

WEST LINDSEY DISTRICT COUNCIL

Minutes of the Meeting of Council held in the Council Chamber - The Guildhall, Marshall's Yard, Gainsborough, DN21 2NA on 23 January 2017 at 7.00 pm.

Present: Councillor Roger Patterson (Chairman)
Councillor Mrs Jessie Milne (Vice Chairman)

Councillor Sheila Bibb	Councillor Mrs Pat Mewis
Councillor Owen Bierley	Councillor Richard Oaks
Councillor Matthew Boles	Councillor Malcolm Parish
Councillor David Bond	Councillor Judy Rainsforth
Councillor Jackie Brockway	Councillor Mrs Diana Rodgers
Councillor Stuart Curtis	Councillor Lesley Rollings
Councillor Christopher Darcel	Councillor Thomas Smith
Councillor Michael Devine	Councillor Lewis Strange
Councillor Steve England	Councillor Jeff Summers
Councillor Ian Fleetwood	Councillor Mrs Anne Welburn
Councillor Stuart Kinch	Councillor Mrs Angela White
Councillor Giles McNeill	Councillor Trevor Young
Councillor John McNeill	

In Attendance:

Manjeet Gill	Chief Executive
Ian Knowles	Director of Resources and S151 Officer
Dinah Lilley	Governance and Civic Officer
Mark Sturgess	Chief Operating Officer
Alan Robinson	SL - Democratic and Business Support

Also in Attendance:

Rev Sue Deacon	Chairman's Chaplain
Gary James	Accountable Officer for Lincolnshire East CCG
Sarah Shaw	Health Co-ordinator
Anjum Sawney	Dunholme Parish Councillor
Simon Barratt	Dunholme Parish Councillor
Cathryn Nicholl	Scothern Parish Councillor
Steve Taylor	Public Question
William Roberts	Public Question

Also Present: 16 members of the public

Apologies for Absence

Councillor Gill Bardsley
Councillor David Cotton
Councillor Adam Duguid
Councillor Paul Howitt-Cowan
Councillor Angela Lawrence
Councillor Hugo Marfleet

Councillor Maureen Palmer
Councillor Tom Regis
Councillor Reg Shore

Note Councillor White had also given apologies that she would be arriving late.

72 PRESENTATION

The Chairman introduced Sarah Shaw (Health Co-ordinator) and Gary James, (Accountable Officer for Lincolnshire East CCG) to give a presentation on the Lincolnshire Sustainability Transformation Plan. The headline information being:-

- **A nationally required 5 year health and care plan for the whole of Lincolnshire** – our plan must improve health and wellbeing and quality, as well as bring the whole health system back into financial balance by 2021
- **“Big Ticket” Items** - STPs bring together local partners to resolve deep-seated issues, but local solutions must be whole system and realistic to succeed
- **One System, One Budget** - The funding pressures on each part of the system cannot be solved in isolation, so each STP identifies the totality of the health and social care challenges it faces
- **Stakeholder Engagement and public consultation** - Ownership of local plans requires meaningful engagement with all stakeholders, including public consultation on any major service change
- **Integration** - A commitment to integration sits at the heart of the STP process
- **Governance** - Robust governance and clear lines of accountability will be central to the successful implementation of STPs

The process for development was set out in the presentation along with the challenges and the vision for 2021. Plans were set out to overcome the gaps in Health and Wellbeing, Care and Quality, and Finance and Efficiency by 2021.

