempt information. Members were advised that if they wished to comment on the exempt appendix, the press and public would be excluded at the end of the debate and the meeting would go into exempt session.

The Deputy Leader presented his report which recommended the approval of revenue funding in support of a Future High Street Scheme for Grantham. The bid had to be submitted by 31 July 2020. South Kesteven District Council had been invited to submit a business case to the Ministry for Housing, Communities and Local Government (MHCLG) for funding from the Future High Street Scheme in respect of Grantham town centre following a successful expression of interest. A revenue grant from the MHCLG had allowed for the appointment of an external consultancy team to compile a masterplan for Grantham town. A programme of internal and external consultation had taken place to inform the draft business case which had been submitted in March 2020.

The final preferred option expressed in the draft business case included public realm enhancement schemes, developments within the town centre and third party grants to enable vacant premises in the town centre to be brought back into use.

The plans for Grantham were a major opportunity to attract Government funding. Grantham was ideally placed with its infrastructure and strategic connections and had a wealth of historic and architectural heritage. This had been recognised by the recent Heritage Action Zone status. The acquisition and redevelopment of key town centre sites was needed to make those areas within Grantham more attractive. The

total cost of the bid was £19,691,969 with a requested contribution from the Future High Street Fund of £8,061,845. The revenue contribution from South Kesteven was £379,092 over a four year period and would be included in the final bid, submitted by 31 July 2020.

The establishment of a 'Town Team' was proposed; this would be a partnership body. There would also be a Town Centre Manager whose remit would be to help deliver the action plan set out and agreed by the 'Town Team'. It would also undertake monitoring of the funding and evaluation of the programme at key milestones within the scheme during the four year period.

The Deputy Leader thanked officers within the Council and at InvestSK for their work on the bid together with the Leader and Cabinet Members. The Deputy Leader recommended that the Council allocated a revenue budget of £379,092 as the Council's contribution towards the Future High Street Scheme for Grantham town centre. The proposal was seconded.

The Leader of the Council stated that the multi-million pound bid was for an investment in the future of Grantham town centre. The project would revitalise the town centre, improve access and support local businesses. The bid had the potential to attract £11 million in match funding from the private sector which would mean an investment of £20 million in Grantham. He asked for members to support the proposal and thanked those who had been involved in the development and preparation of the bid.

Some members expressed concern about how the bid process had been dealt with. Questions were asked about who had decided the membership of the project board and whether, this included the Chairman of the Planning Committee, given the planning implications of the proposals set out in the Masterplan. Members queried where back bench Councillors could access the government feedback document on the draft business case. It was felt that no pre scrutiny of the draft business case had taken place and that, earlier scrutiny could have led to a more robust business case. Members of the Finance, Economic Development and Corporate Services Overview and Scrutiny Committee had seen the papers at their meeting on 30 June 2020 and Cabinet had looked at the papers at its meeting on 7 July 2020. A comment was made that the Council report did not reflect the concerns raised at the Overview and Scrutiny Committee meeting about who would pick the membership of the 'Town Team' and that meaningful robust scrutiny had not taken place.

The Deputy Leader praised work that InvestSK had done on the bid and stated that Grantham Members had been involved. It had been a short-turn around in accessing the £150,000 from the Ministry for Housing, Communities and Local Government to put the bid together. More engagement would take place as the scheme designs developed.

A Grantham Councillor thanked everyone involved in the preparation of the bid and made reference to work done in the past in relation to having a Grantham Town Council and how this tied in with the Grantham Town Team. She stated that InvestSK had held several workshops earlier in the year which had been well run, where residents and business people had the opportunity to put forward their comments and ideas. She and another Grantham Councillor had attended and

contributed to the workshops. The member was concerned about the loss of attractive buildings as Grantham was an historic medieval town. The member felt that there needed to be more emphasis on tourism and heritage with facilities to attract people to the town. If the Masterplan was set in stone, she felt that members had not had an adequate opportunity to look at it.

The Deputy Leader stated that the Masterplan was not the final document, it had been put together as an outline to enable a bid to be submitted. If the Council received the £8.1 million funding, there was further work to be carried out particularly in relation to areas such as visitor economy. Companies were looking to relocate from London and through the bid Grantham had an opportunity to attract them while encouraging existing businesses to stay and grow.

