

Guildhall Gainsborough  
Lincolnshire DN21 2NA

Tel: 01427 676676 Fax: 01427 675170

## AGENDA

**This meeting will be webcast live and the video archive published on our website**

**Prosperous Communities Committee  
Tuesday, 6th December, 2022 at 6.30 pm  
Council Chamber - The Guildhall**

**Members:**

- Councillor Owen Bierley (Chairman)
- Councillor John McNeill (Vice-Chairman)
- Councillor Mrs Tracey Coulson (Vice-Chairman)
- Councillor Stephen Bunney
- Councillor Liz Clews
- Councillor Christopher Darcel
- Councillor Michael Devine
- Councillor Jane Ellis
- Councillor Mrs Cordelia McCartney
- Councillor Mrs Jessie Milne
- Councillor Jaime Oliver
- Councillor Roger Patterson
- Councillor Mrs Lesley Rollings
- Councillor Jim Snee
- Councillor Trevor Young

1. **Minutes of Previous Meeting** (PAGES 3 - 15)  
To confirm and sign as a correct record the Minutes of the Prosperous Communities Committee held on Tuesday 1 November, 2022.

Ian Knowles  
Head of Paid Service  
The Guildhall  
Gainsborough

Friday, 2 December 2022



Prosperous Communities Committee – 1 November 2022  
Subject to Call-in. Call-in will expire at 5pm on

## WEST LINDSEY DISTRICT COUNCIL

MINUTES of the Meeting of the Prosperous Communities Committee held in the Council Chamber - The Guildhall on 1 November 2022 commencing at 6.30 pm.

### Present:

Councillor Owen Bierley (Chairman)  
Councillor John McNeill (Vice-Chairman)

Councillor Stephen Bunney  
Councillor Liz Clews  
Councillor Christopher Darcel  
Councillor Michael Devine  
Councillor Jane Ellis  
Councillor Mrs Cordelia McCartney  
Councillor Jaime Oliver  
Councillor Mrs Lesley Rollings  
Councillor Jim Snee  
Councillor Trevor Young

### In Attendance:

Sally Grindrod-Smith	Director Planning, Regeneration & Communities
Ady Selby	Director of Commercial & Operational Services
Claire Bailey	Assistant Planning Services Team Manager
Emma Foy	Director of Corporate Services and Section 151
Andy Gray	Housing and Enforcement Manager
Rachael Hughes	Development Contributions Officer
Steve Leary	Commercial Waste Manager
Sue Leversedge	Business Support Team Leader
Darren Mellors	Performance & Programme Manager
Ele Snow	Senior Democratic and Civic Officer

### Apologies:

Councillor Mrs Tracey Coulson  
Councillor Mrs Jessie Milne  
Councillor Roger Patterson

## 30 PUBLIC PARTICIPATION

There was no public participation.

## 31 MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING

A Member of the Committee highlighted that the membership details of the Prosperous Communities Committee had not been updated following the meeting of Full Council on 5 September 2022 and, as such, the minutes did not reflect a true record of the Prosperous

Communities Committee meeting on 21 September 2022. It was requested that this be amended and corrected, with assurance provided that this would be the case.

Having been moved and seconded, it was therefore

**RESOLVED** that, subject to the above amendments being made to the membership and attendance record, the minutes of the meeting of the Prosperous Communities Committee, held on 21 September 2022, be confirmed as a correct record, with the corrected version to be signed at the next meeting.

## **32 MATTERS ARISING SCHEDULE**

With no comments or questions and with no requirement for a vote, the Matters Arising were **DULY NOTED**.

## **33 MEMBERS' DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

There were no declarations of interest at this point in the meeting.

## **34 PROGRESS AND DELIVERY QUARTER TWO (22/23) - INCLUDING PERFORMANCE IMPROVEMENT PLANS**

The Committee gave consideration to a report from the Change, Project and Performance Officer in relation to the Progress and Delivery report for quarter two of 2022/2023. It was explained that the report set out the performance across the council for the period of July to September 2022. The report also saw the introduction of the performance improvement plan, which provided further context and the extra level of assurance requested previously by Members, as to why measures within services were reporting as underperforming, with the plans showing what was being done in direct response to this. It was highlighted that this was a positive step forward in terms of Council performance management and would continue to provide the positive response needed to the challenges faced within some services.

