

Guildhall Gainsborough
Lincolnshire DN21 2NA

Tel: 01427 676676 Fax: 01427 675170

This meeting will be webcast and published on the Council's website

AGENDA

Prayers will be conducted prior to the start of the meeting.
Members are welcome to attend.

Notice is hereby given that a meeting of the Council will be held in the The Council Chamber - The Guildhall, on **Monday, 21st January, 2019 at 7.00 pm**, and your attendance at such meeting is hereby requested to transact the following business.

To: Members of West Lindsey District Council

1. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

2. MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING
To confirm as a correct record the Minutes of the previous meeting of Full Council held on 12 November 2018.
(PAGES 4 - 23)

3. MEMBERS' DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST
Members may make any declarations of interest at this point and may also make them at any point during the meeting.

4. MATTERS ARISING
Setting out current position of previously agreed actions as at 11 January 2019.
(PAGES 24 - 27)

5. ANNOUNCEMENTS
 - i) Chairman of Council
 - ii) Leader of the Council
 - iii) Head of Paid Service

Agendas, Reports and Minutes will be provided upon request in the following formats:

Large Clear Print: Braille: Audio: Native Language

6. PUBLIC QUESTION TIME

7. QUESTIONS PURSUANT TO COUNCIL PROCEDURE RULE NO. 9

8. MOTIONS PURSUANT TO COUNCIL PROCEDURE RULE NO. 10

9. REPORTS FOR DETERMINATION
 - a. Members' Allowances for the Civic Year 2019/2020
(PAGES 28 - 33)

 - b. Local Council Tax Support Scheme 19/20 and Empty Property Charges
(PAGES 34 - 49)

 - c. Council Tax Base and Council Tax Surplus
(PAGES 50 - 56)

 - d. Election Fees for County, District, Parish/Town Council Elections and Local Referenda
(PAGES 57 - 70)

Mark Sturgess
Head of Paid Service
The Guildhall
Gainsborough

Friday, 11 January 2019

Agendas, Reports and Minutes will be provided upon request in the following formats:

Large Clear Print: Braille: Audio: Native Language

Agendas, Reports and Minutes will be provided upon request in the following formats:

Large Clear Print: Braille: Audio: Native Language

Agenda Item 2

West Lindsey District Council - 12 November 2018

WEST LINDSEY DISTRICT COUNCIL

Minutes of the Meeting of Council held in the The Council Chamber - The Guildhall on 12 November 2018 at 7.00 pm.

Present: Councillor Mrs Pat Mewis (Chairman)
Councillor Steve England (Vice-Chairman)

Councillor Owen Bierley	Councillor Matthew Boles
Councillor David Bond	Councillor David Cotton
Councillor Michael Devine	Councillor Ian Fleetwood
Councillor Paul Howitt-Cowan	Councillor Stuart Kinch
Councillor Mrs Angela Lawrence	Councillor Mrs Jessie Milne
Councillor Giles McNeill	Councillor John McNeill
Councillor Richard Oaks	Councillor Mrs Maureen Palmer
Councillor Malcolm Parish	Councillor Roger Patterson
Councillor Mrs Judy Rainsforth	Councillor Mrs Diana Rodgers
Councillor Mrs Lesley Rollings	Councillor Thomas Smith
Councillor Lewis Strange	Councillor Jeff Summers
Councillor Robert Waller	Councillor Mrs Anne Welburn
Councillor Trevor Young	

In Attendance:

Mark Sturgess	Executive Director of Operations and Head of Paid Service
Eve Fawcett-Moralee	Executive Director of Economic and Commercial Growth
Ian Knowles	Executive Director of Resources and S151 Officer
Alan Robinson	Strategic Lead Governance and People/Monitoring Officer
Katie Coughlan	Senior Democratic & Civic Officer
Karen Whitfield	Communities & Commercial Programme Manager
James O'Shaughnessy	Corporate Policy Manager & Deputy Monitoring Officer

Also Present: 18 Members of the Public
1 Member of the Press
Mr Peter Morley
Mrs June Clarke

Apologies

Councillor Bruce Allison
Councillor Mrs Gillian Bardsley
Councillor Mrs Sheila Bibb
Councillor Mrs Jackie Brockway
Councillor Christopher Darcel
Councillor Tom Regis
Councillor Reg Shore
Councillor Mrs Angela White

27 CHAIRMAN'S WELCOME

The Chairman welcomed all Members to the meeting.

Welcomes were also extended to the Officers, Members of the Public and Press who were in attendance.

28 MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING

(a) Minutes of Meeting held on 2 July 2018

RESOLVED that the Minutes of the Meeting held on 2 July 2018 be confirmed and signed as a correct record.

29 MEMBERS' DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Councillor Stuart Kinch declared a personal non-pecuniary interest at this stage of the meeting, in respect of agenda item 6 – Receipt of a Petition Entitled “Save Gainsborough Town Centre”, as he owned a share of a business located within the Town Centre area.

30 MATTERS ARISING

The Monitoring Officer noted that all items due for completion were showing black, as having been completed.

The two remaining green items, were not yet due for completion but were on track to be completed within their respective due dates.

RESOLVED that the Matters Arising be noted.

31 TO RECEIVE A PETITION ENTITLED "MARKET RASEN NEEDS A SWIMMING POOL NOT A DRY LEISURE FACILITY"

“West Lindsey District Council was presented with a Petition on Monday 13 August 2018.

The Petition was entitled “Market Rasen Needs a Swimming Pool Not a Dry Leisure Facility” and contained over 2000 signatures.

The Petition went on to state “West Lindsey District Council have secured a site on Gainsborough Road, between Market Rasen Primary School and the Limes Country Hotel, to build a dry leisure facility. We the residents of Market Rasen hereby sign to say we are opposing these plans and want the land to be used to provide a much needed swimming pool which will benefit people of all ages and disabilities”.

The Chairman advised that the matter would now be debated, in accordance with the agreed

Petition Scheme and therefore she welcomed Lead Petitioner, June Clark to the meeting and invited her to make her five minute address to Members.

Mrs Clark made the following Statement to Council: -

“I am presenting this petition on behalf of the Market Rasen Action Group and the residents of Market Rasen and surrounding towns and villages. I am not representing Market Rasen Town Council in any capacity.

The petition was started when a press release in the Market Rasen Mail, from West Lindsey District Council, informed us that Market Rasen was to get a multi million pound dry leisure facility. Residents were understandably very upset that there had been no consultation about this new facility and the fact that there was no mention of a swimming pool.

As there had been no consultation, Market Rasen residents were not aware that the current facilities at the De Aston Centre would be closing. Although we agree that dry facilities are needed, a swimming pool is seen as a higher priority.

The Leader of West Lindsey District Council and one of its Officers attended a Market Rasen Town Council meeting. When answering questions from Market Rasen Action Group and the public, the Leader admitted that no consultation had been undertaken. We were told that we either accepted what was on offer, or we would lose the money all together. A wonderful demonstration of democracy in action.

Several years ago, extensive surveys and consultation took place and led to a proposal to build a swimming pool in Market Rasen. This was agreed in 2008 at a West Lindsey meeting. Political changes that followed, meant that the proposal was shelved.

The recent presentation of what Market Rasen is getting, showed no provision for a swimming pool, just a vague 'well, we could fit one in this space, if necessary'.

Market Rasen Action Group and the residents of Market Rasen would like answers to the following:

Why was no public consultation done on the new dry facility before the release of the plans?

How many people currently use the De Aston facilities?

If the premise centres on the fact that swimming pools lose money, why is Gainsborough' s kept open?

If the suggestion that sports facilities being managed across the District will result in an overall profit, does this mean that Market Rasen residents will be subsidising the loss making Gainsborough pool?

Are the Council aware, that residents from Market Rasen, Caistor etc travel to pools in Brigg, Lincoln, Wragby, Grimsby and Louth, but not to Gainsborough, thus losing revenue to other Districts?

Are the Council aware that the lack of adequate public transport means that very many residents can't travel to Brigg, Wragby, Louth, Lincoln, Grimsby or Gainsborough to access swimming even if they wanted to?

Where is the commitment to the health and well-being of local residents who are unable to use dry facilities?

Where is the commitment to ensuring that people of all ages learn to swim?

Will West Lindsey District Council carry out an in-depth feasibility study and full and meaningful consultation on providing Market Rasen with a pool, including consideration of a smaller, more cost effective pool? We would respectfully ask that a Councillor, here tonight, tables this proposal and that it is voted on.

Why does West Lindsey District Council appear to never listen to what Market Rasen residents want, but instead decide for us?

When will Market Rasen finally get a Swimming Pool?

Finally, Market Rasen Action Group and local residents would like to remind West Lindsey District Council that West Lindsey consists of far more than just Gainsborough. We, in the forgotten lands, also pay our Council Tax and we are concerned that the proposed dry facilities will fail if a pool is not included, from the start, to attract people.”

The Chairman thanked Mrs Clark for her statement. Before opening the matter for debate, Members were reminded of the three options available to them when considering Petitions. These being: -

- Take the action the petitioners have requested
- Not take the action requested for the reasons put forward during debate
- Or commission further investigation into the matter.

Debate ensued with the Leader of the Council making the initial response.

“Thank you for your work on the petition and for attending this evening.

As a Council we understand that some of the residents in Market Rasen are disappointed that our current plans do not include the provision of a pool at the outset.

We have arrived at our current proposals as a result of independent feasibility studies which have demonstrated that, should a pool be provided in Market Rasen, this would require a significant subsidy in terms of running costs. In the

current financial climate this is not a position this Council can support. As a District Council we have to provide services for a wide range of residents across the whole of our district in a way that provides value for money for all our tax payers.

The proposed dry leisure facility has been made possible by the Council re-working its leisure contract to include the development. The new leisure contract which began on the 1st June 2018 is based upon a key set of outputs and outcomes agreed by our Prosperous Communities Committee, the key principle being for the leisure service to be cost neutral and not require a subsidy.

I think it is important here to stress that the Council are not ruling out a pool development in Market Rasen in the future. The site acquired is large enough to accommodate future expansion, and the building has been designed in such a way that a pool can be added at a later date should this prove viable.

The proposed centre in Market Rasen will provide a wide range of activities for all ages and provide opportunities for residents to participate in our healthy and active programme. Once built, the centre will be managed by the Council's partners Everyone Active.

The Council have consulted widely on the plans as part of the public consultation strategy. I, myself, attended the public engagement session in September and was pleased to hear the positive comments. It was obvious there is significant support for the proposed development.

Conversely some have the view we don't spend the same in Market Rasen as we do in Gainsborough. That of course is correct and will not change due to the size of population. However, we now have a stronger working relationship with Market Rasen Town Council. Strong relationships and partnership working is essential for success.

In summary, the dry leisure facility proposed is a significant investment into Market Rasen built upon a solid evidence base. Furthermore this is being delivered in a cost neutral way to West Lindsey residents. Having seen the plans we are genuinely excited and proud to be able to provide such a high class facility for Market Rasen.

This project marks the largest ever single investment in the town and I as Leader of the Council and near resident recognise how an increased population and improvements to infrastructure is the only thing which will increase the towns offer and prosperity for the future.

Therefore, I cannot support your requested action and I will move that this Council takes no further action in respect of this petition but strategically plan for the improvements which I have outlined.

I therefore move no further action be taken."

Debate ensued with Members of the Opposition making reference to the Scheme

commissioned in 2008. The scheme had been supported by research and had been financed but following a change in administration subsequently shelved. Concern was expressed that yet again communities were approaching the Council feeling like they had not been consulted with and not been listened to. There was a view that far too much focus was being placed on financial figures and delivering schemes at a cost neutral basis, with little consideration given to the wider outcomes of social return, area prosperity and health. The suggestion that this would be looked at in the future was disputed, with the Opposition noting that no commitment to such a project had been made within the Medium Term Financial Plan. There were calls for the petition to be supported and for the previous consultation undertaken to be re-visited.

In responding, Members of the Administration strongly refuted the simplistic re-collection of previous events. It was noted that Local Authorities over the last 10 years had had their spending power cut by up to 75% as a result of the significant cuts to Government Grant Funding. There had been an economy collapse in 2008 and the building of a pool would have resulted in a 3-4% rise in Council Tax for all residents year on year. Members of the Administration were vehement in their commitment to further investment in Market Rasen, however only when the time was right, and only when schemes were truly viable. The Administration's commitment to social return had been demonstrated in number of other projects and suggestions to the contrary were dismissed.

The Leader's earlier proposal to reject the action requested by the petitioners was seconded.

It was moved and seconded that any vote taken on the matter be by way of recorded vote.

Having been proposed and seconded earlier in the meeting, the motion was then put to a recorded vote, having had the earlier request for such also duly seconded.