Further comments were made with members congratulating InvestSK and all those who had been involved in producing the bid and the extensive report that was before members. Reference was made to the previous proposals for the area and how it was hoped that the current proposals would help to revitalise the town centre.

A comment was made about the public transport links within the district. It was noted that there were very few transport links between the main towns in the District, particularly between Grantham and Bourne and Market Deeping. Members felt that this needed to be taken into consideration in any Masterplan.

In answer to questions that had been raised, the Strategic Director for Growth stated that the Project Board was a subset of the Cabinet, and an Officer Project Team fed into it. The Project Team gave advice on planning, and other factors, to the Cabinet Project Board. A copy of the Government response could be given to the member, but a check was needed on its confidentiality, following which it could be given to the member on a private and confidential basis if necessary.

At the time the Finance, Economic Development and Corporate Services Overview and Scrutiny Committee considered the report, only a month and a half remained until the bid needed to be submitted. Engagement had been carried out with members in February 2020, together with businesses and resident engagement but it was acknowledged that this had not been a scrutiny process.

The level of detail within the Masterplan document was strategic and gave an indication of the areas that would be focused on. It was an outline of the proposals only and gave the principles of the work planned if the bid was successful.

Further comments and support for the bid were made by Grantham members who welcomed the bid and the opportunity it presented to help revitalise Grantham town. Reassurance was given in relation to the heritage aspect of Grantham and reference was made to the Heritage Action Zone document, which was approved in March 2020.

Once again thanks were given to InvestSK for the work that it had done and to the Deputy Leader and Cabinet members, particularly the Cabinet Member for Communities and the Cabinet Member for Culture and Visitor Economy who had been involved in the bid.

The Deputy Leader reassured Grantham members that once the bid money was approved, they would be involved in the proposals for Grantham and asked members to vote positively.

As no one wished to comment on the exempt appendix, the Council did not go into exempt session on this item.

On being put to the vote it was unanimously **AGREED**:

That the Council approves a revenue contribution of £379,092 towards the Future High Street Scheme for Grantham Town Centre.

Exclusion of the Press and Public

It was proposed, seconded and agreed that in accordance with Section 100 (a) (4) of the Local Government Act 1972 the press and public be excluded from the meeting during consideration of the next item of business because of the likelihood that otherwise exempt information, as described in paragraph 3 of the Act would be disclosed to them.

114. Financial Impact of COVID-19 on the Leisure Service

The minute relating to this item contains exempt information under section 100 (a)(4) of the Local Government Act 1972, paragraph 3 of Schedule 12 A of the Act. Information exempt under paragraph 3 is information which relates to the financial or business affairs of an individual or organisation.

On being put to the vote, it was **AGREED**:

To approve the recommendations as set out in the exempt report of the Deputy Leader of the Council.

All those excluded during the discussion of the exempt item were returned to the meeting.

Meeting adjourned between 15:10 – 15:22.

115. Programme of meetings 2020/21

The Leader of the Council presented his report on the draft programme of meetings for 2020/21. Following the recommendation from the Cabinet that the draft be adopted, the Leader proposed the draft programme with two changes: the removal of the Budget Overview and Scrutiny Committee on 21 October 2020 and the inclusion of an additional ordinary meeting of the Council on 1 October 2020.

A comment was made in relation to the workload of those on the Planning Committee due to the increased number of meetings and therefore site visits. The timeframe for the review of the Constitution was also commented on, it was noted that the completed review of the Constitution was not expected to be complete until 2021.

On being put to the vote, it was **AGREED**:

That the draft programme of meetings for 2020/21 including the two changes proposed by the Leader be approved.

116. Recommendations from the Constitution Committee

The Chairman of the Constitution Committee presented her report which included the recommendations from the meeting of the Constitution Committee held on 29 June 2020.

On 16 December 2019 the Constitution Committee had agreed a project plan to review the Constitution. A Working Group was formed, made up of all members of the Committee. The Working Group had met four times since January 2020.