It was highlighted that the Change, Project and Performance Officer would work collectively with the Service Leads and Directors to complete the performance improvement plan, with the more detailed plan then being managed at service level with oversight by the Senior Management Team, including clear links to the objectives of both teams and individuals. The plan included measures where performance had remained below target for two consecutive quarters or more. Additional information was then provided by the Team Manager as to the reasons relating to the measure reporting below target, the impact this had, the actions in place to improve performance and when it would be expected to see the improvement following the action.

The Officer explained she would explain the overview of Council performance, and the improvement plan elements, in the order in which the report was written.

Members were advised that overall performance was looking very positive. Over 78% of all

measures were either exceeding or within agreed tolerance of their targets, compared with 68.4% in quarter one. Similarly, services with measures exceeding target for two consecutive quarters or more had increased from 76% in quarter one to 83% in quarter two.

There were six measures which featured in the improvement plan this quarter: four in operational and commercial services, one in homes and communities and one in finance business and property services.

The first two measures were corporate health measures, the first being the average time taken to pay invoices. This measure had been identified as one to be reviewed within the 2023/24 measure and target setting which would commence shortly. The intention being that the target be amended to keep in line with the council's contractual standard payment terms, meaning that the measure, whilst reporting as underperforming, was in fact not underperforming in terms of contractual payment terms.

The second of the corporate health measures was overall customer satisfaction which had been attributed in part to the major service change with the introduction of the purple lidded bins. It was anticipated this would now improve and was supported by the T24 programme reviews.

Members heard that the measure relating to the average number of calendar days from receipt of a completed Disabled Facilities Grant (DFG) application to the completion of work, was already on an upward trajectory in terms of performance. At the start of the 2022/23 Progress and Delivery cycle, April was reporting 302 days whereas September was 170, averaging 171 for the quarter. The improvement in the process resulted from the T24 review undertaken at the end of 2021 where actions were put in place to target the areas of the process where improvements were identified.

With regard to the average number of stalls on a Tuesday and Saturday market, it was explained that these measures were covered by the three year action plan approved by the Prosperous Communities Committee in January 2022, with a three-phased approach to regenerating the Markets having been approved. It was highlighted that it was currently year one of this plan and the transition phase, with actions already underway before looking to move into the development phase in 2023/24.

The final measure was the recycling rate. It was explained that the summer has been exceptionally dry and as a result there was reduced garden waste sent for recycling. In addition, the introduction of the purple lidded bin and the initial bin rejections had had a short term reduction on the recycling rate, however through the targeted communication plans in place, to assist customers as well as Officers on the ground, it was expected for this to improve.

The Chairman thanked the Officer and welcomed the inclusion of the performance improvement plan, noting it was helpful in providing the additional information and assurance where services were underperforming.

On inviting questions from Committee Members, there was widespread praise for the presentation of the report and the performance improvement plan. There were discussions regarding the number of market stalls and the strategy to improve the markets, with one Member of the Committee commenting that markets in other areas appeared to be more

successful, with sold out spaces and waiting lists to be allocated a stall. The Member also enquired as to the number of empty properties behind the stated 1% in the report and requested that figures be provided on a ward-by-ward basis. His final comment was regarding the length of time for a DFG application to be completed, noting it had long been an area of underperformance and seeking greater assurance that this would be further addressed.

The Change, Project and Performance Officer undertook to provide the empty property details to Members after the meeting, and provide increased narrative regarding the market stalls element in the next report. With regard to the DFG completion information, she explained that as part of the performance improvement plan work, there would be even greater focus on this area in the next report and that Officers sought to provide Members with the details regarding the elements of the process that were within the control of the Council.