Votes were cast as set out below:

For: - Cllrs, Bierley, England, Fleetwood, Howitt-Cowan, Kinch, Lawrence, G McNeill, J McNeill, Mewis, Milne, Palmer, Parish, Patterson, Rodgers, Smith, Strange, Summers, Waller, and Welburn

Against: - Cllrs Boles, Bond, Cotton, Rainsforth, Rollings and Young

Abstain: - Cllrs Devine and Oaks.

With the majority of Councillors voting in favour of the motion (19), the motion was declared **CARRIED** and therefore it was **RESOLVED** that the request of the petitioners be rejected.

Mrs Clark, as Lead Petitioner, was advised that she would be sent written notice of the decision and also a copy of this would be displayed on the Authority's website.

Note: The majority of petitioners left the meeting following consideration of the above item and prior to the next agenda item being discussed.

32 TO RECEIVE A PETITION ENTITLED " SAVE GAINSBOROUGH TOWN CENTRE"

West Lindsey District Council was presented with a Petition on 15 October 2018

The Petition was entitled "Save Gainsborough Town Centre" and contained over 1175 signatures at that date.

The Petition asked that: -

"the WLDC Conservative controlled Council to urgently improve the Town Centre"

The Chairman advised that the matter would now be debated, in accordance with the agreed Petition Scheme and therefore she welcomed Lead Petitioner, Councillor Trevor Young, to the meeting and invited him to make his five minute address to Members.

Councillor Young made the following Statement to Council: -

"The Liberal Democrat Group present this petition urgently requesting this council to improve the town centre, and to provide the necessary investment and resource to protect the existing businesses from further decline.

We call upon this council for this to be debated in this chamber this evening and an urgent paper to be prepared to the next relevant policy committee.

It is recognised that economic downturn in high street shopping is a national issue, however the Liberal Democrats firmly believe that in those towns where there is little effort to address the issue, they will suffer the worst.

- Currently in the Gainsborough Town Centre there are 1 in 5 shops empty, more than any other town in Lincolnshire.
- In the past year 13 businesses have been forced to close in the town centre, one every month?
- There is a risk of more retail closures in the next six months.
- The Gainsborough Market once recognised as one of the best in the county has almost disappeared.
- Trinity Street – which is the main gateway into the town now has 1 in 3 shops empty, which is hardly a good advertisement for a town looking to achieve growth and external investment.

The Liberal Democrat Group also surveyed all the town centre businesses and retailers.

- 84% reported that this Council does not offer enough support / advice / information to their business
- 76 % of businesses stated that Customer Numbers have massively decreased over the past Year.
- 74% of businesses think that the decline in the town centre is having a negative impact on their weekly trade.
- 92% of businesses feel that the Closure of Oldrids Store in the Town Centre has had a detrimental impact on trade
- 96% of businesses feel that the council could offer far more daily / weekly

assistance.

- 100% of businesses feel that far more could be done with the market square with short term car parking in the market square being the number one priority.

Whilst it is agreed that there are many challenges regarding Town Centres competing with online shopping etc – It is a Myth that all Town Centres are Dying!

Retford, Newark, Worksop, Brigg and Boston all have vibrant town centres and markets, so what are they doing different to Gainsborough.

This council has a reputation of taking far too long to address issues, we have witnessed the creeping effect of the decline in the Retail Shops and the Market yet have failed to react in a timely manner.

The current administration's strategic plan regarding growth and regeneration is all based on medium to long term strategies, this petition is not against any of the current proposals and we hope that they all come to fruition, however there is an urgent need to start discussing the economic recovery plan for the town."

The Chairman thanked Councillor Young for his statement. Before opening the matter for debate, Members were reminded of three options available to them when considering Petitions. These being: -

- Take the action the petitioners have requested
- Not take the action requested for the reasons put forward during debate
- Or commission further investigation into the matter.

Debate ensued with the Leader of the Council making the initial response.

"Thank you Councillor Young for your petition inquiring what the administration is doing in regard to saving Gainsborough Town Centre. Due to the fact we are doing more than ever before I am pleased to list the following as an outline of our strategy and success to date:

- our aim is to Increase the population of the town from the current 21,000 to circa 30,000 through our Growth and Housing Agenda's – this is critical to the towns commercial viability. Increasing footfall is critical to achieving any level of success.
- We have plans to regenerate the historic town centre guided by our Heritage Master Plan and in partnership with the Town Council's Neighbourhood Plan. This will be very ably supported by the creation of a partnership with Muse.
- To this end secure the £1.8m grants funds we have been awarded from the Lottery to repair and restore the Market Place, Silver and Lord Street's
- We have already established support for town centre businesses through the Shop Front and Gainsborough Growth fund, and I am delighted to inform you that the GLLEP has agreed to fund our Living Over the Shop scheme.

- Using MSRL our joint venture company to refurbish 3 shops and create 3 new flats – WLDC's investment share was £400k
- Working with LCC to improve the appearance and use of the Market Place – and hopefully Beaumont street too.
- We are having a review of Gainsborough market at the next Prosperous Communities committee. You attended the member consultation last week.
- The Opening of Travelodge on the 20th of October with £1.4m investment from our reserves and the refurbishment of the Roseway car park. We now have a beautiful street scene and a hotel destined to increase the local GVA.
- We will continue the impetus of the regeneration of Market Street and the Roseway Quarter to draw/entice shoppers from Marshall's Yard into the historic town centre.
- We will Continue to work with the Lincolnshire Co-op to redevelop the Lindsey centre – this will provide a new anchor store and additional town centre car parking.
- And, redevelop the former Guildhall site into a 3 screen cinema with food and drink outlets – this is at the pre planning stage.
- Enhancement of Whittons Gardens and riverside walk will be implemented with the cinema scheme
- still to come is the drawdown of our £4m grant award for Gainsborough from the GLLEP

I will now ask the Director of Economic and Commercial Growth to say as much as she is able to with reference to other projects which are being worked up, whilst understanding we are in open session which means sensitive commercial detail cannot be revealed

The Director of Economic and Commercial Growth then addressed the meeting and provided updates in respect of the following projects, all aimed at improving the prosperity of the Town as a whole: -

- Stage 2 of the development partnership
- Riverside Gate Way and marina
- Japan Road
- Northern SUE
- Southern SUE
- Somerby Park / NNDR growth policy
- Place Board
- Trinity Street

The work being undertaken directly with Traders and the promotion of grants to assist them was outlined in detail. It was imperative the Council worked on initiatives to encourage footfall back into the market place and the Director of Economic and Commercial Growth gave assurance that there was market interest in the town. Growing the town's size was key to securing further investment and interest.

The Leader thanked the Director of Economic and Commercial Growth before concluding his address as follows: -

“As has been illustrated, we have and are very busy on a vast number of fronts. Recently the Town Council, who have embarked upon producing a Neighbourhood Plan has agreed to work with us on our regeneration projects and ambitions. We have already created an opportunity for businesses in the town centre to apply for funding specifically for a shop front face lift.

The success of the town centre regeneration initiative is very much dependent upon all incumbents of the town centre and the town council working with us. Especially the property owners. We cannot do it alone !

During this four year term of office, we have as an administration, and supported professionally by our officer team and staff, created an extensive range of opportunities for the district. We have won EU and UK bids to the value of £10m to help unlock sites for development, creating viability.

We are making unprecedented investments in other places such as Market Rasen with the proposed building of a dry surface leisure facility.

After several years of attempting to work with other agencies, a project for Caistor is looking promising.

We are enablers of investment and growth, long may it continue.

I move, no further action be taken.”

In the ensuing debate the majority of Members were in agreement that the Council had worked hard over recent years to make improvements to the Town. A Partnership approach was the only way to proceed with all involved having to take responsibility for their role. It was accepted that there was still a lot to do and number of keys areas which needed to be focussed on.

It was suggested by some that to constantly talk down the Town was not of assistance.

The Leader’s earlier proposal to reject the action requested by the petitioners was seconded.

It was moved and seconded that any vote taken on the matter be by way of recorded vote.

Having been proposed and seconded earlier in the meeting, the motion was then put to a recorded vote, having had the earlier request for such also duly seconded.

Votes were cast as set out below:

For: - Cllrs, Bierley, England, Fleetwood, Howitt-Cowan, Kinch, Lawrence, G McNeill, J McNeill, Mewis, Milne, Palmer, Parish, Patterson, Rodgers, Smith, Strange, Summers, Waller, and Welburn.

Against: - Cllrs Boles, Bond, Cotton, Devine, Oaks, Rainsforth, Rollings and Young

Abstain: - None

With the majority of Councillors voting in favour of the motion (19), the motion was declared **CARRIED** and therefore it was **RESOLVED** that the request of the petitioners be rejected and no further additional action be undertaken at this time.

Councillor Young, as Lead Petitioner, was advised that he would be sent written notice of the decision and also a copy of this would be displayed on the Authority's website.

33 ANNOUNCEMENTS

Chairman

The Chairman addressed Council advising it had been a very busy, but enjoyable period, with the up and coming weeks leading into Christmas looking even busier.

Over recent months she had had the pleasure of attending a number of Events, Award Ceremonies, Business visits and Official openings, making note of the following: -

- * attendance at three Graduation Ceremonies, in July it was Riseholme College of Further Education Awards in the Epic Centre, In September, the University of Lincoln's International Business School ceremony and the Lincoln College Graduation both held at the Cathedral. It had been a great pleasure to see these hard working young people receive a whole variety of qualifications in their chosen fields and not all academic.
- * attendance at the Family Fun Day at the Trinity Arts centre in July, joined by fellow Members, for an action packed day organised in partnership with Lincolnshire County Council. It had been a fabulous day that had really brought the Community together, which the Chairman hoped to see become an annual event.
- * 'turf cutting' at two new Lace Housing developments, one at Ingham and the other at Nettleham. Lace was a 'not for profit' company and their schemes were designed to enable older people to remain within their communities and maintain links with family and friends, enjoying quality facilities and services, the developments were making a welcome addition to the housing across our District.
- * There had been exciting times in Gainsborough with the opening of the fully refurbished Everyone Active Leisure Centre with Olympic medallist Colin Jackson in September and just this month the eagerly anticipated brand new Travelodge. The Chairman had had the pleasure of being part of the opening of both these establishments which demonstrated the Council's commitment to continuous investment in the area.
- * The Chairman was keen to engage with Businesses and indicated she had a planned programme of visits in order to learn more about the enterprises that she considered to be the life blood of the District. During the period she had joined the Leader for a visit to the Riverside Enterprise Park in Saxilby, touring two businesses and hearing how the Council's development had helped business to establish and grow. She had also visited a micro-Brewery, near Fiskerton, awarded funding through the Lindsey Action

Zone, to expand in order to meet demand.

The Chairman had also hosted a number of events herself here at the Guildhall including a Flag Raising Event for Merchant Navy Day, for which she expressed thanks to those Councillors who had attended and a Bake off Style fundraising event to help raise funds for the Lincolnshire Wildlife Trust.

The Chairman had also had the pleasure of hosting her annual Civic Service in her local church, St Peter's in the village of Scotter in September. She thanked her Chaplain the Reverend Swannack for his poignant service, those Councillors who had attended to support her and the Eau Valley Singers who performed both during the Service and at the reception which had proceeded.

The Chairman concluded her announcements by making reference to two up and coming events, these being the Annual Carol Service being held on 10 December, at Gainsborough's All Saints' Church, to which all Councillors were welcome, and the launch of the Annual Community Awards.

Promotional information and Nominations Packs for the Awards were available for Councillors to collect at the conclusion of the meeting.

ii) Leader of Council

The Leader addressed Council and advised the new Lincolnshire Pension structure continued to move in a positive direction.

At the last Leaders and Chief Executive's meeting, discussions were largely focussed around Lincolnshire growth via the LEP, planning for growth and strengthening partnerships. This was seen by many as a viable alternative to Devolution.

The Humber Strategy review continued and the Leader expressed his thoughts on the Environment Agency's Plans to establish flood areas within the reaches of the Ouse and Humber and his fears for the future should alternative action not be taken.

The Leader had attended the Annual DCN Conference. Presentations and discussion had centred around housing, homelessness and town centres.

Members of the Scampton advisory group had taken a tour of RAF Scampton on the 30th October. This had allowed those present to appreciate the scale of the site and some of the issues which would have to be resolved before a handover took place.

On the 9th November the Leader had meet with Julian Chafer, a senior person within the Defence infrastructure Organisation along with Sir Edward Leigh, the Chief Executive of LCC and the Leader of LCC. An excellent paper on the opportunities for developing the site had been produced by Oliver FitchE-Taylor the Planning Manager. With an equally detailed MOU presented by Eve Fawcett-Moralee.

