

Guildhall Gainsborough  
Lincolnshire DN21 2NA  
Tel: 01427 676676 Fax: 01427 675170

## AGENDA

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

### Corporate Policy and Resources Committee

Thursday, 15th December, 2022 at 6.30 pm

Council Chamber - The Guildhall, Marshall's Yard, Gainsborough, DN21 2NA

**Members:**

- Councillor Mrs Anne Welburn (Chairman)
- Councillor Jeff Summers (Vice-Chairman)
- Councillor Owen Bierley
- Councillor Matthew Boles
- Councillor Stephen Bunney
- Councillor Liz Clews
- Councillor Michael Devine
- Councillor Ian Fleetwood
- Councillor Paul Howitt-Cowan
- Councillor John McNeill
- Councillor Mrs Mandy Snee
- Councillor Robert Waller
- Councillor Trevor Young

1. **Apologies for Absence**

2. **Public Participation Period**

Up to 15 minutes are allowed for public participation. Participants are restricted to 3 minutes each.

3. **Minutes of Previous Meeting/s**

i) For Approval - Corporate Policy & Resources

To confirm and sign as a correct record the Minutes of the Meeting (PAGES 3 - 21) of the Corporate Policy and Resources Committee held on 10 November 2022

ii) For Approval - Concurrent Meeting

To confirm and sign as a correct record the Minutes of the (TO FOLLOW) Concurrent Meeting of the Prosperous Communities and Corporate Policy and Resources Committees held on 24 November 2022

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

Large Clear Print: Braille: Audio: Native Language

4. **Declarations of Interest**  
Members may make declarations of Interest at this point or may make them at any point in the meeting.
5. **Matters Arising Schedule** (PAGES 22 - 23)  
Setting out current position of previously agreed actions as at 7 December 2022
6. **Public Reports for Approval:**
- i) Local Council Tax Support Scheme 2023/24 (PAGES 24 - 36)
  - ii) Saxilby Footbridge Refurbishment (TO FOLLOW)
  - iii) Cost of Living Crisis Update (TO FOLLOW)
  - iv) Recommendation from the Community Awards Panel - 2023 Award Proposal (PAGES 37 - 42)
  - v) Amendments to approved Committee Timetable arising from the earlier commencement of the pre-election period in West Lindsey (PAGES 43 - 47)
  - vi) Committee Work Plan (PAGES 48 - 50)
7. **Exclusion of Public and Press**
- To resolve that under Section 100 (A)(4) of the Local Government Act 1972, the public and press be excluded from the meeting for the following items of business on the grounds that they involve the likely disclosure of exempt information as defined in paragraphs 1,2 and 3 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A of the Act.
8. **Exempt Reports**
- i) Council Debt Write Offs 2022/232 (PAGES 51 - 62)
  - ii) Potential RAF Scampton Purchase (PAGES 63 - 551)

Ian Knowles  
Head of Paid Service  
The Guildhall  
Gainsborough

Wednesday, 7 December 2022

Corporate Policy and Resources Committee- 10 November 2022  
Subject to Call-in. Call-in will expire at 5pm on 9 December 2022

## WEST LINDSEY DISTRICT COUNCIL

MINUTES of the Meeting of the Corporate Policy and Resources Committee held in the Council Chamber - The Guildhall on 10 November 2022 commencing at 6.30 pm.

**Present:** Councillor Mrs Anne Welburn (Chairman)  
Councillor Jeff Summers (Vice-Chairman)

Councillor Owen Bierley  
Councillor Matthew Boles  
Councillor Stephen Bunney  
Councillor Michael Devine  
Councillor Ian Fleetwood  
Councillor Paul Howitt-Cowan  
Councillor John McNeill  
Councillor Mrs Lesley Rollings  
Councillor Mrs Mandy Snee  
Councillor Robert Waller  
Councillor Trevor Young

**In Attendance:**

Ian Knowles	Chief Executive
Emma Foy	Director of Corporate Services and Section 151
Nova Roberts	Director of Change Management, ICT & Regulatory Services
Sally Grindrod-Smith	Director Planning, Regeneration & Communities
Peter Davy	Financial Services Manager (Deputy Section 151 Officer)
Sarah Elvin	Housing Communities Project Officer
Sue Leversedge	Business Support Team Leader
Alison McCulloch	Revenues Manager
Claire Bailey	Assistant Planning Services Team Manager
Katie Storr	Democratic Services & Elections Team Manager

**Apologies:** Councillor Liz Clews

**Membership:** Councillor Lesley Rollings was appointed substitute for Councillor Liz Clews

### 34 PUBLIC PARTICIPATION PERIOD

There was no public participation.