A radically different governance and organisational structure was proposed which included:-

- Neighbourhood Teams
- Multispecialty Community Providers
- A more efficient way of working
- Partnerships out of county
- Working together to plan and deliver services
- An ongoing commitment to work with patients and the public

The financial implications were described:

- 21 October 2016 submitted a balanced financial plan for the Lincolnshire
- Health spend will increase from £1.266bn (16/17) to £1.4bn (20/21)
- Do Nothing £182m deficit by 2021;
- Solutions ‘Do Something’ £130m
- Assumed Strategic Transformation Funding of £52m (in 2020/21)
- Model is inclusive of workforce, activity and capital models

The impact on West Lindsey Residents was

- **Improving the quality of care in all local services:** GP appointments, joining up health and care, better access to care – less cancelled operations, more investment and resources for prevention, health and wellbeing and self-care, expanded A&E to include an urgent care front door, more choice and personalised support for women and families
- Exploring options for better utilisation of the facilities at John Coupland eg. primary care hub
- Potential **changes to hospital services:** still to be finalised before May 2017 public consultation but likely to cover options for the following areas:
- **Balancing quality and access:** arguments for centralising some services to ensure sufficient workforce seeing a high volume of complex cases, with expertise on one site.
- **Understanding the local perspective:** engagement, discussion, concerns about travel times and access, patient choice.

The key dates for the future included:-

- Jan-March 2017 – Engagement and dialogue on our Plan with public, staff and stakeholders
- 25 Jan 2017 - Options Appraisal Event scoring of proposals for major service change which will require full public consultation
- 20 Feb 2017 – Clinical Senate review of major service change
- March 2017 – NHSE assurance on Pre Consultation Business Case
- May 2017 – post election public consultation

The Chairman thanked Mr James for his presentation and sought questions or comments from Members.

It was asked why Grantham A&E had been closed before any consultation, causing great inconvenience for residents needing to travel to other centres. The response was that this had been an emergency measure due to sustainability issues, and was done with reluctance. Steps were being taken to assess the situation and provide urgent care facilities.

Members expressed concerns that the main urban centre of Lincoln was not easily accessible for those in rural areas. Mr James responded that no major site closures were planned but there was to be consultation on where services should be provided.

It was questioned as to whether the NHS could ever be sustainable in light of the current influx of 'health tourists'. The response was that the Government were trying to address this issue. There was also a national recruitment pilot ongoing, General Practices needed to be sustainable.

Further questions were raised regarding the lack of consultation to date, however it was stated that the consultation so far had been with regulators and following shortlisting of the crucial issues the public consultation was to commence.

Some Members suggested that Lincoln University should have a medical school where local students could be recruited as doctors and nurses. It was proposed that

all health organisations would be working together to design one integrated plan, which had never been done before.

Note Councillor Trevor Young declared a personal interest as being a senior NHS manager.

The Chairman noted that it was necessary to hold a local meeting, and a date would be fixed. The Chairman of Governance and Audit proposed that the matter be incorporated into the ongoing health commission being undertaken by the Council, this was seconded and agreed.

RESOLVED that the issues raised within the presentation and subsequent discussion be incorporated into the ongoing health commission, through the Prosperous Communities and Challenge and Improvement Committees.

73 MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING

RESOLVED that the Minutes of the meeting held on 14 November 2016 were confirmed as a correct record.

74 MEMBERS' DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

The Leader of the Council noted that all Members had a pecuniary interest in Item 14 (Members Allowances), however an automatic exemption applied to this item.

75 MATTERS ARISING

In referring to the first item on the list of Matters Arising in which Councillor Young had raised a point of information, seeking clarity as to whether the 10 authorities did in fact debate and vote on the same paper and set of resolutions regarding devolution. The Chief Executive had provided clarification to Councillor Young outside of the meeting. However Councillor Giles McNeill requested that the same information be shared with all Members. The Chief Executive agreed to circulate that which had been provided to Councillor Young.

76 ANNOUNCEMENTS

Chairman of Council

The Chairman noted that the list of Civic Engagements had been circulated to all Councillors, but made particular mention of his and the Vice Chairman's visit around all staff over the Christmas period, and that they had visited a number of care homes.

Leader of the Council

The Leader informed Members of the current progress of the Central Lincolnshire Local Plan (CLLP), this had now been through public examination and the Planning Inspectorate was now giving consideration to the document. A further six week consultation began that morning on the proposed modifications. It was hoped for adoption of the Local Plan by the Council meeting on 24 April 2017.