Discussion had centred around Master Planning, the need to have Scampton included in the CLLP review next year as well as Heritage, minerals safeguarding and the One Public

Estate.

iii) Head of Paid Service

The Head of Paid Service addressed Council on behalf of the Management Team during which the following points were made: -

- * Emergency Planning Awareness training had been arranged for all Members on Tuesday, 27 November, with details having been given to Members in an earlier email. The session would be facilitated by Emergency Planning and Business Continuity colleagues and was specifically tailored for elected Members and their role in their local community. The session would focus on the approach to be taken in the event of severe Winter weather and address the lessons learnt from previous incidents – both local and national. Recent incidents had demonstrated a need for a co-ordinated approach to the incident from the local council concerned and therefore all Members were urged to make every effort to attend the training, if at all possible.
- * The Local Government Association local partnership had reviewed the Council's housing programme on behalf of Homes England. They were very complimentary about our approach and gave us substantial assurance in our handling of the programme.
- * In terms of our Projects –the construction of the crematorium had started on site with completion scheduled for this time next year. This was considered great news as it would then start to provide a facility for local people and a contribution to Council finances. Thanks were expressed to those staff who have kept this project on target.

In conclusion the Head of Paid Service made reference to the Members Bulletin, encouraging all Members to access its content, as a number of updates were now published through this forum.

34 PUBLIC QUESTION TIME

The Monitoring Officer advised the meeting that three questions had been received under the Public Question Time Scheme from Mr Peter Morley, who was in attendance to put his questions direct to the meeting.

The Chairman welcomed Mr Morley to the meeting, and invited him to put his three questions to the meeting.

Mr Morley's questions were as follows: -

“Question 1

On the 19th June the Finance Officer presented the Financial Statement to the Governance and Audit Committee for approval prior to external audit. He said **“The first 23 pages are a narrative report, I ask you to read it and tell us if it works what we are trying to say with the narrative report is, this is all**

you need to read because we are conscious of the fact that not everybody wants to go through all the numbers and statements etc. and so we are trying to get to a succinct document that says this is what West Lindsey is all about. He then goes on to say **“Over the year we have made a small surplus on service of £150.000 and along with additional Business rates we ended with a surplus of £432.000.** This surplus was in fact against a projected Budget set at the beginning of the year for part of the annual outgoings and is in actuality nothing more than a paper exercise.

In actual fact, overall for the year, income was £44.113m and expenditure was £45.701m which means there was a deficit of £1.588m, yet again in the Narrative report, the Finance Officer proudly proclaims **“We have once again shown good financial stewardship and delivered a small profit”**

At best this is misrepresentation of the facts and I ask that this Council provide a suitable explanation.

Question 2

Councillor Summers, in his introduction to the Financial Statement explained about the changes at senior level and how cost savings had been made but I will now ask him in light of these assumed savings why has the overall figure on the ‘Employee, Benefits, Expenses bill risen by £1.1M when equivalent full time staff numbers have reduced by 16 from the previous year.

Question 3

Again this is a question for Councillor Summers to answer, can you please explain the following; published figures in the narrative report state that in 2016/17 the Council had £18.88m of investments but at the end of 2017/18 this figure is now £15.316m and as almost £2.5m was spent on the Keighley Hotel this year it appears that almost £6m has disappeared from the Investment portfolio. I have further questions that require answers but will hold these over to the next meeting.”

The Chairman thanked Mr Morley for his questions and asked the Leader of the Council to respond.

As the first question made reference to the Executive Director of Resources, at the request of the Leader, he responded to Mr Morley’s first question as follows: -

“The table on page 15 shows the net position that is funded by tax payers and government grant. The table on page 26 ‘The Comprehensive Income and Expenditure Account shows the position when generally accepted accounting practice is applied to the accounts of the Local Authority. However, the accounting adjustments are reversed under a statutory override which ensures the taxpayer does not pay for the accounting adjustments which are of a non cash nature. Therefore it is appropriate to declare a surplus has been achieved for the benefit of the tax payer.

With regards my comments on the narrative report, it is my aspiration that the narrative report becomes a clear and reliable representation of the performance of the local authority both in financial and non-financial terms. Thus providing tax payers and other stakeholders with an overview of this Authority's activities within a given financial year.

As the nature of Mr Morley's questions indicates the Financial Statements are not easy to understand and can be interpreted in different ways.

I thank Mr Morley for working through the financial statements in such detail and raising his concerns with regards to the variation in interpretation."

The Leader of the Council thanked Mr Knowles for his response before proceeding to answer Mr Morley's further two questions as follows

"With regard to question 2, Employee Benefits includes recognition of the implications of the reporting standard known as IAS 19 which requires that the Authority's pension liability is calculated on an annual basis using assumptions agreed by actuaries.

This standard requires that the employee benefits includes an amount for 'post employment benefits' which for this year amounts to £933k. This is not a cash transaction and as mentioned above is not expected to be funded by the tax payer on a year on year basis but provides an indication for comparison purposes.

This amount will vary from year to year and is outside the control of the local authority. The remainder of this variance is made up of exit packages, establishment changes, employer turnover and the impact of employee increments, pay award and national insurance and pension contribution changes.

The change in budgeted full time equivalent staff can be seen on page 18 of the Narrative Report and shows a reduction year on year of 17 employees.

"With regard to question 3, the figures Mr Morley refers to (page 17 of the Narrative Report) relate to the level of investments that were with banks and other institutions at the year end. I accept this could have been better explained and we will consider that in next year's report. The Balance Sheet on page 27 of the report shows the total assets of the Authority have increased from £43m in March 2017 to £51m in March 2018 reflecting the good financial stewardship I referred to when presenting the accounts to Council.

I would like to thank Mr Morley for his questions and we will use this feedback to make further improvements to the financial statements in future."

The Chairman thanked Mr Morley for his attendance and indicated he would receive a copy of the responses to his questions, provided verbally at the meeting, in writing, in due course.

35 QUESTIONS PURSUANT TO COUNCIL PROCEDURE RULE NO. 9

Councillor Trevor Young had submitted the following question, under Council Procedure Rule No. 9 to the meeting: -

1) *Question to Cllr Jeff Summers, Leader of the Council, from Councillor Trevor Young*

“Could the Leader of the Council explain to the people of the District why it is that this council has not met for one full quarter of the year? By doing so he will also explain to the councillors why this is the case and why it seems unimportant for the council to meet in a timely manner and take council for the affairs and wellbeing of the District and its citizens?”

It is accepted that there are no meetings in August as has long been the case except for the planning committee. But a glance at the Council meeting calendar shows that at least one Full Council was cancelled, supposedly for lack of business and there has been no Full Council Meeting in October.

Could it be that the Leader and his administration are just tardy when it comes to meetings thinking that they have a majority and so debate and consideration don't matter anymore?

Or perhaps the Leader and his administration are frightened of that very debate and questions that might arise either as direct questions or through the movement of business through the council.

While we accept there is no point in meeting for meeting sake the electorate who vote for us and pay our allowances surely have a right to expect the council to meet as a full council on a regular basis and to debate the policy which the administration want to enact during their tenure of office.

Time was when the council will deal with all business and its right that some business is enacted through committees.

However, there are times when a policy or change affects the whole district and thus every elected member and the people they serve. This can be seen in the move to charge for green waste for example or the letting of contracts for leisure services provision across the district.

The Market Provision is being discussed and worked through and the way markets are provisioned. This is causing some disquiet among the Leaders own members and it could be that bringing these policies and strategies to full council will show the cracks in the administration and allow the people to see where the current control of the council is failing the people who ought to expect more.

I invite the Leader therefore to answer the question and respond where in doing so hope that this council will not have a further period of one quarter of a year when it fails to meet.”

The Leader of the Council, Councillor Jeff Summers, responded as follows: -

“Thank you for your question Councillor Young.
You are correct to say that September’s scheduled full council was cancelled. It was cancelled by the Head of Paid service as there was insufficient business to be conducted to warrant a meeting. This is in accordance with the Head of Paid Services delegations as detailed in Part IV of the constitution.

The Council has an effective Scheme of Delegation which allows for a vast majority of decisions to be made at the two Policy Committees, Corporate Policy and Resources and Prosperous Communities Committee. As you know both Committees are politically balanced and give members from all parties the opportunity to debate the decisions made. In addition to the committee membership, all members are welcome to attend both policy committees to listen, learn and with the chairman’s consent, ask questions.

Unnecessary, potentially, poorly attended council meetings where repetitive business formed the agenda would neither enhance the Council’s business nor use our resources efficiently.

This Council’s constitution will always inform our decisions, assisted by the need not to waste our resources both human and financial.

You mention Tardy. Of the sixteen years I have sat on this Council, representing everyone in the district I can assure all, we now operate a system of fourth option governance (where all members are involved as much as they want to be) which allows all members to be part of the decision making process.

The political make up of our council is determined by our electorate, every four years!

I am so pleased you mentioned green waste in your question. The changes were consulted upon, a decision to charge was made, Why? (Because we felt it unfair for non-users of the service to pay, many of them residents in your own ward) the consultation resulting in a resounding yes from residents by significantly subscribing to our valued service, way above expectations.

Whereever possible our council will provide equitable physical, financial and social solutions for the future.

Another very important point you raise is Gainsborough markets. We held a workshop on this subject only the other evening, at which you were present. There are many issues around markets and high street trading. First and foremost a stall holder / high street shop must provide what the customer is looking for, at a competitive price. Commercial strain is not a new phenomenon.

With the introduction of out of town retail parks, supermarkets, designer

outlets and more importantly, internet sales and next day delivery. We cannot shoulder this pressure alone. You as a market trader must be well aware of the issues.

By the way have you declared an interest?

Thank you.”

Having heard the response, Councillor Young requested opportunity to pose a supplementary question.

The Chairman, using her discretion as granted by the Constitution, declined the request.

36 MOTIONS PURSUANT TO COUNCIL PROCEDURE RULE NO. 10

The Chairman advised the meeting that no Motions, under Council Procedure Rule No.10, had been received.

37 REVISED COUNCIL VISION AND VALUES

The Council’s Vision, Mission and Values have been under review since the start of 2018. The review had included full engagement with staff and Members through a variety of techniques.

Members therefore gave consideration to a report which set out the review process which had been undertaken and the arising revised vision and set of values which it was being proposed be adopted by the Council. It was also noted that the strap line “the Entrepreneurial Council” would be removed, in a phased approach.

Members noted that consideration of a revised mission for the Council would take place once the vision had been adopted and as part of the 2019/22 revised Corporate Plan.

In response to comments the Head of Paid Service outlined the reasons for removing the strapline emphasising the importance of a clear vision, understood by all.

Members were supportive of its removal citing a number of reasons for such and whilst it may have been appropriate at its time of adoption the Council had moved on.

Members considered it important that the values once adopted needed to filter into the culture and behaviour of the organisation.

In response to a suggestion that the wording of the vision should be left with some flexibility, the Head of Paid Service expressed caution to do so. The vision had been developed with staff and members and was considered to represent the essence of all the work which had been undertaken and was in accordance with the comments which had been made throughout.

RESOLVED that

- (a) the following vision for the Council, be endorsed and adopted:
“WEST LINDSEY IS A GREAT PLACE TO BE WHERE PEOPLE, BUSINESSES AND COMMUNITIES THRIVE AND CAN REACH THEIR POTENTIAL”;
- (b) the following revisions to the Council’s values be endorsed and adopted
1. To put the customer at the centre of everything we do
 2. To act as one council
 3. To be business smart, to act on evidence and take advantage of opportunities, thinking creatively and getting things done
 4. To communicate effectively with all stakeholders
 5. To have integrity in everything we do; and
- (c) the strapline “The Entrepreneurial Council” no longer be used.

38 RECOMMENDATION FROM LICENSING COMMITTEE - REVIEW OF THE GAMBLING POLICY

The Chairman of the Licensing Committee outlined the report and recommended it for Council approval.

The review of the Gambling Policy was a ‘business as usual’ process for the licensing team, and in essence the team had to follow a statutory process in carrying out any ‘review’ of policy.

Therefore the licensing authority was legally obliged to:

- Prepare
- Consult
- Determine, and
- Publish its Statement of Principles (Policy) every three years or sooner if necessary

This was a mandatory requirement as set out in Section 349 of the Gambling Act 2005.

A review of the policy had taken place and the persons and bodies consulted was kept deliberately wide in order for a comprehensive consultation exercise to be undertaken with anyone who may be affected or otherwise may have an interest in the policy.

The consultation generated three responses being received which in turn resulted in a minor change to the draft policy.

The ‘trained’ Members of the Licensing Committee had considered the review of the policy at their meeting held on 18 September 2018 in detail and resolved that the amended draft policy be approved and **RECOMMENDED to Council** for formal adoption.

Only Council could formally adopt this Policy, it is not a decision that could be delegated to a Committee or Sub-Committee. Once approved by Council, the Licensing Authority must

then publish the policy, along with a Statutory Notice regarding the implementation date, also.