### **35 MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING/S**

Members noted there were two sets of minutes, one being for approval and one for noting, with each set taken in turn, it was

**RESOLVED** that: -

- (a) the Minutes of the Meeting of the Corporate Policy and Resources Committee held on 29 September, 2022 be confirmed and signed as a correct record; and
- (b) the Minutes of the Joint Staff Consultative Committee held on 8 September 2022, be noted.

### **36 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

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

### **37 MATTERS ARISING SCHEDULE**

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

### **38 COUNCIL TAX ENERGY REBATE DISCRETIONARY SCHEME**

Members gave consideration to a report which sought agreement to amend the Discretionary Council Tax Energy Rebate Scheme, previously agreed by delegated decision on 9 May 2022.

Earlier in the year, the Government had announced the Council Tax Energy Rebate Scheme to assist residents with the rising costs of energy by making a payment of £150 according to their council tax bands.

The scheme had been split into two areas of work; the core scheme being for residents in council tax bands A-D and which is fully funded and the discretionary scheme, intended for residents in bands E-H.

Government Funding had been allocated for this purpose with any underspend to be paid back to Government. It was also stressed any overspend would have to be met by the Local Authority. The scheme was due to close on 30 November 2022.

The delegated decision taken in May, in respect of the discretionary element was summarised to Committee and was available publicly and had enabled automatic payments of £150 to be made to anyone in Bands E to H in a vulnerable category, leaving the remaining balance to allocate to anyone else in Bands E to H to make an application with supporting evidence of financial hardship.

Members noted that since the Scheme launched 351 accounts in bands E-H had received a payment and of the original allocation £117,300 remained unspent.

Four options in respect of extending the discretionary scheme, to assist West Lindsey residents with their energy bills, had been considered, with each detailed within the report. The option being recommended to the Committee was option 1; a small payment to all Band E Council tax account holders who had not yet received a payment.

The rationale for this preferred Option was outlined to Members and contained in Section 6 of the report.

Debate ensued and Members remarked on the hard work undertaken by the team to administer such schemes since the onset of, first the pandemic, and now cost of living measures.

Whilst acknowledging the payment to each account was small, Members considered this to be a pragmatic approach and a preference to the funding being returned to Central Government. The approach was fully supported across the Chamber and although it was a very small amount, Members considered it would be welcomed by a large number of people, targeted those it had been demonstrated had not received assistance to date and that it would be foolhardy to return funding to Central Government.

Members sought indication as to the additional costs associated with administering such schemes and making such payments, and whether this had to be taken from the total funding allocation, met by the Authority or funded separately.

Whilst it was not feasible for Officers to provide a transaction cost for per applicant currently, Officers did confirm that only that week notification had been received from the Government, that administering organisations needed to complete an application for what were deemed "New Burdens", which was the funding towards administering the Schemes.

To-date the local authority had received £56,000 towards administration costs, but that had nearly been fully utilised on IT costs, postage costs and an additional temporary Officer to help with the additional work. There were a lot of extra costs to the Authority, there was now opportunity to apply for further funding and Officers were currently undertaking that process.

In responding to questions Officers outlined how eligible recipients from bands D-H had been identified initially, how the remaining fund had been advertised and promoted and the hardship test which had been applied; evidence of energy bills in arrears. Council Tax accounts in arrears had also been approached as this was often a sign of hardship. Assurance was sought and received that if more residents eligible for the £150 were identified through any means, then the full £150 payment would be made. The smaller payments referenced in the report, would only be made right at the end of the Scheme post 30 November. Assurance was also offered that the team provided a service where they would complete the forms on behalf of residents who made contact, there was no reason for residents to struggle with online applications and paper forms.