Regarding the governance of Lincolnshire post Devolution failure, the Leader of Lincolnshire County Council had that day announced that there would be a referendum at the same time as the County Council elections seeking support for a unitary authority. It had to be asked however how many County Councillors would be returned and how many officers would be eligible to TUPE across? And how would the performance differ from as at present? Information would be provided as and when it became available.

The Lincolnshire Local Government Pension Scheme was to be pooled with that of 12 other UK authorities' funds to create a total fund of around £40 billion, in order to create savings. Some investment portfolios had achieved significant interest in recent times.

The Lincolnshire Business Expo had taken place the previous week at the EPIC Centre, with around 100 exhibitors and promotional opportunities, including a West Lindsey stand. Gainsborough traders needed to achieve equity with those in Marshall's Yard, and the town centre needed invigorating intervention.

Chief Executive

The Government had launched an Industrial Strategy, and it needed to be seen what this meant for local governance structures, and it was understood that the government was prepared to open discussion with local authorities for deals without mayors. With the near completion of the Local Plan it had to be questioned where the money was coming from to provide for infrastructure.

The provisional financial settlement had been released for consultation. The reductions in budgets were more significant for rural areas, with a reduction of 31% compared with 22% for urban areas. Councillors Strange and Bierley (Members of SPARSE) and the local MP had been working to consider the implications, such as a subsequent reduction in New Homes Bonus, cuts in rural transport provision, and GP recruitment.

The Health Commission was an ongoing project with enthusiastic support from Members, with a particular focus on such issues as the shortage of GPs and prevention of ill health.

The Chief Executive had also been working with various individuals on the 400th anniversary of the Mayflower, and had attended a meeting in Southampton. The project was very interesting and major events were planned with other towns both in the UK and USA during 2020, and an invitation for West Lindsey to take part.

Councillor Howitt-Cowan was the lead Councillor on this project and a report was to be submitted to Committee in due course, and there was an opportunity to link nationally to access Lottery and Arts England funding.

The key thrust of the Industrial Strategy mentioned earlier was how economies could work together, such as with the university, County Council and neighbouring authorities in Lincolnshire and South Holland. Three Food Enterprise Zones had been created but it was also about looking at the Agrifood-triangle, and promoting the value of agri-food and the innovation taking place with technology. The Midlands Engine was also a key player in seeking funding for agri-food.

77 PUBLIC QUESTION TIME

Mr Steve Taylor attended the meeting to pose the following question to the Leader:-

“The Leader of the Council is aware of the rage within Scothern, that despite a 23% increase in houses planned for the village, not one penny has been provided for Village facilities from planning obligation monies. Whilst both the law and planning guidance positively encourage community facilities being partly funded from new homes development, West Lindsey Planners fail to permit this. The Leader of the Council kindly offered to held a meeting with the planners so that we could examine why West Lindsey is inconsistent in its support for community facilities when other Councils in the UK are much more supportive. Unfortunately, several months on we have not had this meeting, I understand that this is being blocked by officers. Can he confirm that will be meeting soon to fully discuss this issue? Would he also like to comment on the view that if the Southern Area communities are not supported in improving their voluntary social, sporting and community facilities we would expect the Council to provide the capital, revenue funding and staffing for such facilities which we don't have - but which other parts of the district do?”

The Leader responded:-

“I would like to thank Mr Taylor for his question as it is important that communities have the infrastructure they need to thrive and prosper. Contributions towards infrastructure in villages can be made from a variety of sources. Contributions towards infrastructure through s106 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 are strictly regulated and cannot provide for all the infrastructure a community might need. Contributions from s106 agreements have to be based on the need for the infrastructure to mitigate the harm or impact of a development. Therefore contributions towards affordable housing, roads, schools and health centres are usually prioritised in this process.