In response to comments from a Member of the Committee providing additional information to aspects of the report, such as the number of residents in Market Rasen left homeless by recent flooding and the success of walking cricket and other activities at Market Rasen Leisure Centre, the Officer confirmed that the homeless figure following the floods was relating to those who had required Local Authority intervention to rehome, rather than the number affected by the flooding. She confirmed she would feed the additional leisure activity information into the next report.

There was further discussion regarding the performance of the markets, and questions raised regarding the impact of a three year plan rather than immediate action. The Chairman confirmed there was work underway already seeking to make those improvements.

The final comments from the Committee Members revolved around the reduced quantity of green waste, whether there had been any cost savings arising from that, and whether the time to process a DFG had reduced because the discretionary DFGs were no longer being processed. It was confirmed by Officers that there had been no cost savings from the reduced amount of green waste and further details of the breakdown of the DFGs would be shared with Members after the meeting.

Having been moved and seconded, and with thanks again expressed to all involved, the Chairman took to the vote and it was unanimously

**RESOLVED** that

- a) the Progress and Deliver Quarter Two (July – September) 2022/23 report be approved; and
- b) the Progress and Deliver Performance Improvement Plan for Quarter Two (July-September) 2022/23 be approved.

### **35 CORPORATE ENFORCEMENT POLICY**

The Committee heard from the Housing and Environmental Enforcement Manager in relation to the updated Corporate Enforcement Policy. It was explained that the Corporate

Enforcement Policy was last updated in 2018 and whilst there was no requirement for this policy to be reviewed within a certain time period, it was necessary to ensure the policy reflected any legislative or policy changes. It was also good practice to bring the updated policy to the Committee in order for amendments to be accepted.

Members were provided with a summary of the background to the document, with it explained that the Council carried out a wide range of regulatory roles in meeting its many statutory duties of protecting the public, individuals and the environment. The policy was an overarching policy that applied to all of the services within the Council that have regulatory type duties. In some service areas, these enforcement duties had specific guidance and regulations, which set out the requirements for enforcement within that specific area. It was recognised that fair and effective enforcement was essential and Members were assured that the Council was committed to being consistent, fair and proportionate its approach to these matters. A clear policy ensured that all those who lived in, worked in and visited the district were able to have a clear understanding of what could be expected in regards to an enforcement matter.

With regard to individual work areas having separate specific policies that provided more details in regards to approach they took on specific subjects, it was noted that those policies were not included within this document, but were informed by it and referred to it. It would be these policies that could be more flexible for Councillors as they dealt with more local specific issues. There were currently local policies for Licensing, Public Protection, Housing Standards, Planning Enforcement and Food and Health and Safety. Further strategies and policies relating to envirocrime and anti-social behaviour (ASB) were also being scheduled for development.

Members thanked the Housing and Environmental Enforcement Manager for a thorough and detailed report and supported the work undertaken by his teams. Members enquired as to the details of evidential vs public interest test in terms of taking action. It was explained that in receiving complaints, mostly of an anonymous nature, there needed to be the evidence in place that there was an area of concern and that, in approaching the enforcement of resolving an issue, there needed to be greater public interest in resolving the issue. An example of using this test was given of flytipping, whereby the costs of taking a prosecution through the court system needed to be balanced with the less costly method of issuing a fixed penalty notice.

A Member of the Committee raised a specific enquiry as to how matters were dealt with if there was one individual suffering, for example through noise complaints. Members were assured that the individual needs of the complainant were always taken into consideration, in terms of harm and impact caused by the problem. With noise complaints, the harm and impact could be worse for some than others, in which case Officers would be looking at multiagency options for resolving the complaint.