The recommendations in the report were then moved, seconded and voted upon without discussion.

RESOLVED that the recommendation from the Licensing Committee be accepted and the amended draft policy referred to as 'The Gambling Policy (Statement of Principles)' be approved and adopted. The revised document to be published in accordance with the relevant regulations and become effective from January 2019

39 AMENDMENTS TO THE CONSTITUTION - ANIMAL WELFARE REGULATIONS AND MEETING CANCELLATION DELEGATIONS

Members gave consideration to a report, presented by the Chairman of the Governance and Audit Committee, which sought agreement to a number of minor amendments to the Constitution.

These related to the introduction of the New Animal Welfare Regulations and also amendments to permit consideration being given to cancelling meetings during significant National Events or Emergencies.

The recommendations were moved and seconded.

Prior to being put to the vote a Member brought to the attention of the meeting two typographical errors within the proposed amended pages.

Officers undertook to amend these prior to re-publication and on that basis it was: -

RESOLVED that the amendments to the Constitution as set out in Appendices A and B be approved.

The meeting concluded at 8.58 pm.

Chairman

Council Matters Arising Schedule

Purpose:

To consider progress on the matters arising from previous Council meetings.

Recommendation: That members note progress on the matters arising and request corrective action if necessary.

Matters arising Schedule

Active/Closed Meeting	Active Full Council				
Status	Title	Action Required	Comments	Due Date	Allocated To
Black					
	petition notice - MRAG	extract from mins of mtg: - Mrs Clark, as Lead Petitioner, was advised that she would be sent written notice of the decision and also a copy of this would be displayed on the Authority's website.	completed	28/11/18	Katie Coughlan
	Petition Decision - Gainsborough Town Centre	Extract from mins of mtg 12/11/18: - Councillor Young, as Lead Petitioner, was advised that he would be sent written notice of the decision and also a copy of this would be displayed on the Authority's website.	completed	28/11/18	Katie Coughlan

	public question time	extract from mins of mtg 12/11/18: - The Chairman thanked Mr Morley for his attendance and indicated he would receive a copy of the responses to his questions, provided verbally at the meeting, in writing, in due course.	completed	28/11/18	Katie Coughlan
	constitution amends	extract from mins of mtg 12/11/18: - RESOLVED that the amendments to the Constitution as set out in Appendices A and B be approved.	Amendments have been made and the effected pages re-published on the website	28/11/18	James Welbourn
	Gambling Policy	Extract from Mins of Mtg 12/11/18 The Gambling Policy (Statement of Principles)' be approved and adopted. The revised document to be published in accordance with the relevant regulations and become effective from January 2019	document has been published in accordance with relevant regulations	28/11/18	Phil Hinch

Green					
	<p>motion submitted by Leader</p>	<p>extract from mins of mtg 9/4/18 Chairman</p> <p>1. I propose that with the full support of this Council I write to Lincolnshire County Council and require them to agree a scheme of works, funding strategy, implementation plan and timetable to address the current highway safety issues at this junction as a matter urgency.</p> <p>2. I propose that this Council works with our partners on the Central Lincolnshire Strategic Group to address the issues at this junction in the context of delivering the growth and the 5 year housing land supply across the area.</p>	<p>please work with the leader .</p> <p>update requested from EFM 13.6.18</p> <p>UPDATE: EFM had meeting with vice chair of LCC Transport Portfolio holder with WLDC leader to agree a funding strategy once a technical solution is finalised circa end of June. In addition Central Lincolnshire Local plan strategic group is reviewing delivery arrangements with a view to creating a Gainsborough Growth Board.</p> <p>This project has passed LCCs first round of budgeting setting positively. the next round of budgeting setting is due in November and a decision will be taken thereafter.</p> <p>Update as at 11 Jan This project has passed the next phase of budget review. There is one more stage to pass for this to become an accepted budgeted project.</p>	01/03/19	Eve Fawcett-Moralee

	<p>Constitution Review - Future consideration</p>	<p>Extract from mins of mtg 14/5/18</p> <p>Councillor Young advised the meeting that the Constitution did not currently permit questions and motions at the Annual Council Meeting. He was of the view that this had been the case historically and requested that this position be re-instated.</p> <p>The request was seconded but before being put to the vote the Chairman of the Governance and Audit Committee advised that he considered such an amendment would be deemed housekeeping in nature and therefore he undertook to review this and amend as appropriate.</p>	<p>to be considered as part of the annual review</p>	<p>01/12/18</p>	<p>Alan Robinson</p>
<p>Grand Total</p>					

Agenda Item 9a



Council

21 January 2019

MEMBERS' ALLOWANCES FOR CIVIC YEAR 2019-2020

Report by:

Monitoring Officer

Contact Officer:

Alan Robinson
Monitoring Officer
01427 676509
Alan.robinson@west-lindsey.gov.uk

Purpose / Summary:

To review and agree the recommendations made by the Independent Remuneration Panel with regard to Members' allowances for 2019-2020 civic year.

RECOMMENDATION(S):

That Members approve the new rates as shown within this Report (Appendix 1), with regard to Members' allowances for the Civic Year 2019–2020 by agreeing to:

- a) The proposed increase of 2% for the Basic allowance
- b) The proposed increase of 2% across Special Responsibility Allowances (SRA's)
- c) The reduction of claimable broadband reimbursement payments to £10 per calendar month
- d) Rail travel, when amounting to more than £25, should be booked centrally through Committee Administration.
- e) Retaining all remaining allowances at current rates

IMPLICATIONS

Legal: None

Financial : FIN/158/19

The total additional budget requirement for the proposed increases is £4,750.
This amount will be built into the Base Budget 2019/20 onwards.

Staffing : None

Equality and Diversity including Human Rights : None

Risk Assessment : None

Climate Related Risks and Opportunities : None

Title and Location of any Background Papers used in the preparation of this report:

None

Call in and Urgency:

Is the decision one which Rule 14.7 of the Scrutiny Procedure Rules apply?

i.e. is the report exempt from being called in due to urgency (in consultation with C&I chairman)

Yes

No

x

Key Decision:

A matter which affects two or more wards, or has significant financial implications

Yes

No

x

1. Background

- 1.1 West Lindsey District Council's Independent Remuneration Panel (IRP), has carried out its annual review of the Council's Scheme of Members' Allowances.
- 1.2 To inform the review, the Panel has considered a number of factors. These include as assessment of the workloads of Members; changes in the availability, costs and uptake of broadband services and the financial and budgeting situation the Council faces, including proposed pay awards for Officers.
- 1.3 The Panel consulted with all Members, providing the opportunity to make comments via email and also offered the opportunity for meeting with the Panel. On 23 October 2018, five Members met independently with the Panel to give their views.
- 1.4 The comments made to the Panel by Members have been taken into account when arriving at the final Recommendations within this report.
- 1.5 The Panel would like to record its thanks to those Members and Officers who made themselves available to speak with the Panel.

2. Members' Allowances

- 2.1 Taking all factors into account, the Panel have recommended a 2% increase across all Members' allowances. This is in line with the proposed pay award for Officers for 2019/20, but is lower than the figure of 2.5%* which has been cited as the average pay award for 2018/19 (Income Data Research – Oct '18).
- 2.2 A convention to round up to the nearest five pounds has been adopted in applying the 2% award. This increases the Members' basic allowance by £110 to £5590 p.a. for the year 2019/20.
- 2.3 The net effect of applying the 2% award is an overall increase for 2019/20 of £4,750 across the allowance scheme.
- 2.4 The revised schedule of allowances is set out in Appendix One.

3. Broadband Payments

- 3.1 The Panel also reviewed the allowance available for Members to assist with the provision of broadband services. This currently stands at £20 per month, but is not universally claimed.
- 3.2 The background for inclusion of the allowance was reviewed. It was introduced a number of years ago, at a time when broadband/internet access was not as widespread across the populace. However, such access was deemed to be useful to enable Members to fulfil their duties more effectively and also assisted in the Council's move to paper-less working.

- 3.3 In present times, broadband/internet access is now much more widespread and its availability among Members is not solely for their Council work. Hence it is recommended that the current allowance be reduced to £10 per month.

4. Travel by Public Transport

- 4.1 A need for greater clarity concerning the rules associated with travel by public transport (particularly train travel) was brought to the attention of the Panel.

- 4.2 The Scheme currently states:

“The rate for travel by public transport shall not exceed the ordinary first class fare. Any Member who wishes to travel standard class may elect to do so.”

- 4.3 The Panel were firmly of the view that, where rail travel amounts to more than £25, then this should be booked centrally through Committee Admin; giving as much notice as possible of the intention to travel, and utilising any discount rail cards. “Standard fare” tickets should be the default position, unless the cost of first class, (which includes a meal/wif-fi), is lower than the cost of “standard fare” plus any subsistence payment that may arise.

5. Mileage and Subsistence Allowances

- 5.1 No change to mileage allowances. The Panel noted and commented that mileage allowances are currently in line with the tax efficient rate authorised by the Inland Revenue.

- 5.2 No change to subsistence allowances as set out below. 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

Appendix One: Special Responsibility Allowances (SRA): Recommended Rates

Allowance	Rate 2018/19	Rate 2019/20
Basic Allowance	£5,480	£5,590
SRA – Leader of Council	£12,180	£12,425
SRA – Deputy Leader/s (in the event of two or more being nominated, the payment to be shared)	£4,415	£4,505
SRA – Chair of Council	£3,900	£3,980
SRA – Vice-Chair of Council	£1,340	£1,370
Civic Allowance for the Chairman of Council	£1,575	£1,610
Civic Allowance for the Vice-Chairman of Council	£430	£440
SRA – Committee Chairs (excluding Licensing Cttee and Regulatory Cttee)	£3,045	£3,105
SRA – Regulatory Chair	£1,522.50	£1,555
SRA – Licensing Chair	£1,522.50	£1,555
SRA – Committee Vice-Chairs (excluding Licensing Cttee and Regulatory Cttee)	£1,440	£1,470
SRA – Regulatory Vice-Chair	£720	£735
SRA – Licensing Vice-Chair	£720	£735
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 for the Leader of the Opposition)	£4,415	£4,505

SRA – Deputy Leader of the Opposition	£800	£820
SRA – Minority Group Leaders (per group member, and including the Group Leader)	£95	£100
Independent Members: Governance & Audit and Standards Committees – 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	No change
Dependent Carer’s Allowance	£10	No Change

Agenda Item 9b



Full Council

21 January 2019

Subject: Local Council Tax Support Scheme for 2019/2020

Report by:

Director of Resources

Contact Officer:

Alison McCulloch
Revenues Team Manager
Alison.mcculloch@west-lindsey.gov.uk
01427 676508

Purpose / Summary:

For Council to agree the Local Council Tax Support Scheme for West Lindsey DC for 2019/20.

RECOMMENDATION(S): That members;

1. Agree that full council adopt Option 1 of the report for the Local Council Tax Support Scheme for West Lindsey District Council for 2019/20.
 - To cap council tax support to Band E
 - To award 100% council tax support to care leavers on a low income until they reach the age of 25 years
 - To apply any new legislative requirements and the uprating of the non-dependent charges (these are detailed at 3.4 option 4), applicable amounts and household allowances and deductions, used in the calculation of the reduction in accordance with the Department for Works and Pensions (DWP) annual up-ratings
2. Agrees that full council adopt Option 2 of the report for the empty property charges for council tax for West Lindsey District Council for 2019/20.
 - In accordance with new government legislation increase the amount charged in respect of properties that have been empty for 2 years or more from 150% to the maximum amount determined by Government (currently 200%).

IMPLICATIONS

Legal:

The Council has to determine a local scheme for council tax reduction by 31 January 2019.

Financial : FIN/144/19/CC

The cost of the Local Council Tax Support scheme (LCTS) is shared between Lincolnshire County Council (75%), West Lindsey District Council (12.5%) and Lincolnshire Police (12.5%).

- It is forecast that the LCTS scheme for 19/20 will incur additional costs of approximately £0.032m.
- To comply with the Council budget guiding principles, a scheme has to be designed that aims to fit the level of available government grant. The Local Council Tax Support Grant has now been rolled into the Revenue Support Grant and it is no longer possible to identify the funding which directly relates to this area. It is therefore desirable that the financial impact is cost neutral or can demonstrate financial savings.
- The scheme that is chosen by the Council will need to be monitored to ensure the level of council tax collection remains comparable with previous years
- Capping council tax support to Band E properties will currently affect 8 council tax support claimants however these are customers who are living in the highest band of property.
- In the light of new legislation the council tax empty property charges have also been considered with a view to increasing the long term empty property charge on a property that has been empty for 2 years or more from 150% to the maximum amount determined by government (currently 200%).
- Currently we charge a total of £378,713.16 in respect of 198 long term empty properties. If we increase this charge to 200% a total of £504,950.88 will be collectible creating a financial gain of £126,237.72.