Additionally any contribution through a s106 needs to take account of the effect of the contribution on the viability of the development. In other words contributions towards local infrastructure cannot make the proposed development unviable. Equally a development that is unacceptable in

principle cannot be made acceptable by a s106 contribution.

I know Mr Taylor has had at least two meetings with officers and members (including legal officers) and that this has been explained to him, both face to face and in writing, in relation to recent planning approvals in Scothern. The council has also taken further legal advice in the points that he has raised and this has informed the responses he has had.

Finally I understand Mr Taylor is asking a variety of questions on this topic at a number of council committee meetings in the coming months. I will ask officers to take a note of the points he raises at each of these meetings and ensure he gets a comprehensive reply to all of them.

Mr Taylor then sought to ask a supplementary question stating that the Council compared itself with Craven District and that that Council was expecting £4,000 per new home as an off-site contribution for open spaces, sport and recreation, as many other Councils were also providing the same level of support. It was important that the voluntary sector be given the tools for the job, and Mr Taylor requested that Councillors seriously question advice given by Planners as it was erroneous.

A second public question was submitted by Mr William Roberts:-

“Sir,
Given the clear and committed support of West Lindsey District Council to the neighbourhood planning process, as experienced by both our own group, and the parish council.

Does the leader of the council feel it is the responsibility of all elected members to fully support those communities engaged in what is at times a difficult process, and assist in smoothing that path by encouraging concerned residents to engage with the properly appointed bodies and groups, rather than setting up independent opposition, distributing dubious and confusing information and generally obstructing the right and proper procedures necessary to develop a neighbourhood plan.”

The Leader responded by thanking Councillor Roberts for his question.

“Neighbourhood planning is directly aimed at protecting the environment of, and directing development within, a community which best fits the aspirations of that community. These aspirations very closely fit within the Corporate Plan of this Council, which include

- BEING OPEN FOR BUSINESS
- PEOPLE FIRST
- ASSET MANAGEMENT
- PARTNERSHIP WORKING
- AND OUR EMERGING NEW LOCAL PLAN.

Neighbourhood planning is not singularly driven by any one of this council's priorities but is influenced by all. Simply because we are demonstrating we

are open for business by promoting and assisting you with the production of your plan.

Within this process, we are demonstrating our intent to put our residents first. Asset management plays a significant role in determining where any development happens and in what guise.

To be successful we have to work in partnership with yourself and a raft of other agencies. Complying with our own planning policy and that produced by government. The support for Neighbourhood Plans can easily be demonstrated when you recognise we have a total of 33 plans in the system with 6 already approved. Of those responding to the most recent consultations, 83.92% of votes were in favour of the proposals at Dunholme, with 93.68 % in favour at Scothern.

It is very important that members of this council work with all constituted bodies within the plan process to produce a plan which is democratically produced by that community. We are all obligated to assist our communities in this process.”

Councillor Darcel then requested to speak in response, stating that he was delighted with the question and agreed that Members should be involved in the preparation of Neighbourhood Plans. Cllr Darcel was elected to represent the views of the community, not just those of the Neighbourhood Planning Group (NPG), and he did not feel that the Group were representing, or listening to, the residents, but a group of landowners, who were not working to the benefit of the village. Cllr Darcel stated that he was proud to represent residents and that was his number one priority, and that the NPG was an unelected group which was not doing so.

78 QUESTIONS PURSUANT TO COUNCIL PROCEDURE RULE NO. 9

Councillor Smith put the following question under Council Procedure Rule 9.

“I understand that from time to time the council, through its development management function, enters into agreements, in accordance with section 106 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990, with developers to provide works or facilities to mitigate the harmful effects of the developments it approves. It is important that these agreements are completed to prevent unnecessary costs associated with accommodating the development in the West Lindsey falling on the public purse. In view of the imminent adoption of the Central Lincolnshire Local Plan, which proposes further new housing developments in many of our towns and villages, can I ask that Council requests Challenge and Improvement Committee to establish a task and finish group to examine the use of s106 agreements to ensure that, as far as legally possible, everything is being done to ensure that developers make an appropriate contribution to mitigate the potentially harmful effects of these developments on the communities of the District”.