The Chairman echoed the positive comments of the Committee regarding the work undertaken and the detail of the report presented for consideration. Having been moved and seconded, it was unanimously,

**RESOLVED** that

- a) the Corporate Enforcement Policy, as set out in Appendix 1 of the report,

be approved; and

- b) minor amendments to the Corporate Enforcement Policy be made in the future by the Director – ICT, Change Management and Regulatory Services in consultation with the Chairman of the Prosperous Communities Committee, where they be needed as administrative changes or to update the policy in regards to statutory or regulatory guidance; and
- c) the actions as set out in section 5.3 of the report, be approved, as follows:
  - Further Councillor workshops should take place to look specifically at the Local Enforcement Plan (Planning Enforcement) and to seek views from Councillors on this. *Note – this item is on the forward plan for December and will need to be rescheduled accordingly.*
  - A broader strategy is developed and brought back to Prosperous Communities Committee to consider the Council's approach to environmental enforcement issues in both the urban and rural areas, which will include the consideration of various options for delivery. This will include considering the potential for an external provider to work with the Council to deliver enforcement activities for lower level, fixed penalty offences such as littering, dog fouling and fly-tipping.
  - A programme of work for raising awareness and communicating positive outcomes from the regulatory work areas should be developed to seek to improve public perception and confidence.

## **36 CLIMATE, ENVIRONMENT AND SUSTAINABILITY ANNUAL UPDATE**

The Committee heard from Councillor Stephen Bunney, in his role of Member of the Council's Environment and Sustainability Working Group. He provided a comprehensive summary of the report, detailing the almost £1.5 million of Government funding received to retrofit homes across West Lindsey and improve energy efficiency for residents most in need, as well as outlining similar efforts to secure money to upgrade Council buildings. He explained the green theme was very much woven into in the 'Levelling up' work and the Economic Recovery Strategy. Councillor Bunney highlighted that it was fundamental that everything undertaken as a Council provided balance between supporting and promoting jobs, growth and the future prosperity of the district, against tackling climate change. He noted that the task ahead was substantial and not without challenges, however, the report provided a summary of activity undertaken within the last year, highlighting some of the successes already achieved, and setting the scene for activity for the coming year. This was the first report of its type, setting the scene, and it would evolve and become more sophisticated as the work streams develop and became firmly rooted in the Council's business.

The Chairman thanked Councillor Bunney for his introduction and invited comments from the Committee. Members of the Committee were welcoming of the work undertaken, however, a Member of the Committee raised concerns regarding the energy efficient homes grants, stating that he had found it confusing and difficult to engage with. He explained the agencies



he had contacted had not been aware of the West Lindsey schemes and the process would prove off-putting for applicants. He praised the opportunity, but expressed his concerns that it would not achieve what was intended. Officers took note of the feedback provided and explained the Council was working within Government framework, meaning the application process was as guided nationwide.

Members of the Committee enquired as to options for electric fleet vehicles as well as the role played by developers across the district in terms of building energy efficient homes, rather than seeking to retrofit after the fact. It was explained that the rural nature of the district raised issues regarding the electrification of refuse vehicles, however there were options for other fleet vehicles. In terms of the Planning laws, it was highlighted that the review of the Central Lincolnshire Local Plan was already pushing the boundaries of what was expected nationally, which, if passed, would see houses in Lincolnshire being built as net zero carbon.

There were lengthy discussions regarding options open to home owners, such as the use of solar panels, ground source heat pumps, alternatives to boilers and the use of gas. A Member of the Committee sought greater assurance that the West Lindsey District Council website could become a source of trusted information for residents, providing details of schemes available, factual information on alternative heat sources, rather than using an internet search engine and finding only adverts from providers. Officers recognised the need for impartial information and publicising options to residents.

The Chairman thanked all Members for their input and worthwhile discussions points, wishing to put on record his thanks to Mr Steve Leary, Policy and Strategy Officer – Environment and Sustainability, all Members of the Working Group and support Officers involved in the work of the group. Having been moved and seconded, and on taking the vote, it was unanimously

**RESOLVED** that

- a) progress against the ten themes identified in the Environment and Sustainability Action Plan be noted; and
- b) the scope and timeline for the Environment and Sustainability Strategy and Action Plan refresh be approved.