Staffing :

The changes are minimal and therefore should not impact on staff.

Equality and Diversity including Human Rights :

Risk Assessment :

- a. If Council Tax Support caseloads rise or fall then WLDC and the other major precepting authorities will have to absorb those expenditure variations through the Collection Fund. It is therefore vital that the financial implications of the scheme decisions made are realistic in terms of bridging the funding gap.
- b. If there is a downturn in the local economy, or where there has been major redundancies if a major company ceases trading, Council Tax Support caseloads could rise significantly.
- c. Each Council must approve their local Council Tax Support scheme by 31st January otherwise a default scheme similar to the current Council Tax Benefit scheme will be imposed which will cause funding gaps between the amount of grant received and the amount of council tax support entitlement.
- d. The amount of council tax support awarded last year was just over £6 million but forecasts indicate this will be slightly lower this year. Whilst this is not a budget saving it will contribute towards the savings required by 2020.

Climate Related Risks and Opportunities :

None arising from this report.

Title and Location of any Background Papers used in the preparation of this report:

Local Government Finance Act 2012

Rating (Property in Common Occupation) and Council Tax (Empty Dwellings) Act 2018

Call in and Urgency:

Is the decision one which Rule 14.7 of the Scrutiny Procedure Rules apply?

Yes

No

Key Decision:

Yes

No

Executive Summary

Council Tax Benefit was a national scheme providing means-tested financial help to households to pay their Council Tax liability. This was abolished on 31 March 2013 and every Local Authority was tasked with designing a local scheme of financial support to replace Council Tax Benefit.

West Lindsey District Council consulted with the residents of the district and the precepting authorities and adopted a local scheme approved by full Council in January 2013. This scheme was re-adopted for 2014/15 and for 2015/16 and, following further consultations in 2015, minor amendments to the scheme were agreed for 2016/17. No changes were made to the scheme in 2017/18 but amendments were made in 2018/19 in anticipation of Universal Credit implementation. As at 1 October 2018 the amount of Council Tax being collected from claimants this year has increased by 2.74% compared to last year proving the success of the changes.

Re-modelling of the scheme has taken place and a consultation with suggestions for possible amendments to the scheme has been conducted. The consultation took place between 22 August 2018 and 3 October 2018 with residents, voluntary groups, stakeholders and citizen panel members taking part. The consultation was available both as an on-line consultation and via hard copy.

Part of the consultation process also included two technical changes to council tax; considering abolishing the empty property exemption currently payable for up to 2 months and increasing the long term empty property premium from 150% to the maximum amount determined by Government (currently 200%).

In order to help inform the decision-making process the results of the consultation are included in this report.

The finalised local council tax support scheme must be approved and adopted by Full Council by 31st January 2019 at the very latest.

1. Background

- 1.1 The Local Government Finance Act 2012 replaced Council Tax Benefit with a Council Tax Support scheme. Unlike Council Tax Benefit (CTB) which is set by Central Government, the new Council Tax Support scheme must be defined by individual Local Authorities (albeit with much central prescription).
- 1.2 Pensioners are protected by Government which means 'local schemes' must give the same level of assistance to pensioners awarded to them as that under the old Council Tax Benefit scheme. West Lindsey District Council also made the decision, since 2013/14, to protect those in receipt of a War Pension and those claimants receiving a Disability Benefit and the proposal is not to change this decision.
- 1.3 **The changes suggested in the consultation for the council tax support scheme for 2019/20 were:**

	Change
1	Cap council tax support to Band D
2	Cap council tax support to Band E
3	Award 100% council tax support to care leavers on a low income until they reach the age of 25 years.

- 1.4 Appendix A details the estimated cost of the council tax support scheme for the year 2018/19.
- 1.5 **The changes suggested in the consultation in respect of empty properties for 2019/20 were:**

	Exemption/Discount	Council Tax Paid under Current Scheme	Council Tax to be paid under proposed scheme
1	Empty and unfurnished properties	2 months NIL After 2 months 100% charge.	100% charge immediately property becomes empty
2	Empty over 2 years	After 2 years 150% charge	After 2 years the maximum amount determined by government (currently 200% charge)

- 1.6 Consultation took place over a 6 week period from 22 August 2018 to 3 October 2018. The consultation questionnaire was available on the West Lindsey website and in paper format at the West Lindsey office at Gainsborough and at the benefit surgery at Welton. It was also sent to all 1,450 members of the Citizens Panel.
- 1.7 Benefit Officers who attend the benefit surgery and officers working at the Guildhall promoted the consultation offering assistance to residents to complete the survey.

2. Results of the Consultation

- 2.1 1450 consultation questionnaires were issued to the Citizens panel. This panel consists of residents from all areas of the district who experience differing financial and personal circumstances, some of whom are currently in receipt of council tax support.

The Benefits and Revenues teams also issued approximately 30 hard copy questionnaires to council tax support claimants who visited the offices at Gainsborough or the surgery at Welton. Claimants were also offered the opportunity to complete the consultation on-line via the West Lindsey digital hub or via a Benefit Assessor.

A total of 979 replies were received in response to the consultation, 776 received from the Citizens Panel members and 203 others. This equates to a 67% response rate from the Citizens Panel members.

The descriptions of the households completing the consultation were broken down as below:

- 705 of respondents are families with one or more dependent children
- 52 are single person households or couple without children.
- 37 are households that include someone who is disabled
- 18 are lone parent households with one or more dependent children
- 4 are a carer in a household with one or more dependent children
- 4 are households that include someone entitled to a war pension
- 159 respondents detailed their circumstances were not one of the above

2.2 Question 1

Currently Council Tax Support is paid in respect of all council tax properties regardless of what council tax band the property is in. Do you think council tax support should be restricted to any of the bands indicated below?

Band D

Band E

No Limit

A third of the responders 319 (33.3%) agreed that council tax support should be restricted to Band D properties.

However, 525 (54.9%), over half of responders felt that council tax support should be restricted to Band E properties.

Only 113 (11.8%) did not feel there should be any restrictions on council tax support.

2.3 Question 2

Currently young adults leaving local authority care pay council tax in accordance with the council tax support scheme once they reach the age of 18 years. However, it is recognised that these individuals often require additional support. Do you think it would be fair and reasonable to award all care leavers on a low income full council tax support until they reach the age of 25?

Yes

No

Don't know

This question had the most overwhelming majority being 908 (92.7%) of responders agreeing that young care leavers on a low income should receive full council tax support until they reach the age of 25.

Only 52 (5.3%) were of the opinion that care leavers should not receive support and 19 (1.9%) responded that they did not know whether they should receive support or not.

Appendix B details the estimated cost of awarding council tax support to all 18 care leavers in the district had this been awarded in 2018/19.

2.4 Question 3

Currently when they become empty, properties receive a 2 month exemption from council tax. Do you think that this exemption should be abolished and the charge become due immediately?

Yes

No

Don't know

Less than a quarter, 224 (22.9%) of responders, agreed that the 2 month empty property exemption should be abolished and the charge should become due immediately.

However, 747 (76.3%) disagreed and did not think the exemption should be abolished. Only 8 (0.8%) of responders said they did not know whether this should be abolished or not.

2.5 Question 4

Currently council tax is charged at 150% when a property has been empty for 2 years or more. Do you think that West Lindsey DC should increase this council tax charge to 200% on properties that have been empty for 2 years or more?

Yes

No

Don't know

Another overwhelming response of 905 (92.4%) of responders felt that the council should levy a 200% charge on empty properties once they have been empty for 2 years or more.

65 (6.6%) disagreed that the charge should increase and only 9 (0.9%) of responders stated that they did not know whether it should increase or not.

2.6 Comments

Some of the comments received in relation to the consultation were:

- any changes made should not impact on those already financially disadvantaged. Yes, discourage people from leaving properties empty for long periods
- Council tax support/help should only be paid to those in band a, where people on low incomes already finding trouble paying for a basic living
- Don't understand what support means on Council tax? I thought we paid according to property, why would people get support on a property beyond their means
- Support must always be there for those who need it most eg under 25s, low income, benefits and single people. If a house is owned and left empty or a landlord they shouldn't get any council tax breaks.
- The options are very restricted for question 1 - I suggest band C and below should be restricted as occupants could help themselves by downsizing if in true difficulty.

3. Options for the council tax support scheme

Taking into account the responses to the consultation there are 4 options for consideration for the 2019/20 scheme.

	Change
1	Cap council tax support to Band E, award 100% council tax support to care leavers on a low income until they reach the age of 25 years and make legislative requirements.
2	Cap council tax support to Band E and make legislative requirements
3	Award 100% council tax support to care leavers on a low income until they reach the age of 25 years and make legislative requirements
4	Make no changes to the current scheme apart from legislative requirements

3.1 Option 1

- To cap council tax support to Band E
- Award 100% council tax support to care leavers on a low income until they reach the age of 25 years
- to apply any new legislative requirements and the uprating of the non-dependent charges (these are detailed at 3.4 option 4), applicable amounts and household allowances and deductions, used in the calculation of the reduction in accordance with the Department for Works and Pensions (DWP) annual up-ratings

Band	CTR claims	Non Pensioners or Vulnerable	Amount of CTR at Band F and above	Amount of CTR if capped	Difference
F	30	6	10,051.61	8,275.68	1,775.93
G	7	1	1,049.32	369.64	679.68
H	1	1	2,382.95	1,363.61	1,019.34
		Total	13,483.18	10,008.93	3,474.95

Advantages	Disadvantages
It is a clear and simple change to the current scheme.	Some claimants may be disadvantaged if they are currently in receipt of council tax support at a property banded higher than a Band E.
It is administratively simple.	

It will ensure young, vulnerable adults moving / transgressing from care into living alone receive financial assistance towards their living costs.	
It ensures claimants do not take advantage by moving into this district into high banded properties when other local authorities are already capping the support they award.	
This option ensures the council tax support rules stay consistent with the Department for Work and Pensions rules which avoids confusion for claimants.	

3.2 Option 2

- To cap council tax support to Band E
- to apply any new legislative requirements and the uprating of the non-dependent charges, (these are detailed at 3.4 option 4), applicable amounts and household allowances and deductions, used in the calculation of the reduction in accordance with the Department for Works and Pensions (DWP) annual up-ratings

Advantages	Disadvantages
It is a clear and simple change to the current scheme.	Some claimants may be disadvantaged if they are currently in receipt of council tax support at a property banded higher than a Band E.
It is administratively simple.	
It ensures claimants do not take advantage by moving into this district into high banded properties when other local authorities are already capping the support they award.	
This option ensures the council tax support rules stay consistent with the Department for Work and Pensions rules which avoids confusion for claimants.	

3.3 Option 3

- Award 100% council tax support to care leavers on a low income until they reach the age of 25 years
- to apply any new legislative requirements and the uprating of the non-dependent charges, (these are detailed at 3.4 option 4), applicable amounts and household allowances and deductions, used in the calculation of the reduction in accordance with the Department for Works and Pensions (DWP) annual up-ratings

Advantages	Disadvantages
It is a clear and simple change to the current scheme.	
It is administratively simple.	
It will ensure young, vulnerable adults moving / transgressing from care into living alone receive financial assistance towards their living costs.	
This option ensures the council tax support rules stay consistent with the Department for Work and Pensions rules which avoids confusion for claimants.	

3.4 Option 4

To make no change to the current scheme, adapted from the scheme applied to people of pension age, for another 12 months but to apply any new legislative requirements and the uprating of the non-dependent charges (as detailed below), applicable amounts and household allowances and deductions, used in the calculation of the reduction in accordance with the Department for Works and Pensions (DWP) annual up-ratings.

The current non-dependent deductions (stipulated by the Department for Works and Pensions for 2018/19 are detailed below along with estimated upratings anticipated for 2019/20.

Non Dependent Deduction 2018/19	Estimated Deduction 2019/20
£11.65	£11.70
£ 9.74	£ 9.80
£ 7.72	£ 7.75
£ 3.83	£ 3.85

Advantages	Disadvantages
------------	---------------

There has been a slight reduction in the number of households claiming council tax support which has reduced the costs of the scheme. In September 2017 we had 6,892 claimants and in September 2018 there were 6,866 claimants.	Very small saving to the council
Collection rates are being maintained under the current scheme.	
This option ensures the council tax support rules stay consistent with the Department for Work and Pensions rules which avoids confusion for claimants.	

4. Options for the council tax – technical changes in respect of empty properties

Taking into account the responses to the consultation there are 4 options for consideration for the empty property charges from 2019/20.