Councillor Bibb, as Chairman of the Prosperous Communities Committee responded:-

“I would like to thank Councillor Smith for his question.

Section 106 agreements are one way that key infrastructure can be secured to ensure that developments are carried out without unduly impacting on existing communities. However there are limits to what can be required through a section 106 agreement and a development that is unacceptable in principle cannot be made acceptable through a section 106 agreement. Above all the council must not be put in a position where it appears it is selling a planning permission.

Having said that it is equally important that development contributes to mitigating any harm that it causes and s106 agreements are a mechanism that a council can use to ensure that happens. It is also important that elected members know that all is being done to ensure that section 106 are used appropriately and that any money collected by means of a section 106 agreement is spent for the purpose it was collected.

Given the number of working groups we have ongoing at the present time I don't think it is appropriate for another to be set up to cover this area. However members have asked that section 106 monitoring is included in the revised Progress and Delivery arrangements to be put in place from April 2017 and that Prosperous Communities Committee receives a report on all outstanding s106 agreements (including the part of the District where they are located and progress with delivering the infrastructure that they require) early in the new municipal year.

I hope that this will satisfy the Councillor Smith as he is a member of Prosperous Communities Committee and will therefore be able to scrutinise and question the information supplied in the report.”

Councillor Smith posed a supplementary question, that whilst the response provided for those s106 agreements in the future to be included in the Progress and Delivery reports, what could be done to address previous agreements to ensure that they were appropriate?

The Chairman of the Governance and Audit Committee responded that Planning was to be covered by the first quarter audit of the year and it was suggested that retrospective consideration be given to previous s106 agreements, as assurance for Cllr Smith.

79 MOTIONS PURSUANT TO COUNCIL PROCEDURE RULE NO. 10

A motion under Council Procedure Rule 10 was submitted by Councillor Bibb.

“During recent weeks there has been great focus in the media on the provision of services by the NHS. Here in West Lindsey there are places

within the district where appointments with a doctor involve a 4 week wait, longer than the national average quoted, and a very different experience to that found in many urban areas. This is in part due to the inability to attract GP's to serve in a rural area.

At a recent meeting of the West Lindsey Health Commission this issue was given consideration and a suggestion was put forward, based on an idea originating from Cllr. Reg Shore, that this Council ask our MP, Sir Edward Leigh, to lobby the Secretary of State for Health to introduce a scheme of 'rural weighting' for GP's who accept positions in areas such as Gainsborough. Similar to the accepted practice of 'London weighting', such a scheme would act to attract the needed physicians and in turn would facilitate the better provision of health services.

Furthermore, we would like to encourage other rural authorities to support us in this and lobby their MP's as well. To this end I ask that Council support this action and that a letter be sent to the MP and to other rural authorities asking them to lobby based on these proposals.

I so move."

The Chairman seconded the motion and it was **RESOLVED** that Councillors add their support to the lobbying. The Chairman noted that he would write to Chairmen of all Councils to pass a similar motion, and that the Chief Executive would also seek support from Chief Executives of other authorities to seek support.

Councillor Strange noted that he and Councillor Bierley could also ask the SPARSE organisation to support the matter, as it worked with all rural authorities. The Chief Executive affirmed that she had already discussed the motion with SPARSE, and the District Council's Network had also been approached for its support in this matter.

80 DUNHOLME NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN

Councillor England noted that he had the pleasure of introducing two Neighbourhood Plans for adoption at the meeting. He also advised Members that the Neighbourhood Planning Bill was currently progressing to being enacted and which would no longer require Neighbourhood Plans to be formally adopted by Councils and that they would be deemed as automatically made following a successful referendum result. There was also a requirement for Councils to publish the number of Neighbourhood Plans in preparation or made within each authority's area, and also the level of support provided to such groups, which, due to the hard work of officers was excellent in West Lindsey.