### **37 JUBILEE IMPACT REPORT AND CLOSURE OF THE WORKING GROUP**

The Vice-Chairman, in his role as Chairman of the Platinum Jubilee Member Working Group, introduced the next report regarding the success of Platinum Jubilee celebrations across the district, and seeking to formally close the Member Working group. It was explained that the report had been delayed from the meeting in September, owing to the sad news of the death of Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth II. It was highlighted that the Council had been supportive of local communities arranging their own celebrations, as well as assisting groups and communities to access funding through the Platinum Jubilee Grant Funding scheme. This had proved to be both anecdotally successful, from comments made by Councillors and members of the public, and evidentially successful given the level of positive interaction demonstrated across many social media platforms.

Members of the Committee offered their own success stories of celebrations in their areas, and supported the approach taken by the Council to publicise and support community events, rather than planning one large district event. The weekend of the Jubilee celebrations had been widely seen as a wonderful district and nationwide event.

In light of the confirmed date for the Coronation of King Charles III, it was enquired as to whether there would be a similar working group for any coronation celebrations. It was confirmed that whilst there would be no specific working group, Officers would be involved in similar district-wide communications and publicising of events and suchlike, rather than organising a Council event. Members would be welcome to make contact with Officers with any events they were aware of.

Having been moved, seconded, and with reiteration from the Chairman on behalf of the Committee regarding the success of the weekend events and thanks to all involved, it was unanimously

**RESOLVED** that:

- a) the contents of the report regarding activities undertaken for Queen Elizabeth II's Platinum Jubilee be received by Members; and
- b) the Platinum Jubilee Member Working Group be formally closed.

**38 PROPOSED FEES AND CHARGES 2023/2024 - INCLUDING CHRISTMAS PARKING**

The Committee gave consideration to a report detailing the proposed fees and charges for 2023/24, including parking charges for Christmas events in Gainsborough and Market Rasen. The Chairman highlighted a number of appendices relating to the item that contained commercially sensitive information and reminded Members that should they wish to discuss those appendices, the Committee would need to enter closed session.

**Note:** Councillor J. Oliver left the Chamber at 8:12pm

The Business Support Team Leader explained that the report detailed the proposed fees and charges to be implemented from 1 April 2023, for services within this committee, contained within the report at Appendices A and B. Additionally, the appendices which provided service specific detail around performance and demand were included within the report at appendices 1 to 16.

Consideration had been given to total cost recovery, benchmarking data, and team manager knowledge of the market when proposing fees. The budget implications included in the report reflected both the impact of proposed amendments to fees, and the forecast demand.

Members heard it was proposed to apply the inflation rate of 6% (which was less than half the level of current inflation). This reflected the impact of the current year pay award on service provision, with employee costs and officer time being the main cost driver for many of the proposed fees, whilst ensuring services remained accessible to all residents given the

current cost of living crisis.

This approach also reflected the feedback from the budget consultation event where the majority of respondents felt that a cap less than inflation should be applied for 23/24, followed by a year where inflationary costs were fully reflected in the fees and charges review.

Inflation had been added to the majority of non-statutory fees in order to achieve total cost recovery, except where fees had already been approved for 23/24 (such as green waste collections), or to ensure charges remained comparable to benchmarking data across the sector (as with the crematorium with an average increase of 3.2%).

Those services where no increase had been proposed were:

- Car parks
- Markets,
- Bulky waste, and the
- Trinity arts centre for theatre hire

There were two service areas where the income budgets had been amended to reflect updated business plans which had been presented to committee earlier in the year, these were:

- The Crematorium and,
- Markets
- Car parking permit demand had also fallen and it was proposed to reduce the income budget to reflect this. This reduction would be considered as part of the budget setting process for 23/24 but was included here to highlight that there was an expected pressure on income in this area.

The net impact of the F&C review for this Committee was an increase in income of £6,100 in 23/24, rising to £55,100 in 27/28. The significant increase in 27/28 was due to the forecast demand for planning fee applications in that year.

**Note:** Councillor J. Oliver returned to the Chamber at 8:15pm

There were no new fees proposed in this report, other than the inclusion of a day of free parking at Christmas.