	Change
1	Abolish the 2 month empty property exemption and charge full council tax once a property becomes unoccupied.
2	In accordance with new government legislation increase the amount charged in respect of properties that have been empty for 2 years or more from 150% to the maximum amount set by Government (currently 200%) but add some exceptions to the increase provided certain criteria are met.
3	In accordance with new government legislation increase the amount charged in respect of properties that have been empty for 2 years or more from 150% to the maximum amount set by Government (currently 200%) with no exceptions.
4	Make no changes to the current charges

4.1 Option 1

Abolish the 2 month empty property exemption and charge full council tax once a property becomes unoccupied.

There are currently 168 properties in receipt of a 100% exemption because they have been empty between 0 and 2 months.

Band	No of properties	Annual Charge	Possible Financial Gain for 2 months charge	Possible Total Gain £
A	95	1,104.12	184.02	17,481.90
B	23	1,288.14	214.69	4,937.87
C	26	1,472.16	245.36	6,379.36
D	16	1,656.18	276.03	4,416.48
E	4	2,024.22	337.37	1,349.48
F	4	2,392.26	398.71	1,594.84
G	0	2,760.30	460.05	0
H	0	3,312.36	552.06	0
Total	168			£36,159.03

The total sum above assumes all these properties would have been empty for the full 2 months before being charged when, in reality, some will actually only be empty for a matter of days before being occupied.

This appears to be an unpopular suggestion with the respondents of the consultation with less than a quarter agreeing to this change.

4.2 Option 2

In accordance with new government legislation increase the amount charged in respect of properties that have been empty for 2 years or more from 150% to the maximum amount set by Government (currently 200%).

No of a/cs	18/19 Charge	50%	Total 150%	Total Amount	Total 200%	Total Amount	Difference
131	1,104.12	552.06	1,656.18	216,959.58	2,208.24	289,279.44	72,319.86
26	1,288.14	644.07	1,932.21	50,237.46	2,576.28	66,983.28	16,745.82
21	1,472.16	736.08	2,208.24	46,373.04	2,944.32	61,830.72	15,457.68
8	1,656.18	828.09	2,484.27	19,874.16	3,312.36	26,498.88	6,624.72
5	2,024.22	1,012.11	3,036.33	15,181.65	4,048.44	20,242.20	5,060.55
1	2,392.26	1,196.13	3,588.39	3,588.39	4,784.52	4,784.52	1,196.13
4	2,760.30	1,380.15	4,140.45	16,561.80	5,520.60	22,082.40	5,520.60
2	3,312.36	1,656.18	4,968.54	9,937.08	6,624.72	13,249.44	3,312.36
198				378,713.16		504,950.88	126,237.72

This option is popular with respondents as over 92% favoured the option to increase the over 2 year empty property charge and comments included:

- Yes, discourage people from leaving properties empty for long periods
- empty houses should be bought back to the housing market , waiting for prices to rise is unacceptable tax them very hard
- Empty properties is a tricky one. If the owners are actively trying to sell a property it seems unfair to charge more than basic council tax but if not then 200% may encourage owners to either, rent out the property or sell.
- Houses should not be left empty when we have a shortage of housing, this would discourage
- I think an increase to 200% might be a good idea but it would be good if there could be criteria put in place to avoid purchasers of long term empty properties being penalised, i.e. give them some time to bring the property back into use before adding the premium but they would have to show evidence of this.
- Please consider increasing the charge on property that has been empty for more than five years by 500%, or by an additional 100% for every year the property has been empty (if allowed)

The Government has suggested that increasing the premium allows Local Authorities to strengthen the incentive for owners of empty properties to bring them back into use. Their guidance does however state that the premium should not be used to penalise owners whose property is genuinely on the market for sale or to let and therefore the reasons for a property being long term empty should be taken into account.

Taking the above into consideration exceptions to the premium should include properties that are actively up for sale and have been so for at least 3 months or properties where occupation is hindered due to legal reasons beyond the control of the owner.

These exceptions will be considered by the council tax team and only granted where suitable evidence is provided by the owner.

4.3 **Option 3**

In accordance with new government legislation increase the amount charged in respect of properties that have been empty for 2 years or more from 150% to the maximum amount set by Government with no exceptions.

This would be in direct contradiction of the Government's best practice guidance for dealing with the empty property premium.

4.4 Option 4

Make no changes to the current council tax charges

5. Recommendations

It is recommended that the Members consider the local council tax support scheme and the technical changes for council tax separately.

There are 4 options for council tax support and 4 options for council tax empty property charges.

5.1 Council Tax Support

In respect of council tax support agree to Option 1 which is the favoured option by the consultees and will ensure council tax support is paid to those claimants in need of the assistance.

5.2 Council Tax Technical Changes

In respect of council tax technical changes agree to Option 2 which again is favoured by consultees and will allow for some exceptions to the premium. This would be in accordance with government best practice guidance and in line with comments some consultees have made.

6. Local Council Tax Support Scheme 2019/20

It is recognised that whatever decision is reached this would only be a scheme for 2019/20. A review of the scheme is undertaken annually when more knowledge of the impact of that year's scheme and collection rates are available. Monitoring will also take place to analyse the impact and any unintended consequences it has had on council taxpayers and benefit recipients.

Appendix A – Forecast Cost of 2018/19 Scheme

	Total Cost	LCC – 75%	WLDC – 12.5%	LPA – 12.5%
Cost of 2017/18 Scheme	£5,924,118 (used RRV403 1.4.18 figures)	£4,443,088	£740,515	£740,515
Forecast cost of the 2018/19 LCTS scheme at 31.10.18	£6,173,317 (Used CTB1 figures)	£4,629,988	£771,665	£771,665
Forecast cost of 2019/20 LCTS scheme at 31.10.18	£6,432,596	£4,824,446	£804,075	£804,075

Appendix B – Estimated cost of Care Leavers

	Total Cost	LCC – 75%	WLDC – 12.5%	LPA – 12.5%
Number of care leavers at 31.10.18 – estimated Band A charge	18 x £1,104.12 = £19,880	£14,910	£2,485	£2,485

Agenda Item 9c



Council

Monday, 21 January 2019

Subject: Council Tax Base and Council Tax Surplus 2019/20

Report by:

Executive Director of Resources

Contact Officer:

Tracey Bircumshaw
Strategic Finance and Business Support Manager
tracey.bircumshaw@west-lindsey.gov.uk

Purpose / Summary:

To approve the Council tax base for the district and to determine the Surplus or Deficit to be distributed for the purpose of 2019/20 budget setting

RECOMMENDATION(S):

- 1. To approve the Council Tax base 2019/20, calculated in accordance with the Local Authorities (Calculation of Tax Base) (England) Regulations 2012, as being 29,532.83**
- 2. To approve the amount of Council Tax Surplus to be distributed as £1,391,000.**

IMPLICATIONS

Legal: None from this report

Financial : FIN/192/19
The Council tax base is used when setting the Council Tax
The Surplus or Deficit is an income or charge to revenue and is taken into account when setting the budget

Staffing : None from this report

Equality and Diversity including Human Rights : None identified from this report

Risk Assessment : There is a risk that collection rates may be lower than the estimated 98.3% utilised for the purpose of calculating the tax base. However, it is expected over the long term that this rate is achievable.

Climate Related Risks and Opportunities : None arising from this report

Title and Location of any Background Papers used in the preparation of this report:

Call in and Urgency:

Is the decision one which Rule 14.7 of the Scrutiny Procedure Rules apply?

i.e. is the report exempt from being called in due to urgency (in consultation with C&I chairman)

Yes

No

Key Decision:

A matter which affects two or more wards, or has significant financial implications

Yes

No

Executive Summary

Collection Fund Surplus for 2019/20

1 Introduction

- 1.1 The Council is required to declare an estimate of the surplus or deficit that will occur on the Collection Fund at the end of each year. The Collection Fund records the amount of income collected from Council Tax, together with precept payments to principal authorities. These elements will generate a surplus or a deficit which should be taken into account when determining the Council Tax for the following year.
- 1.2 Any surplus or deficit generated through the Collection fund in relation to Council Tax is shared between the County Council, the Police Crime Commissioner and this Council in the same proportion as the amount of their precepts for 2018/19.
- 1.3 A surplus or deficit may occur in the Collection Fund if the Council tax base is larger or smaller than originally anticipated or collection rates are higher or lower than expected.

2 Estimated Council Tax Surplus for 2019/20

- 2.1 The amount calculated as available from the Collection Fund for distribution during 2019/20 has been calculated as £1,391,000 (2018/19 £650,180)

- 2.2 This amount will be shared amongst the precepting authorities as follows:

	£
Lincolnshire County Council	995,000
Police and Crime Commissioner	176,000
West Lindsey District Council	220,000

	1,391,000

- 2.3 This Council must take the £220,000 into account when it sets its element of the Council Tax for 2019/20

3 The Council's Tax base for 2019/20

- 3.1 The tax base is an important factor in determining the level of Council Tax for the next year. It is expressed as the equivalent of the number of dwellings in Band D.

- 3.2 The calculation takes into account the following factors:-

- 3.2.1 The number of chargeable dwellings in each valuation band in each Parish on 30 November 2018.

- 3.2.2 The number of discounts available to single and other eligible persons and for vacant dwellings.
- 3.2.3 The number of premiums effective at the relevant date.
- 3.2.4 The number of valuation band reductions for dwellings adapted for the disabled.
- 3.2.5 The number of dwellings exempt from liability.
- 3.2.6 The total amount estimated to be applied for the Council Tax Support Scheme.
- 3.2.7 The estimated amount of Council Tax collection in the financial year.
- 3.2.7 The proportion which dwellings in each band bear to Band D, on a full year basis.
- 3.2.8 An estimated collection rate of 98.3%
- 3.3 The Council Tax Support scheme was introduced in April 2013 enabling actual information to be used as a basis for the estimation in calculating the impact of the reductions on the tax base. These are detailed within Appendix A.
- 3.4 The number of chargeable dwellings in each valuation band has been taken from the valuation list supplied by the Valuation Office on 31 October 2018 and updated by the Council Tax department on 30 November 2018. A summary of the calculation and adjustments taken into account is shown at Appendix A.
- 3.5 The overall tax base for 2019/20 is estimated to be 29,532.83 (29,224.12 2018/19) (total of parishes below) Band D properties.
- 3.6 The number of properties exempt from Council Tax, including Ministry of Defence buildings, has been deducted from the initial tax base. Direct payments in lieu are received from the Ministry of Defence and these are included later in the tax base calculation.
- 3.7 A loss of collection from Council Tax equal to 98.3% has been taken into account, reflecting current levels of collection and assumed collection rates for the changes proposed.
- 3.8 The Council levies additional amounts for the precepts of Local Councils, and separate tax bases are required for those areas. These are shown at Appendix B.

APPENDIX A

COUNCIL TAX BASE 2019/20

Band	Z	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	TOTAL
Number of dwellings	0.00	16,214.00	8,055.00	7,647.00	5,758.00	3,452.00	1,433.00	521.00	67.00	43,147.00
Exempt properties	0.00	(364.00)	(130.00)	(113.00)	(44.00)	(18.00)	(10.00)	(4.00)	(5.00)	(688.00)
No of Chargeable dwellings	0.00	15,850.00	7,925.00	7,534.00	5,714.00	3,434.00	1,423.00	517.00	62.00	42,459.00
Disablement relief	31.00	(1.00)	21.00	(14.00)	(6.00)	(13.00)	(11.00)	2.00	(9.00)	0.00
Adjusted Chargeable dwellings	31.00	15,849.00	7,946.00	7,520.00	5,708.00	3,421.00	1,412.00	519.00	53.00	42,459.00
Discounts on relevant day	(1.75)	(1,900.65)	(704.45)	(542.35)	(302.40)	(142.65)	(58.80)	(25.30)	(5.85)	(3,684.20)
Empty Homes Premium	0.00	67.50	13.50	9.50	4.00	2.00	0.50	2.00	1.00	100.00
Total Discounts	(1.75)	(1,833.15)	(690.95)	(532.85)	(298.40)	(140.65)	(58.30)	(23.30)	(4.85)	(3,584.20)
Adjusted Total Dwellings	29.25	14,015.85	7,255.05	6,987.15	5,409.60	3,280.35	1,353.70	495.70	48.15	38,874.80
Reduction in tax base due to CTS	6.79	3,776.44	670.32	352.02	124.20	59.86	14.24	3.99	0.56	5,008.40
Equivalent after reduction due to CTS	22.46	10,239.41	6,584.73	6,635.13	5,285.40	3,220.49	1,339.46	491.71	47.59	33,866.40
Ratio to band D	5/9	6/9	7/9	8/9	9/9	11/9	13/9	15/9	18/9	
	5.00	6.00	7.00	8.00	9.00	11.00	13.00	15.00	18.00	
Total No of Band D equivalents	12.51	6,826.33	5,121.47	5,897.90	5,285.40	3,936.13	1,934.77	819.56	95.18	29,929.27
Band D contributions in lieu (MOD)	0	41	33.08	29.34	5.5	0	1.44	0	2	112.36
	12.51	6,867.33	5,154.60	5,927.24	5,290.92	3,936.13	1,936.21	819.56	97.18	30,041.68
Adjusted for Collection rate 98.3%**	12.30	6,751.26	5,067.49	5,826.98	5,201.07	3,869.22	1,903.32	805.63	95.56	29,532.83

* The total number of Band D equivalents has been calculated at a parish level.