The first of the Neighbourhood Plans for adoption at the meeting was that of Dunholme, which, following referral to referendum by the Prosperous Communities Committee had gained 83.92% support for its proposals. Councillor England invited Anjum Sawney and Simon Barratt to present the Dunholme Neighbourhood Plan.

Parish Councillor Sawney shared the experience that the group had been through in

the production of the Plan. It was felt that there had been a lack of support and assistance, particularly due to the lack of an officer dedicated to support communities through the neighbourhood plan process. Eventually support was forthcoming from other Parish Councils who had undertaken the process. The impact of the delay was that a number of planning applications were given approval against the wishes of residents. Now that Councillor England had taken on the role of supporting Neighbourhood Plans and that Luke Brown was in post, guidance was available and progress was much easier, and thanks were expressed, however it was felt that there were lessons to be learned in how to improve the process.

The Leader responded that the Council now had a Member and an officer in place, and apologised for the delays experienced, however it was important that a suitable officer had to be sought with appropriate experience. The Plan was now in place and was wished every success.

RESOLVED that the Dunholme Neighbourhood Plan be adopted and made.

81 SCOTHERN NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN

The second of the Neighbourhood Plans for adoption at the meeting was that of Scothern, which, following referral to referendum by the Prosperous Communities Committee had gained 93.68% support for its proposals. Councillor England invited Cathryn Nicholl to present the Scothern Neighbourhood Plan.

Parish Councillor Nicholl described the process gone through in the preparation of the Scothern Neighbourhood Plan and thanked a number of people for their hard work and support in the production of the Plan, and all those residents who had contributed. Particular thanks were passed to Luke Brown and Councillor England for their help, advice, guidance and encouragement to the steering group.

Councillor Stuart Curtis as Ward Member for Scothern congratulated the Group on the work they had undertaken in the production of their Plan, and also responded to the Dunholme members that whilst he sympathised with the problems they had experienced this was not a purely West Lindsey problem, the matter was countrywide and meant that the Planning Committee was sometimes unable to defend refusal of applications.

RESOLVED that the Scothern Neighbourhood Plan be adopted and made.

82 BUILDING CONTROL TRADING COMPANY

The Director of Resources introduced the report which sought approval for the establishment of a trading company to support the Council's commercial activities primarily within Building Control.

West Lindsey District Council was developing a portfolio of commercial propositions based on both existing and new activities. Currently these activities were generating a

modest level of income, but there was an ambition to build a number into significant revenue generating operations.

The report was considered by Corporate Policy and Resources Committee on 15 Dec 2016, the minute of which was appended to the report.

In order to maximise opportunity and revenue options the Council had already established a trading vehicle (WLDC Trading Ltd) to act as the group holding company across a range of commercial propositions. As part of that group structure, approval was given to establish a series of companies limited by shares, for operations which had commercial opportunities.

As well as already undertaking a small number of commercial services for developers within the district, the Council had the opportunity of work for Building Control Commercial services outside of the District as part of a big development. The Building Control Service was able to operate within the district of West Lindsey but to take full advantage of income generation from new services and to operate outside of the boundary, the Council would need to trade through a Subsidiary Trading Company.

A number of Councillors sought assurance that should there be a failure of a company there would be minimal risk to the Council finances and no risk to individual Councillors. The Director of Resources confirmed that all subsidiary companies were required to submit business plans on a regular basis and any possible failings should be foreseen. Councillors themselves were indemnified against any risk, and financial implications would be limited to the specific companies.

Note Councillor White joined the meeting at this point.

Note The meeting adjourned at 20.30 due to a technical fault with the microphones, this could not be resolved immediately so the meeting reconvened at 20.56 without microphones or webcasting.