On that basis it was **RESOLVED** that

- (a) the existing Council Tax Energy Rebate Discretionary Scheme be

amended and option 1 approved, namely: -

- a small payment, estimated at approximately £33, be made to all eligible households in Council Tax band E, who have not already received a Council Tax Energy Payment, noting the resulting small surplus which may arise and would be refunded back to Central Government and that payments would be made direct to Council Tax accounts thus reducing the instalments due; and
- (b) Delegated authority be granted to the Section 151 Officer to make any minor amendments to the estimated £33 payment, in respect of the Scheme.

**Note:** Having sought advice during the discussion, Councillor John McNeill declared a non-registrable interest as a Band E property owner, and given he may be entitled to such a payment, remained in the meeting but did not take part in the discussions or vote.

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

Members gave consideration to the Progress and Delivery report for quarter two 2022/2023, which covered the period of 1 July to 30 September 2022.

Before considering the details of the performance, Members' attention was drawn to page 7 of the report, with quarter two seeing the introduction of a Performance Improvement Plan. The Performance Improvement Plan intended to provide further context and the extra level of assurance Members' had been seeking, when measures within services were reporting as underperforming. The Improvement Plan detailed those measures where performance had remained below target for two consecutive quarters or more, reasoning as to why the measure was reporting below target, the impact this was having, the actions in place to improve performance and when improvement was expected to be seen as a result of the actions being taken.

Officers outlined how the Plan had been developed, and how it would be managed and monitored, noting Improvement Plans would include clear linkages to the objectives of both teams and individuals.

Turning to the performance data Members were advised over 78% of all measures were either exceeding or within agreed tolerance of their targets, up compared with quarter one at 68.4%. Similarly, measures exceeding target for two consecutive quarters or more, had increased from 76% in quarter one to 83% in quarter two.

The measures that had performed above or below target for two consecutive periods, in each portfolio area, were then highlighted to the Committee, as follows: -

#### **Corporate Health**

Two measures were reporting below target during the quarter and had been included in the Performance Improvement Plan, earlier referred to, namely, the average time taken to pay invoices and overall customer satisfaction. Members noted the reasoning for this and the

actions to be taken. Overall performance in the portfolio continued to remain positive and Members indicated they had no questions in respect of this area.

### **Change Management, ICT and Regulatory Services**

10 measures were performing above their targets for two consecutive periods with only 2 measures reporting below target for quarter two. Continued high performance was reported in all areas, but those areas brought to the Committee's attention within the portfolio were: -

**In-year council tax collection.** Having recently received outturn figures for 21/22, the average national collection rate was 95.8% for Council Tax with the Council Tax team having achieved 98% and therefore performing in the top quartile across the country.

**Completed Food Safety inspections.** The percentage of completed inspections continued to remain on track for the year, evidencing the recovery from the pandemic.

**Housing Enforcement Cases** - The percentage of cases closed within 6 months was reporting as below target. A number of long-standing cases which had been affecting the performance figures, had been closed over the Summer and such performance was projected to return to expected levels during quarter three.

**Land Charges.** Following a successful T24 review, searches were consistently being turned around within the agreed timeframes. The Market share for the service was reporting below target, with this being monitored but the focus remained on maintaining the high standards.

Members indicated they had no questions in respect of the Portfolio.

### **Finance and Property**

Rental portfolio voids were reporting above target with voids, at 3.3%.

No measures were reporting below target within the Portfolio and Members indicated they had no questions in respect of this area.

### **Homes and Communities – Homes Health and Wellbeing TM**

Noting the 22/23 measures review, approved by Members in February 2022 three measures with targets were set within the Portfolio. This year's performance would be used to baseline and inform the targets set for the 23/24 cycle.

The reasoning for new measures having been set were summarised to the Committee noting how individual cases could impact overall performance in the case of households in bed and breakfast accommodation.

One performance measure continued to report above target, this being long term empty properties as a % of all housing stock and the measure reporting below target which has been included in the Performance Improvement Plan related to the average number of calendar days from receipt of a completed DFG application to completion of work.