Members had, in recent years, been presented with a separate report to request a day of free parking at Gainsborough and Market Rasen to support Christmas events. This had now been included within this report, requesting approval for the current financial year, and each year up to and including 2025. This covered the period of the current parking strategy, and a further review of this would be included in the next parking strategy, due in 2025.

Members were asked to make recommendation to Corporate Policy and Resources Committee for approval of the proposed fees, and also to approve a free day of parking at Gainsborough and Market Rasen to support Christmas events, for the 4 years, 2022 to 2025.

The Chairman thanked the Officer and invited comments and questions from the Committee.

A Member of the Committee requested that further consideration be given to the car parking charges across the district, commenting that the offer in Market Rasen was not equitable to the offer in Gainsborough. He moved an amendment that car parking charges in Gainsborough be brought in line with those in Market Rasen. In addition, the Member noted that the number of fixed penalty notices issued for parking infringements appeared to have noticeably increased, and moved a further amendment for the cost of such notices to be reduced by 50%. He argued that the parking charges, and increased number of fixed penalty notices being issued, would be to the detriment of the town, with visitors and shoppers preferring to go elsewhere.

The Section 151 Officer highlighted that the Medium Term Financial Plan (MTFP) had contained a budget gap in 2023/24 of £1.4million, with no solution to resolve at that point. In referring to inflationary figures as a result of the current economic landscape, this would increase to an assumed budget gap of £1.8million. The delayed Budget announcement from Government, due to take place on 17 November, would detail settlement figures for Local Authorities, but with the Prime Minister using phrases such as ‘eye watering cuts’, there was no confidence that Local Authorities would receive sufficient funding from Central Government. It was explained to the Committee that, without further exploration of the financial implications of the proposed amendments, it would not be prudent for the Committee to make a decision. Further work could be undertaken to understand the implications of such a proposal, however, as a point to note, it was highlighted that bringing equity across the parking charges in the district would not cover associated costs.

The Member of the Committee expressed his dissatisfaction at the perceived delayed receipt of information regarding parking costs, and commented that he believed some Members of the Committee, and the Council, experienced difficulties accessing relevant committee papers. This was rebutted by Officers however it was offered to seek resolution for those who had such concerns, outside of the meeting.

The Chairman highlighted to the Committee that the Parking Strategy had been approved at a previous meeting and the recommendations in front of the Committee at this stage were regarding the provision of free parking for Christmas events in Gainsborough and Market Rasen.

A Member of the Committee supported the comments against the increased number of fixed penalty notices issued, reiterating that many residents of West Lindsey would choose to go to, for example, Scunthorpe rather than Gainsborough, particularly given the free parking available in certain areas of Scunthorpe. She indicated her support for the Member’s second amendment, that being to reduce the cost of the fixed penalty notices, and, on further clarification, went on to second both proposals.

Members of the Committee sought further details regarding the cost implications of amending the car parking offer in Gainsborough to match that on offer in Market Rasen, as well as the implications of other alternatives, such as removal of charges completely. It was reiterated by the Section 151 Officer that those implications were not available instantly however Officers would undertake to complete those detailed costings and further breakdown of tickets issued. In response to a question relating to further discussions taking place at the upcoming meeting of the Corporate Policy and Resources Committee, it was

confirmed that, with additional information available, Members of that Committee would be able to debate further.

A Member of the Committee summarised what he understood to be the proposed amendments and voiced his concerns regarding both. He noted the previously approved Parking Strategy and argued that the report at that stage had not raised any concerns regarding the parking offers across the two towns. He reiterated content of that report regarding usage data and repeated concerns regarding the financial impact of the proposals. It was recognised that there would need to be further work undertaken in order to fully illustrate the financial implications.

In response to the financial concerns, a Member of the Committee suggested that there needed to be greater focus on the cost implications for the wider economic community, for example the impact of losing return visitors vs the cost of increasing free parking in Gainsborough, rather than simply focusing on balance sheets.