The Covid-19 pandemic had meant that progress on the review had been suspended temporarily. The Chairman of the Constitution Committee thanked members of the Committee and officers for their work to date in respect of the review. A revised copy of the Summary and Explanation and Articles 1 – 4 were appended to the report. The revisions to the documents were shown in red with the changes tracked. Where parts had been taken out, these had been moved to more appropriate parts of the Constitution and the Chairman of the Constitution Committee stressed to members that nothing had been taken out. Article 4 was a revision of Article 17 on decision making which it was felt should be brought forward within the Constitution for ease of reference. Other parts of the original Article 17 would be moved elsewhere within the Constitution.

Regular reports from the Constitution Committee would be brought before Council until the review was completed in March 2021. When Council had agreed the revisions to the Articles these would be collated within a new Constitution document.

The Working Group had also considered the definition for Key Decisions and what constituted significant expenditure or savings when making a Key Decision. The Committee had carefully considered this issue and had made a recommendation as outlined in the report. The Chairman of the Constitution Committee proposed the recommendations contained within the report. The proposal was seconded.

One member expressed concern about the content and quality of the documents before members and the timeframe given for members to look at the documents. He had concerns about the number of members who had attended some of the Working Groups and that the notes from the Working Group meetings and the last Constitution Committee were not available. He felt that the documents before members had not been sufficiently scrutinised by all members for them to vote on it.

A comment was made about the loose-leaf booklet that had previously contained the Constitution and whether consideration could be given to providing something similar in the future.

Another member stated that he recognised the need to review the Constitution, but he did not agree with some of the changes that had been made. He referred to the proposal at Article 2, Members of the Council, under other rights where a change had been made so that a member could request that an item was placed on an Overview

and Scrutiny Committee agenda rather than have a right to do so. He also asked for a point of order in relation to 1.6 in Article 1 where it stated that:

“Changes to the Constitution will only be approved by the full Council after consideration of a report by the Monitoring Officer on the proposal by the Constitution Committee....”

The report before members stated that the report author was the Head of Governance, not the Monitoring Officer, and he proposed an amendment that the report and appendices should go back to the Constitution Committee for further consideration. The proposal was seconded.

The Director of Law and Governance, who was also the Monitoring Officer, stated that a number of working group meetings had been held by the Constitution Committee and extensive discussions had taken place. It was felt that the Constitution was too big a document to consider at one time and it was proposed that it was looked at in smaller sections. She assured members that nothing had been taken out or missed and she was in agreement with the recommendations contained within the report, which could be taken as her report.

The member who had seconded the amendment felt that significant changes had been made to the document, especially in relation to scrutiny and the role of all members. Not all parties were represented on the Constitution Committee. She felt that too few members had been involved in preparing the documents before members and she supported the amendment for it to go back to be reviewed again by the Constitution Committee.

A point of order was raised in relation to the seconding of the amendment to which the Chief Executive responded.

Further support was given to the proposed amendment. One member felt that the process was being rushed, especially in the current climate with Covid-19. Another member felt that due to the number of changes within the document, consideration should be given to looking at it separately in a Council meeting dedicated to the Constitution.

Confirmation was sought that any recommendation agreed at the Council meeting complied with the current Constitution. The Monitoring Officer had confirmed previously that she approved the recommendations from the Constitution Committee, and they were compliant with the current Constitution.

Another comment was made that perhaps an overview of the Constitution’s structure showing where changes had been slotted in would help members to see the document more clearly and this could be done if it was referred back to the Constitution Committee. Other comments referred to the political balance of the Constitution Committee and the newness of some of the members on the Committee and the extent to which they had knowledge of the Constitution as a whole.

The Chairman of the Constitution Committee stated again that nothing was being hidden from members; the Committee was politically balanced and all members had the opportunity to speak at the meetings.

The amendment to refer the report and appendices back to the Constitution Committee for further review was then taken. The vote on the amendment was lost.

As the meeting had reached the three hour mark it was proposed, seconded and agreed to continue the meeting for a further hour.

Debate then followed on the substantive proposal. Clarity was asked about how the recommended £200,000 recommended as a significant figure for Key Decisions, related to limits within the Financial Regulations. The Cabinet Member for Finance and Resources confirmed that the figure was in line with the Financial Regulations of the Council.