Note Councillor Strange and Councillor Rollings left the meeting at this point.

It was proposed that in order to give additional reassurance, the Corporate Policy and Resources Committee receive quarterly reports on the Trading Companies of the Council. This was seconded and on being voted upon it was **RESOLVED** that this be added as a further recommendation.

The amended recommendations were then moved en bloc and on being seconded and voted upon it was **RESOLVED** that:

- a) approval be given for a subsidiary company of the Group Holding Company which will be a trading company (the trading arm) primarily for Building Control services to facilitate the return of profits to the Council which can be used to ensure the sustainable delivery of front line services;
- b) authority be delegated to the Corporate Policy and Resources Committee for approval of annual business plan and accounts as a subsidiary of the Group Holding Company;

- c) the Shareholder Agreement for the Building Control Company be approved;
- d) the nomination of the Chief Executive and Head of Strategic Trading and Environmental Services as Company Directors for the new company be agreed;
- e) the nomination of the S151 Officer, (the Director of Resources) as the Council's Shareholder representative be agreed;
- f) delegated authority to be given to the Council's Section 151 Officer and the appointed Director(s) of the new company to agree the format and content of a Resourcing Agreement for the supply of services by the Council; and
- g) quarterly reports be submitted to the Corporate Policy and Resources Committee.

83 LOCAL COUNCIL TAX SUPPORT SCHEME

The Chairman of the Corporate Policy and Resources Committee presented the report which had been considered by the Committee and referred to Council for approval. There was a requirement to comply with budget principles and funding was vulnerable to change. There had been a reduction in claims

Three options were set out in the report for consideration. Details on the calculations were listed in the appendix. It was commented that the options described were not helpful and could provide more realistic alternatives.

It was recommended that the Members consider the three options and agree Option 1 being to adopt the scheme based on the 2016/17 scheme with adjustments to include any new legislation affecting the default/pension age scheme and the uprated non-dependent deductions, applicable amounts and allowances as per the Department for Works and Pensions annual 'Up-ratings'.

It was also proposed to undertake a fundamental review of the scheme during 2017/18 to determine whether it had met the financial aims and requirements of this authority and its major preceptors.

Option 1 was proposed and seconded and on being voted upon it was:-

RESOLVED that Option 1 be agreed as the preference for the Local Council Tax Support Scheme for West Lindsey District Council for 2017/18 as recommended by Corporate Policy and Resources Committee on 15 December 2016.

84 MEMBERS' ALLOWANCE SCHEME

Mr David Lomas, Chairman of the Independent Remuneration Panel outlined the process that had been undertaken to produce the recommendations set out in the report. Consultation had taken place with Councillors and thanks were expressed to those that had responded. The report had given consideration to the weekly impact of

the changes. It was considered that the changes to the Special Responsibility Allowances were reasonable and had been rounded to the nearest £10. Comparison had been made with other authorities and the results set out in the appendix.

Mr Lomas noted that last year there had been criticism regarding the SRA for the Leader of the Opposition, this was now recommended to have parity with the Deputy Leader of the Council.

The recommendations were as set out below:

A	Basic Allowance	£5,400	£5,280
B	SRA - Leader of Council	£12,000	£11,747
C	SRA – Deputy Leader/s (in the event of two or more being nominated, the payment to be shared)	£4,350	£4,237
D	SRA -Chair of Council	£3,840	£3,737
E	SRA – Vice-Chair of Council	£1,320	£1,282
F	Civic Allowance for the Chairman of Council	£1,550	£1,500
G	Civic Allowance for the Vice-Chairman of Council	£420	£400
H	SRA – Committee Chairs	£3,000	£2,919
I	SRA – Committee Vice-Chairs	£1,420	£1,382
J	SRA – Chair of Taxi & General Sub-Committee	£1,320	£1,282
K	SRA – Leader of the Opposition (in the event of the Council being a ‘hung’ Council, the Leaders of the two largest groups be paid the same special responsibility allowance as	£4,350	£3,737

	for the Leader of the Opposition)		
L	SRA – Deputy Leader of the Opposition	£790	£769
M	SRA – Minority Group Leaders (per group member, and including the Group Leader)	£90	£85
N	Co-optees’ Allowance – A payment of £60.00 for the first four hours of attendance at a meeting/event and a second payment for attendance in excess of four hours. The first four hours would commence from the start time of the meeting (To be paid when not chairing a meeting).	£60	£50