In respect of DFGs Members noted performance was already on an upward trajectory. April's figures had reported 302 days whereas September was 170, averaging 171 for the quarter. The improvements in the process resulted from the T24 review undertaken at the

end of 2021.

In responding to Members' comments about possible improvements to the application process, and indicating how daunting these could be for customers, whilst accepting they were often set by Central Government, Officers outlined how the T24 review, referred to, had identified this too. As a result, additional capacity had been added to the front end of the application process. Now when a referral was received, Council Officers would phone the customer and complete the form on their behalf, posting it out for the customer to sign and return. This had been one of the main contributors to reducing the times and Members welcomed the approach.

### **Operational and Commercial Services**

Five measures had performed in excess of the agreed targets for at least two consecutive quarters within the Portfolio.

Three measures were reporting below target and all featured within the Performance Improvement Plan. Those areas brought to the Committee's attention within the Portfolio were: -

**Average stalls on a Tuesday and Saturday** – These measures were covered by the three-year action plan approved by the Prosperous Communities Committee in January 2022 consisting of a three-phased approach to regenerating the Markets was approved – Transition, Development and Delivery. The Council was currently in the transition phase, with actions underway.

**Recycling rates** – the Summer had been exceptionally dry and as a result there was reduced garden waste sent for recycling, in addition the introduction of the purple lidded bin and the initial bin rejections had had a short-term reduction on the recycling rate. This was expected to improve through the targeted communication plans in place, to assist customers, as well as Officers on the ground.

**Leisure centre**, as with Home Choices, there had been a shift in measure as it had been felt that the 2021/22 performance measures set had not provided meaningful data – new targets around membership and membership activity had now been included for 2022/23. This year's performance would be used as a baseline and to inform the targets set for the 2023/24 cycle.

In response to Members' questions around the number of stalls, it was stressed this was an average over the period, accepting that the number of stalls could vary from week to week.

### **Planning and Regeneration**

Development Management performance remained high with 3 measures maintaining performance above target. There were no measures under target in the Portfolio and Members indicated they had no specific questions on this area.

A period of general questioning ensued and Members commended the usage figures of the Market Rasen Leisure Centre. Enquiries were made as to whether data could be provided specifically in relation to the 3G facilities, their occupancy and usage across the week. Officers undertook to ascertain the information and supply it to Members.

In relation to the Trinity Arts Centre, again the performance was commended but Members



noted that most of the attendance was due to cinema screenings. Members sought indication as to what future proofing if any was being done, given the new ventures to open soon in the same local area, or work to ensure the offer at the Centre was different, in order to complement not compete with new offerings. Members were advised that a new Trinity Arts Centre Business Plan was being developed to reflect those matters referenced by Members and would be submitted to the relevant Committee in due course.

Referring to the reduced recycling rates, dual-hatted Members advised they were aware that this was a County wide reduction. A break down of the rates for each District was requested, again with Officers undertaking to provide this outside of the meeting.

Finally referring to fly-tipping, Members indicated it would be useful to understand the nature of the fly tips, acknowledging that rubble and such items, often tipped rurally, were considerably more difficult and costlier to remove, as opposed to maybe sofas, and the like, in the urban areas. The total cost of the service over the last few years was also requested. Again, Officers indicated they would ascertain the information, and circulate to Members. Going forward greater narrative around the nature of the "tips" would be included in the report where possible.

With no further questions, it was **RESOLVED** that: -

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

#### **40 MID-YEAR TREASURY MANAGEMENT REPORT 2022-23**

Members considered a report which provided the Mid-Year update for Treasury Management Indicators in accordance with the Local Government Act 2003.

The report sought to update the Committee on progress against the Treasury Management Strategy which was approved by Council in March 2022 for 2022/23 financial year, and was compliant with the CIPFA Code of Practice on Treasury Management.

It was acknowledged that the report had been written during a time of much change in the national political situation, and during a period of economic turbulence, with there having been an increase to the base interest rate since the report had been published.