A comment was made about the wording in relation to members of the public being able to inspect the Council's accounts. The member felt that the public should have every opportunity to question the Council's procedures and referred to the changes in relation to making objections to the external auditor within a 30 day period between June/July in relation to the Council's accounts.

The changes made to the Constitution had been made in consultation with the Finance Team and it did not take away the public's right to object to the external auditor if they were unhappy with the Council's accounts. The Cabinet Member for Finance and Resources confirmed that the wording suggested was acceptable and stated that the timeframe for the inspection of the 2019/20 accounts had been changed due to Covid-19.

A member of the Constitution Committee stated that a considerable amount of work had been undertaken by the Working Group. Currently the Constitution was nearly 300 pages and contained duplications and contradictions. The aim was for a document that was slimmer and easier to understand for both Councillors and members of the public. He reassured members that nothing was being excluded and the Monitoring Officer ensured that nothing was missed out. It was a complicated document and some time had been lost due to the Covid-19 crisis.

Further comments were made in relation to the content of the Constitution in respect of the scrutiny aspect and seeing the whole document in context. A question was asked in relation to the difference between 'request' and 'right' and it was stated that no member had the legal right to put an item on the agenda, they could request an item be added. The changed wording was a reflection of this. The wording used in respect of the scrutiny function, including the wording around 'critical friend' was a straight lift from the statutory guidance.

A request was made that the Leader withdraw the item in light of the comments that had been made, and in the interests of unity and collaboration. It was suggested that an all member workshop be held to look in detail at the document.

The Chairman of the Constitution Committee stated that this was the third update to the Constitution since 2007. All members were notified when the Constitution Committee met and had the opportunity to attend the meetings and make any comments. She also invited Members to attend the Working Group meetings. She would take on board the comments made and ensure that members were given enough time to look at the papers.

A request was then made that a recorded vote be taken. As the request was supported by ten or more Members of the Council, in accordance with Article 4.13.4 of the Council's Constitution, a recorded vote was taken.

For: Councillors Adams, Bellamy, Bosworth, Chivers, Cooke, Cottier, Crawford, Dawson, Dobson, Griffin, Jeal, Johnson, Kaberry-Brown, Kingman, Lee, Manterfield, Mason, Dr Moseley, Reid, Robins, Sandall, Jacky Smith, Stevens, Adam Stokes, Ian Stokes, Thomas, Trollope-Bellew, Trotter, Ward, Hannah Westropp, Hilary Westropp, Whittington, Woolley, Linda Wootten and Ray Wootten. (35)

Against: Councillors Baxter, Bisnauthsing, Clack, Dilks, Hansen, Kelly, Knowles, Moran, Morgan, Steptoe, Wheeler, Jane Wood, Paul Wood (13)

Abstain: Councillors Fellows, Selby and Judy Smith. (3)

On being put to the vote, it was **AGREED**:

1. To approve the adoption of the revised Summary and Explanation and revised Articles 1 to 4 as appended to the report from the Constitution Committee.
2. To adopt with immediate effect, a minimum value of £200,000 as the definition of significant expenditure or saving in respect of Key Decisions.

117. Appointments to Committees

Following the resignation of Councillor Benn the Council was asked to review its appointments to Committees and appoint a new Chairman of the Environment Overview and Scrutiny Committee. Outside body appointments were also required for the Lincolnshire County Council Flood and Drainage Management Committee, the Black Sluice Internal Drainage Board and the Upper Witham Internal Drainage Board. The political balance calculation for the Environment Overview and Scrutiny Committee and the Governance and Audit Committee were contained within the agenda pack. The political balance calculation for the Companies Committee was circulated separately as an addendum to the report. There was no change to the political balance of the Committees.

A member asked if she could ask a question of the nominees, it was confirmed that any questions could be asked during the debate.

The Chief Executive asked the Leader for the Conservative Group's nominations. The Leader nominated Councillor Helen Crawford to the Environment Overview and Scrutiny Committee, Councillor Jacky Smith to the Governance and Audit Committee and Councillor Susan Sandall to the Companies Committee.

The Chief Executive then asked for nominations for the Chairmanship of the Environment Overview and Scrutiny Committee. The Leader nominated Councillor Nikki Manterfield for the Chairmanship. The Independent Group Leader nominated Councillor Ashley Baxter. He referred to when there was only one Scrutiny

Committee, which had been chaired by an opposition member. He felt that it was an opportunity for the Leader of the Council to choose a Chairman from the opposition.