No change to the allowances for Dependent Carers or travel allowances. The Panel noted and commented that travel allowances are currently in line with the tax efficient rate authorised by the Inland Revenue.

Subsistence – No change (Receipts must be provided for subsistence claimed and attached to the claim form).

- a. Absence of more than four hours but no more than eight hours – only the cost of one meal can be reimbursed up to a maximum of £15.
- b. Absence of more than eight hours but no more than 12 hours – only the cost of two meals can be reimbursed up to a maximum of £25.
- c. Absence of more than 12 hours but no more than 16 hours – only the cost of three meals can be reimbursed up to a maximum of £33.
- d. Absence of more than 16 hours but not including an overnight stay – only the cost of four meals can be reimbursed up to a maximum of £40.
- e. Overnight – No Change – £83
- f. Overnight (London or LGA) – No Change – £208

Members of the Labour Group were not able to support the recommendations as it was felt that allowances were already adequate and a 1% increase would have been acceptable, however the proposed increases were much higher.

Note The Chairman congratulated Mr Lomas on his BEM award in the Queen’s birthday honours.

The recommendations were moved, seconded and voted upon and it was therefore **RESOLVED** that the new rates as shown above, with regard to Members' Allowances for the Civic Year 2017 – 2018 be approved by:-

- Agreeing to the increase of £120 p/a for the Basic Allowance;
- Agreeing the proposed changes to SRAs; and
- Agreeing to restore parity between the Deputy Leader and the Leader of the Opposition.

85 COLLECTION FUND SURPLUS AND COUNCIL TAX BASE

The Director of Resources presented the report which set out the declaration of the estimated surplus on the Council's Collection Fund relating to Council Tax at the end of March 2017 and how it was shared amongst the constituent precepting bodies. It also set out the Council Tax base calculation for 2017/18. The tax base was a key component in calculating both the budget requirement and the Council Tax charge.

The estimated surplus for the year was £218,896, an increase of £16,813 against the budgeted figure. This had to be taken into account when setting the Council Tax for 2017/18.

The West Lindsey share of the £218,896 included an average of the Parish and Town Council precepts. This changed the ranking from that reflected in the Council Tax leaflet, where WLDC was shown as receiving less than both the Police Authority and the County Council as a proportion of the total Council Tax paid by residents.

The basis of calculating the Council Tax Base was set out in paragraph 2 of the report. Members were therefore asked to agree the Council Tax Base of £28,959.46 – a small increase on 2016/17.

The recommendations as set out in the report were moved, seconded and voted upon.

RESOLVED that:-

- a) the estimated surplus of £218,896 be accepted and be declared as accruing in the Council's Collection Fund at 31 March 2017 relating to an estimated Council Tax surplus;
- b) the Council uses its element of the Collection Fund surplus/deficit in calculating the level of Council Tax in 2017/18; and
- c) the calculations of the Council's tax base for 2017/18 as set out in Appendix A be approved, and that in accordance with the Local Authorities' (Calculation of Council Tax Base) Regulations 1993 (as amended), the tax base for each part of the Authority's area shall be as set out in Appendix B.

86 MINUTES OF COMMITTEE MEETINGS

RESOLVED that the minutes of the Committee Meetings published since the Council meeting of 14 November 2016 be received.

The meeting concluded at 9.15 pm.

Chairman