** Total No Band D Equivalents x Collection Rate + Band D contributions in Lieu.

APPENDIX B

PARISH TAX BASE 2019/20

Parish	2019/20 Tax Base
Aisthorpe	38.65
Bardney - Apley - Stainfield	695.60
Bigby	154.10
Bishop Norton	130.01
Blyborough	31.05
Blyton	375.72
Brampton	31.65
Brattleby	52.54
Broadholme	37.00
Brocklesby	36.05
Brookenby	158.96
Broxholme	29.89
Bullington	11.87
Burton	417.06
Buslingthorpe	21.47
Cabourne	27.77
Caenby	26.76
Caistor	925.99
Cammeringham	48.30
Cherry Willingham	1,348.06
Claxby	69.62
Corringham	163.79
Dunholme	683.35
East Ferry	40.58
East Stockwith	69.32
Faldingworth	186.35
Fenton	146.28
Fillingham	82.53
Fiskerton	370.97
Friesthorpe	10.95
Fulnetby	4.81
Gainsborough	4,528.31
Glentham	165.05
Glentworth	114.16
Goltho	26.64
Grange de Lings	11.79
Grasby	185.04
Grayingham	61.32
Great Limber	78.54
Greetwell	294.62
Hackthorn - Cold Hanworth	82.58
Hardwick	15.84
Harpwell	23.84
Heapham	41.76
Hemswell	119.85

Parish	2019/20 Tax Base
Hemswell Cliff	161.14
Holton Beckering	44.27
Holton le Moor	58.69
Ingham	313.54
Keelby	689.98
Kettlethorpe	166.08
Kexby	116.22
Kirmond le Mire	13.86
Knaith	120.97
Langworth - Barlings - Newball	210.06
Laughton	149.95
Lea	379.87
Legsby	80.31
Linwood	39.81
Lissington	51.33
Market Rasen	1,237.87
Marton - Gate Burton	239.68
Middle Rasen	707.59
Morton	432.02
Nettleham	1,391.88
Nettleton	232.84
Newton-On-Trent	136.44
Normanby-By-Spital	140.37
Normanby le Wold	20.06
North Carlton	80.42
North Kelsey	343.90
North Willingham	46.20
Northorpe	48.92
Osgodby	206.65
Owersby	89.78
Owmbly-By-Spital	106.64
Pilham	26.30
Rand	19.30
Reepham	327.72
Riby	43.02
Riseholme	112.40
Rothwell	63.49
Saxby	16.94
Saxilby - Ingleby	1,345.89
Scampton	353.95
Scothern	335.63
Scotter	1,160.46
Scotton	212.48
Searby cum Owmbly	80.75
Sixhills	13.55

Parish	2019/20 Tax Base
Snarford	17.35
Snelland	31.26
Snitterby	90.64
Somerby	24.65
South Carlton	35.19
South Kelsey	206.74
Spridlington	86.84
Springthorpe	56.08
Stainton le Vale	34.89
Stow	118.53
Sturton-By-Stow	491.63
Sudbrooke	697.85
Swallow	93.09
Swinhope	45.93
Tealby	266.92
Thonock	8.82
Thoresway	36.78
Thorganby	10.69
Thorpe le Fallows	6.11
Toft Newton	126.39
Torksey	282.62
Upton	161.99
Waddingham	208.68
Walesby	104.81
Walkerith	26.48
Welton	1,468.57
West Firsby	10.66
West Rasen	32.92
Wickenby	80.18
Wildsworth	27.46
Willingham	191.77
Willoughton	104.70
Total	29,532.83



Committee Council

Date 21st January 2019

Subject: Election Fees for County, District, Parish/Town Council Elections and Local Referenda

Report by:

Executive Director of Resources

Contact Officer:

Ian Knowles
Executive Director of Resources
Telephone 01427 675183
Email ian.knowles@west-lindsey.gov.uk

Purpose / Summary:

To agree the Election Fees for the Returning Officer of West Lindsey District Council

RECOMMENDATION(S):

1. That members agree the fees for the Returning Officer in as detailed appendix 1

IMPLICATIONS

Legal:

None directly arising from this report

Financial : FIN/185/19/TJB

The proposed changes to the Returning Officer will result in the following changes

For District Council Elections (Paid for by WLDC) £5,280 (old) - £5,110 (new) = £170 (reduction)

For County Council Elections (Paid for by LCC) £2,910 (new) - £2,376 (old) = £534 (increase)

For national Elections the fee is set and paid for by central government.

The financial impact on West Lindsey of this change is a reduction of £170 for the four yearly District elections.

Staffing :

The Strategic Lead for People and Governance has been designated as the Returning Officer for the purpose of the Elections.

Equality and Diversity including Human Rights :

None from this report

Risk Assessment :

None from this report

Climate Related Risks and Opportunities :

None from this report

Title and Location of any Background Papers used in the preparation of this report:

Call in and Urgency:

Is the decision one which Rule 14.7 of the Scrutiny Procedure Rules apply?

i.e. is the report exempt from being called in due to urgency (in consultation with C&I chairman)

Yes

No

Key Decision:

A matter which affects two or more wards, or has significant financial implications

Yes

No

1 Introduction

- 1.1 On 14th December 2018 the Chief Executives group for Lincolnshire considered a report from the Lincolnshire Elections Officers' group regarding election fees. The report is attached as appendix A. There are further appendices. Appendix 1 shows the full list of proposed fees for elections. Appendix 2 shows a financial summary of the impact on each District.

2 Returning officer fees

- 2.1 The Chief Executive group were able to agree under their delegations the election fees with the exception of the returning officer fee. This was because 6 of the 8 representatives at the meeting are the Returning Officers for their authority areas.
- 2.2 The fees for returning officers have to be agreed by each authority in accordance with their individual schemes of delegation. For West Lindsey this is a matter for full council.
- 2.3 As detailed in the report the changes are designed to deal with an anomaly which means that fees for County Council elections have in the past been disproportionately low. For West Lindsey the report recommends a reduction of £170 for District Council elections and an increase of £534 for County Council elections.

3 Conclusion

- 3.1 Members are asked to consider the fees for West Lindsey's Returning Officer only.

Appendix A
Report of the Lincolnshire Election Officers' Group

To: Lincolnshire Chief Executives' Meeting

Date: 14th December 2018

Subject: Election Fees for County, District, Parish/Town Council Elections and Local Referenda

1. Recommendation

To adopt the scale of fees for County, District and Parish Council elections and local referenda held in Lincolnshire from April 2019, as set out in appendix 1 of the report.

2. Background

For many years all Lincolnshire councils have agreed a common scale of election fees across Lincolnshire. Agreeing a common scale ensures a consistent approach and helps avoid problems such as staff being attracted from one authority to another because of a difference in rates of pay and can support the submission of staffing expenses to the Election Claims Unit in relation to national polls.

A review of the current fees has been undertaken by the Lincolnshire Election Officers' Group to ensure the levels are appropriate and sufficient taking into account minimum wage and national living wage calculations. The Group comprises Electoral Services/Democratic Services Managers from each of the District Councils, City of Lincoln and Boston Borough Council and Lincolnshire County Council.

3. Polling Staff Fees

The scale of fees for polling staff have been maintained at the current level for several years, with the exception of the poll clerk fee which was raised in 2017 following an increase in the National Living Wage. The National Living Wage is due to be raised again in April 2019 to **£8.21** per hour (for those aged 25 and over).

It has become increasingly difficult in recent years to recruit Presiding Officers and Poll Clerks due to the requirement to work long hours without a break. The pressure experienced at recent national polls has also had an impact on attracting good polling staff.

Having considered the number of hours staff are expected to work whilst on polling duty, the unsociable element of those hours, the responsibilities attached to the roles and the impact of increases in the National Living Wage from April 2019, it is recommended that the fees for Presiding Officers, Poll Clerks and Polling Station Inspectors be increased as set out below:-

Job	Current Fee	Suggested Maximum Fee	Narrative
Presiding Officer– single election	£195	£205	£205 equates to £12.81 per hour (based on 16 hours)
Presiding Officer – combined elections	£234	£246	20% increase on single election fee
Presiding Officer – Parish Polls	£63.50	£78	£13 per hour for 6 hours
Poll Clerk – single election	£120	£132	The national living wage increases in April 2019 to £8.21 per hour. £132 equates to £8.25 per hour (based on 16 hours). It is proposed that Poll Clerk fees be annually reviewed to ensure they comply with the hourly minimum wage.
Poll Clerk – combined elections	£143	£158.40	20% increase on single election fee
Poll Clerk – Parish Polls	£38	£50	£8.33 per hour for 6 hours
Polling Station Inspector – single election	£195	£205	Same fee as Presiding Officer
Polling Station Inspector – combined elections	£234	£246	20% increase on single election fee

4. Training Fees

Polling Station staff and Count Supervisors receive a training fee of £40 for attending face to face training prior to each election. This is recommended good practice and meets with the performance standards set by the Electoral Commission. There is no proposal to increase this fee.

In recent years some authorities have introduced on-line training for staff and it is recommended that a fee of £20 be paid to staff undertaking this form of training, if offered by the relevant authority. It will be for each Returning Officer to determine what form they wish the training to take.

5. Count Staff

To reflect the unsocial hours element of a night time count and attract good staff, it is proposed to increase the Count Supervisor fee from £19.50 per hour to £21 per hour, the count assistant fee from £13.50 per hour to £14.50 per hour, and the daytime rate for count assistants from £8.25 per hour to £9 per hour.

The fees for the Deputy Returning Officer (for count and declaration of result only) and the day rate for the Count Supervisor remain unchanged.

6. Postal Vote Staff – Issue / Receipt

Postal vote staff are paid an hourly rate for issuing the postal ballot packs and opening the returned packs, although this varies between authorities as some choose to contract printers to undertake a complete fulfilment whereby the packs are sent direct from the printers to the voters, not issued in-house. The proposed fees incur a minor increase in the fee for daytime postal vote assistants from £8.25 per hour to £8.50 per hour. This fee will be reviewed annually to ensure it complies with hourly minimum wage.

A set fee is introduced for night time postal vote supervisor and assistants consistent with the proposed fees for overnight count staff, of £21 per hour and £14.50 per hour respectively. An overnight opening only usually occurs on polling day when postal packs are handed in at polling stations and then returned to the count centre for opening after close of polls.

7. Hand Delivery of Poll Cards

Of the seven Lincolnshire District Councils, two hand deliver poll cards to the voters and the remainder use Royal Mail.

The delivery rate of 18p per card has not been increased for a number of years and it is now considered appropriate to raise this to reflect the increase in postage costs over recent times. The proposed fee is 20p per card.

8. Returning Officers Fees

An anomaly has been identified in the Returning Officers fees between County and District elections. The same fee of £264 is paid per ward or division yet most local authorities have at least twice as many wards as divisions resulting in a much lower fee being paid for County elections, for the same level of work and responsibility (City of Lincoln Council being the exception).

Example:

15 wards x £264 = £3960

6 county divisions x £264 = £1584

In an effort to address the discrepancy and ensure a consistent approach, it is recommended that the calculation for Returning Officers fees be changed to a set fee of £200 plus £15 per 1,000 electors per electoral area (division or ward).

This would reduce the disparity between fees paid for differing local government elections and recognise the responsibility attached to the role, irrespective of whether it is a county or district election,

The impact of this would be a reduction in the fee paid for district elections for the majority of district councils, and an overall increase for county elections. This would maintain a lesser fee for County elections as the district council Returning Officer, in effect, acts as the Deputy Returning Officer with full powers, but has the same workload and responsibilities as for a district election. The RO fees based on the above calculation for both district and county elections are set out in appendix 2.

A similar proposal is recommended for parish councils in changing the fee from a set amount of £53 per parish, to £53 for up to the first 500 electors plus £18 for each additional 500 electors or part thereof. This more accurately reflects the differing size of parish electorates across the county and ensures a fair fee for small parish councils.

The fees for uncontested elections remain the same.

9. Deputy Returning Officer Fees – Full Powers

Under the current arrangements Deputy Returning Officers appointed with full powers are allocated a fee of £42.50 for the first 500 electors, plus £26.50 for every 500 electors or part thereof, for each district ward contested and £32 per uncontested ward.

It is recommended that this be made a matter for local determination, taking into account the level of duties actually undertaken and any other payments made to the DRO arising from their responsibilities for each particular election. However, it is suggested that any agreed fee should not be more than 50% of a Returning Officer's fee for the same election.