Concern was expressed by some Members over whose responsibility it was to appoint the Chairman of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee and the Monitoring Officer referred members to 6.5.5 of the Constitution.

A point of Order was made that the one hour extension to the meeting had been reached.

6.5.5 stated:

'If the Chairman or Vice-Chairman resigns either from that position or from the Council by giving written notice of resignation to the Chief Executive, the Council shall, at its next meeting, elect a successor.'

It was therefore the responsibility of the Council.

The Leader stated that as the meeting had reached its one hour extension, he proposed a 15 minute extension to complete this item and that all other items be deferred to the next meeting of the Council. The proposal was seconded and agreed.

The Monitoring Officer advised that if the nomination from the Leader failed when voted on, a further nomination could be made.

The Group Leader for the Independent Group wanted to be able to make a second nomination which had been allowed in the past, and he asked that the Procedure Rules be suspended for this item. The Monitoring Officer stated that the item did not come under the Procedure Rules of the Council. The Constitution was clear that the Council made the decision. Members had a recommendation before them from the Leader which had been seconded. If the vote for this nomination failed, then a further nomination could be considered.

A Point of Order was made about debating the nomination and further debate was allowed where members highlighted the suitability of Councillor Baxter to the position of Environment Overview and Scrutiny Chairman, listing his achievements and qualifications.

As the time limit previously agreed had been exceeded, the Leader proposed that a further five minutes extension should be allowed to vote on the Chairmanship of the Environment Overview and Scrutiny Committee and then to go straight to the vote for a and b of agenda item 11 as the Parish Councils had waited a long time for a decision to be made. All other items would be deferred to the next ordinary meeting of the Council. The proposal was seconded and agreed.

The proposal for the Chairmanship of the Environment Overview and Scrutiny Committee was voted on.

On being put to the vote, it was **AGREED**:

That Councillor Nikki Manterfield be appointed as Chairman of the Environment Overview and Scrutiny Committee.

The appointments to the outside bodies required for the Lincolnshire County Council Flood and Drainage Management Committee, the Black Sluice Internal Drainage Board and the Upper Witham Internal Drainage Board were deferred to the annual meeting of the Council.

118. Boothby Pagnell Parish Meeting

A request had been received from Boothby Pagnell Parish Meeting for South Kesteven District Council to confer additional powers on it in relation to community centres, crime prevention, general powers, highways, parish documents, town and country planning and traffic calming as outlined within the report. The additional powers would allow the Parish Meeting to gain independence by empowering the local community.

As the meeting had exceeded the time limits agreed, no debate on the item followed. The proposal to approve the making of an Order conferring additional powers on Boothby Pagnell Parish Meeting was proposed and seconded.

On being put to the vote, it was **AGREED**:

To approve the making of an Order, as attached at Appendix 2 to the report contained within the agenda pack conferring additional powers on Boothby Pagnell Parish Meeting.

119. Swinstead Parish Council

Swinstead Parish Council had recently had three resignations and was therefore inquorate and unable to hold meetings and conduct business.

A temporary appointment of Councillor Nick Robins had been made to Swinstead Parish Council to make the parish council quorate and allow it to conduct urgent business until a new member had been co-opted and taken up office.

The Council **NOTED** the appointment of Councillor Nick Robins on a temporary basis to Swinstead Parish Council.

120. Update from the Leader of the Council

Item deferred to the next ordinary meeting of the Council.

(a) Meetings of the Cabinet

Item deferred to the next ordinary meeting of the Council.

(b) Decisions made under urgency provisions

Item deferred until the next ordinary meeting of the Council.

121. Members' Open Questions

As the meeting had reached the extended time limit agreed by Members no open question session took place.

122. Notices of Motion given under Article 4.9 of the Council's Constitution:

(a) Councillor Ashley Baxter

Item deferred to the next ordinary meeting of Council.

(b) Councillor Virginia Moran

Item deferred to the next ordinary meeting of Council.

(c) Councillor Annie Mason

Item deferred to the next ordinary meeting of Council.

123. Close of Meeting

The meeting closed at 17:40pm.