The Director of Planning, Regeneration and Communities revisited the content of the Parking Strategy paper, highlighted that strategy was evidence based, assessing various aspects such as short stay and long stay parking, geographical assessments and comparisons with similar locations and offers. She also reminded the Committee that the strategy, and indeed parking offers across the district, had been shaped in line with climate change strategies, recognising that there needed to be a balanced viewpoint, particularly when considering the rural nature of the district and limitations of public transport provision. She highlighted there had been significant discussions when the strategy was presented to the Committee in July 2022 and it had been accepted and approved by the Committee at that point.

There was further debate against the current arrangements, with the proposer of the amendments stating a significantly worse scenario in Gainsborough than had been presented to the Committee in July, and reiterating his stance that there needed to be greater opportunity to discuss matters and make parking provisions equitable.

The Chairman brought discussions to a close and asked the Member of the Committee to repeat his amendments, as well as to confirm which recommendation of the report he wished to amend. Based on clarification of the proposals, the Member subsequently proposed that there be an additional recommendation, consisting of two parts, covering both the parking charges in Gainsborough and Market Rasen, and that fixed penalty notices be subject to a 50% reduction of charge amount.

This proposal was duly seconded and, having also been proposed and seconded, a recorded vote was taken.

On being put to the vote, votes were cast in the following manner:

**For:** Councillors Bunney, Clews, Darcel, Oliver, J. Snee, M. Snee and Young (7)

**Against:** Councillors Bierley, Devine, Ellis, McCartney and McNeill (5)

**Abstain:** Nil (0)

With a total of 7 votes for, 5 votes against and no abstentions, the proposal was carried and it was therefore

**RESOLVED** that the following be an additional recommendation to the report (recommendation 4):

“That the current free parking period in Gainsborough be extended to two hours, in line with Market Rasen, to establish parity across the district, and, that fixed penalty notices have a 50% reduction across all current charges.”

Having had a proposer and seconder for the recommendations contained within the report, the Chairman was ready to take the vote. At the request of a Member of the Committee, recommendations 1 to 3 were to be taken en bloc, with recommendation 4 to be considered separately.

Again, a proposal for a recorded vote, across all recommendations, was made and seconded.

On recommendations 1 – 3 being put to the vote, votes were cast in the following manner:

**For:** Councillors Bierley, Bunney, Clews, Darcel, Devine, Ellis, McCartney, McNeill, Oliver, J. Snee, M. Snee and Young (12)

**Against:** Nil (0)

**Abstain:** Nil (0)

With a total of 12 votes for, no votes against and no abstentions, the proposal was carried unanimously and it was therefore

**RESOLVED** that:

- a) Members recommend the proposed fees and charges for 2023/2024 as detailed, to the Corporate Policy and Resources Committee for approval; and
- b) Members recommend the requests for free car parking on 18/11/2022 (Gainsborough) and 10/12/2022 (Market Rasen), when Christmas Events are to be held, to the Corporate Policy and Resources Committee for approval (Section 4.1); and
- c) Members recommend the request for 1 day of free parking in Gainsborough and Market Rasen when Christmas Events are to be held, for the years 2023, 2024 and 2025, to the Corporate Policy and Resources Committee for approval (Section 4.1). A further review to be included in the next parking strategy, due in 2025.

On recommendation 4 being put to the vote, votes were cast in the following manner:

**For:** Councillors Bunney, Clews, Darcel, Devine, Oliver, J. Snee, M. Snee and Young (8)

**Against:** Councillors Bierley, Ellis, McCartney and McNeill (4)

**Abstain:** Nil (0)

With a total of 8 votes for, 4 votes against and no abstentions, the proposal was carried and it was therefore

**Resolved** that (it be recommended to the Corporate Policy and Resources Committee) that the current free parking period in Gainsborough be extended to two hours, in line with Market Rasen, to establish parity across the district, and, that fixed penalty notices have a 50% reduction across all current charges.

### **39 WORKPLAN**

With no comments, questions, or requirement for a vote, the Work Plan was **DULY NOTED**.

The meeting concluded at 9.17 pm.

Chairman