A similar arrangement is proposed for DRO fees for parish elections. Currently a fee of £42.50 is paid per contested parish and £21.50 for each uncontested parish. It is suggested that this fee also be made a matter for local determination based on duties and responsibilities, but again any fee paid should not be more than 50% of the Returning Officer's fee for the same election.

10. Clerical Fees

The current method for calculating Clerical Fees is considered to be inequitable between County and District elections, in the same way as the Returning Officer fees. The basis for the clerical fee is set out below:-

- 1 ward/division - £277
- 2 to 4 wards/divisions - £246 per area
- 5 or more wards/divisions - £215.50 per area

Plus

Postal votes - £63.50 per ward/division
Preparation of poll cards - £2.30 per 100
Preparation of proxy poll cards - £2.30 per 100

As mentioned under Returning Officer's fees, each district has at least twice as many wards as there are county divisions in their electoral area, which results in a much lower clerical fee being paid for the same amount of work and resources.

To simplify the methodology and reduce the disparity between fees paid for county and district elections, it is proposed to introduce a single set fee of £80 per division plus £60 per 1000 electors per ward/division.

The overall impact would be an increase in clerical fees paid for both district and county elections, as set out in appendix 2.

For parish elections it is suggested that a single fee of £8 per 100 electors be charged, with a minimum fee of £65 and a maximum of £350.

It is not proposed to change the clerical fee for uncontested elections of £56.50 per ward/division and £20.50 per parish/parish ward.

11. Neighbourhood Plan Referendum Fees

The holding of Neighbourhood Plan Referendums are becoming more frequent and currently there are no agreed fees for this type of poll. It is suggested that a Counting Officer fee and a clerical fee be introduced based on the fees for parish council elections of:-

Counting Officer - £53 for the first 500 electors plus £18 for each additional 500 electors or part thereof.

Clerical - £8 per 100 electors

12. Conclusion

The Lincolnshire Election Officers Group has considered the scale of fees in detail, taking into account factors such as national living wage, roles and associated responsibilities, equality across differing polls, and simplifying methodology, the Group recommend that the scale of fees as set out in appendix 1 be adopted.

The overall impact for each of the District Councils and the County Council is set out in appendix 2. This aims to provide an estimate of how the proposed fees will affect each authority.

**LINCOLNSHIRE SCALE OF ELECTION FEES – SUGGESTED AMENDMENTS FOR CONSIDERATION BY
THE LINCOLNSHIRE CHIEF EXECUTIVES’ MEETING – 14TH DECEMBER 2018**

Job	Current Fee	Suggested Maximum Fee	Narrative
POLLING STAFF			
Presiding Officer – single election	£195	£205	£205 equates to £12.81 per hour (based on 16 hours)
Presiding Officer – combined elections	£234	£246	20% increase on single election fee
Presiding Officer – Parish Polls (polling hours 4pm-9pm)	£63.50	£78	£13 per hour for 6 hours
Poll Clerk – single election	£120	£132	The national living wage increases in April 2019 to £8.21 per hour. £132 equates to £8.25 per hour (based on 16 hours) Poll clerk fees to be reviewed annually to ensure they comply with hourly minimum wage.
Poll Clerk – combined elections	£143	£158.40	20% increase on single election
Poll Clerk – Parish Polls (polling hours 4pm-9pm)	£38	£50	£8.33 per hour for 6 hours
Polling Station Inspector – single election	£195	£205	Same fee as Presiding Officer
Polling Station Inspector – combined elections	£234	£246	20% increase on single election fee
TRAINING FEES			
Polling station staff attending face to face training	£40	£40	Suggest no change to current fee. At discretion of LA an additional fee to PSI where they attend further training
On-line training	Not set	£20	
Count staff training (supervisors)	£40	£40	No change
Trainer’s fee – per session	£150	£150	Maximum fee payable for each session
COUNT STAFF			
Deputy Returning Officer for count and declaration of result	£77 for first hour plus £25.50 for extra hours	£77 for first hour plus £25.50 for extra hours	No change

Count Supervisor (day)	£15.50 per hour	£15.50 per hour	No change for daytime hours
Count Supervisor (night) – payable after 5pm	£19.50 per hour	£21 per hour	Increase to reflect the unsociable hours
Count Assistant (day)	£8.25 per hour	£9 per hour	Increase to attract good count staff
Count Assistant (night) – payable after 5pm	£13.50 per hour	£14.50 per hour	Increase to attract good count staff and reflect unsociable hours
POSTAL VOTE STAFF –ISSUE / RECEIPT			
Postal Vote Supervisor (day)	£12 per hour	£12 per hour	No change
Postal Vote Supervisor (night) (payable after 5pm)	No fee set – usual practice count supervisor rate	£21 per hour	Consistent fee with count supervisor
Postal Vote Assistant (day)	£8.25 per hour	£8.50 per hour	Increase to attract good count staff
Postal Vote Assistant (night) (payable after 5pm)	No fee set – usual practice count assistant rate	£14.50 per hour	Consistent fee with count assistant
HAND DELIVERY OF POLL CARDS			
Poll card hand delivery	Minimum of 18p per card	20p per card	Increase to reflect postal charges increases in recent year. Fee not increased for a number of years
RETURNING OFFICER FEES			
County & District – per contested division /ward	£264 per division	£200 per division/ward plus £15 per 1000 electors per division/ward (option 4)	
County – per uncontested division	£66 per division	£66 per division	No change
Parish – per contested parish/parish ward	£53 per contested parish / parish ward	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> £53 For the 1st 500 local electors within the parish/parish ward; plus £18 for each additional 500 electors or part thereof per parish/parish ward 	This more accurately reflect the differing size of parish electorates and the number of seats and ensures a fair fee for small parish councils.
Parish – per uncontested parish/parish ward	£21.50 per parish/parish ward	£21.50 per parish / parish ward	No change

Parish – where DRO full powers appointed	£11 (contested) £5.50 (uncontested)	£11 (contested) £5.50 (uncontested)	No change
DEPUTY RETURNING OFFICER FEES – FULL POWERS			
District – per contested ward	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> £42.50 for first 500 electors; plus £26.50 for every 500 electors or part thereafter 	Discretionary, but recommended equivalent to a maximum of 50% of RO fee	Matter of local determination, taking into account the level of duties actually undertaken and any other payment made to the DRO arising out of their duties in connection with the election
District – per uncontested ward	£32 per ward	Discretionary, but recommended equivalent to a maximum of 50% of RO fee	
Parish – per contested parish/parish ward	£42.50 per parish/parish ward	Discretionary, but recommended equivalent to a maximum of 50% of RO fee	
Parish – per uncontested parish/parish ward	£21.50 per parish / parish ward	Discretionary, but recommended equivalent to a maximum of 50% of RO fee	
CLERICAL FEES			
District / County – per contested division	1 division - £277 2 – 4 divisions - £246 5 of more divisions - £215.50 Plus <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Postal votes £63.50 per division Prep of poll cards £2.30 per 100; Prep of proxy poll cards £2.30 per 100 	£80 per division plus £60 per 1000 electors per ward/division (option 4)	
County - per uncontested division	£56.50 per division	£56.50 per division	Unchanged
District - per uncontested ward	£32 per ward	£32 per ward	No change
Parish – per contested parish/parish ward	£32 per 300 electors Minimum £63.50 Maximum £285	Suggest one clerical fee of £8 per 100 electors Minimum £65 Maximum £350	

Parish – per uncontested parish/parish ward	£20.50 per parish/parish ward	£20.50 per parish/parish ward	No change
---	-------------------------------	-------------------------------	-----------

NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN REFEREDUMS FEES			
Counting Officer	No current fee	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • £53 For the 1st 500 local electors within the parish/parish ward; plus • £18 for each additional 500 electors or part thereof per parish/parish ward 	Fees the same as suggested fees for Parish elections
Clerical fees	No current fee	Suggest one clerical fee of £8 per 100 electors	

HIRE OF EQUIPMENT			
Ballot Boxes/polling screens/free standing polling station signs	£2 per polling station £1 for each postal ballot box	£2 per ballot box/polling screen/free standing sign	Discretionary for each authority
Count equipment	Not set		

Miscellaneous charges

Travel fees – 45p per mile

Written confirmation of inclusion on the Register of Electors – current fee £25.00 – inclusive of VAT
– NO LONGER TO BE CHARGED AFTER INTRODUCTION OF GDPR

District Fees	Boston		East Lindsey		Lincoln		North Kesteven		South Holland		South Kesteven		West Lindsey	
	Current	Proposal	Current	Proposal	Current	Proposal	Current	Proposal	Current	Proposal	Current	Proposal	Current	Proposal
RO Fee	£3,960.00	£3,795.00	£9,768.00	£10,050.00	£2,904.00	£3,130.00	£6,864.00	£6,700.00	£4,752.00	£4,725.00	£7,920.00	£7,845.00	£5,280.00	£5,110.00
Clerical Fees	£4,434.00	£4,500.00	£10,126.00	£10,520.00	£4,517.50	£4,840.00	£7,725.40	£8,080.00	£5,577.10	£5,940.00	£9,452.00	£9,780.00	£6,654.74	£6,040.00
Polling Station Staff Fees	£21,915.00	£22,730.00	£65,510.00	£67,945.00	£26,070.00	£27,060.00	£48,325.00	£50,125.00	£33,165.00	£34,390.00	£54,595.00	£56,620.00	£45,645.00	£47,360.00
Count Staff Fees	£3,652.00	£3,896.00	£9,930.00	£10,630.00	£2,095.50	£2,216.25	£6,142.50	£6,643.00	£6,437.50	£6,887.50	£9,659.00	£10,324.50	£3,858.00	£4,146.00
Postal Vote Staff Fees	£779.25	£803.25	£6,862.50	£6,935.00	£2,544.00	£2,818.00	£6,973.50	£7,151.00	£2,676.00	£2,798.00	£5,065.50	£5,192.00	£3,861.06	£3,977.00
Poll Card Delivery Fees *	£6,942.60	£7,714.00	£0.00	£0.00	£11,141.10	£12,379.00	£0.00	£0.00	£0.00	£0.00	£0.00	£0.00	£0.00	£0.00
TOTALS	£41,682.85	£43,438.25	£102,196.50	£106,080.00	£49,272.10	£52,443.25	£76,030.40	£78,699.00	£52,607.60	£54,740.50	£86,691.50	£89,761.50	£65,298.80	£66,633.00

County Fees	Boston		East Lindsey		Lincoln		North Kesteven		South Holland		South Kesteven		West Lindsey		COUNTY TOTALS	
	Current	Proposal	Current	Proposal	Current	Proposal	Current	Proposal	Current	Proposal	Current	Proposal	Current	Proposal	Current	Proposal
RO Fee	£1,584.00	£1,950.00	£3,432.00	£4,250.00	£2,112.00	£2,530.00	£2,904.00	£3,625.00	£2,376.00	£2,910.00	£3,696.00	£4,540.00	£2,376.00	£2,910.00	£18,480.00	£22,715.00
Clerical Fees	£2,757.30	£3,480.00	£6,118.00	£7,640.00	£3,681.00	£4,540.00	£5,073.20	£6,580.00	£4,137.10	£5,160.00	£6,410.00	£8,080.00	£4,992.74	£5,160.00	£33,169.34	£40,640.00
Polling Station Staff Fees	£21,915.00	£22,730.00	£65,510.00	£67,945.00	£26,070.00	£27,060.00	£48,325.00	£50,125.00	£32,110.00	£33,310.00	£54,595.00	£56,620.00	£45,645.00	£47,360.00	£294,170.00	£305,150.00
Count Staff Fees	£3,652.00	£3,896.00	£9,930.00	£10,630.00	£2,095.50	£2,216.25	£5,127.50	£5,537.00	£4,882.50	£5,220.00	£9,659.00	£10,324.50	£3,858.00	£4,146.00	£39,204.50	£41,969.75
Postal Vote Staff Fees	£779.25	£803.25	£6,862.50	£6,935.00	£2,544.00	£2,818.00	£4,004.25	£4,105.50	£2,676.00	£2,798.00	£5,065.50	£5,192.00	£3,861.06	£3,977.00	£25,792.56	£26,628.75
Poll Card Delivery Fees *	£6,942.60	£7,714.00	£0.00	£0.00	£11,141.10	£12,379.00	£0.00	£0.00	£0.00	£0.00	£0.00	£0.00	£0.00	£0.00	£18,083.70	£20,093.00
TOTALS	£37,630.15	£40,573.25	£91,852.50	£97,400.00	£47,643.60	£51,543.25	£65,433.95	£69,972.50	£46,181.60	£49,398.00	£79,425.50	£84,756.50	£60,732.80	£63,553.00	£428,900.10	£457,196.50

*No figures included for those authorities who do not hand deliver poll cards