The report identified that interest rates had been rising and were forecast to rise further resulting in the Council receiving additional investment income, demonstrated in the quarter two budget monitoring report, to be considered later in the evening, and was due to budgets having been set when rates were at historically low levels. Members also noted that increased rates did also mean that the Council would find borrowing costlier if it was required to source funds.

Section four of the report highlighted the movements in the Council's prudential indicators. Changes had arisen as a result of the Council closing its accounts for 2021/22 after the original strategy had been written and due to a revised capital programme for 2022/23, again

outlined in the quarter two budget monitoring report referred to earlier.

The report concluded with an economics update which had been supplied by the Council's Treasury Advisors, Link Asset Services, and which was useful in understanding the national and international context the Council was operating within when undertaking its treasury activities.

Members referenced the usefulness of economic forecast information, particularly during current economic turbulence. Understanding the UK, and indeed the global economic outlook was important for everyone, not just for setting Council budgets, but also to residents in making personal decisions about their finances. Its public nature was therefore much welcomed.

It was suggested that in future the recommendations be more specific in identifying what the changes to prudential indicators were and indicating the relevant sections of the report, as had been the case historically, as this would aid with both Elected Members and the public's understanding.

**RESOLVED** that the report and treasury activity be noted and it be **RECOMMENDED** to Council that the changes to the Prudential Indicators (Section 4.3 of the report) be approved.

#### **41 DISABLED FACILITIES GRANTS - TOP UP FROM CAPITAL RECEIPTS RESERVE**

Members considered a report which presented the forecast overspend from the Disabled Facilities Grant and requested additional top up funding from the Capital Receipts Reserve.

In presenting the report Members noted that West Lindsey's allocation had not been uplifted for inflation and didn't necessarily reflect the demographic of the District with many residents, not holding sufficient capital funds to pay for adaptations or owning their own homes, which allowed charges to be raised against properties.

The delivery of Disabled Facilities grants was a statutory requirement and the relevant Central Government Department had been quite clear that running out of grant funding, did not mean the Authority could cease delivery.

To ensure delivery of the grants could continue and the current service demand be met, a request from capital receipt reserves of £300,000 was being sought with an additional £234,000 having already been allocated from Section 106 monies.

In previous years', top-up grants had been received in January, however this payment had not been confirmed.

The spend to-date was detailed at paragraph 1.8 of the report and the reasoning for budget pressures set out in 1.9.

Members also noted the additional work which would be undertaken alongside allocating funding, to raise with the Government, and the County Council, the inadequacy of funding and the flawed formula used to calculate funding levels, particularly given the demographic

of the District.

Debate ensued and Members sought and received assurance that the lobbying and letters referenced in the recommendations would be undertaken.

Members also questioned the process for determining how S106 funding was allocated, suggesting that there should be greater Member involvement and engagement in committing such Funds. The use of trusted assessors, appointed directly by the District Council, as an alternative way to reduce the delays resulting from a lack of Occupational Therapists was again raised.

In responding, Members were advised that as part of the detailed work undertaken by the Scrutiny Committee, the use of trusted assessors had been considered. However, the need for a Disabled Facilities Grant was not ascertained until a referral had been made from the County Council. The Authority was not in a position to by-pass the County Council, as every person was entitled to an Adult Social Care Assessment. In comparison, a very small number of those assessments actually undertaken ended up in a Disabled Facilities Grant because there were so many other options that Occupational Therapists considered prior to relying on a DFG. The possibility had been discussed with County colleagues, but it had been made clear that given the right to a full assessment and the fact that many assessments did not result in a DFG but some other form of assistance which was the County Council's responsibility to deliver, it was not appropriate to miss out that step. Furthermore the District Council had no expertise, in-house, to supervise an Occupational Therapist or a trusted assessor because health, in those terms was not within the remit of West Lindsey, because it was not one of its functions under statute.

Regarding Section 106 monies, Officers outlined how approved Planning Policy dictated this and the wording of the Section 106 arrangements themselves. This was also detailed in the Infrastructure Funding Statement yearly.

Given this, applications for Section 106 monies were primarily dealt with internally and assessed against the options and priorities paper. If the situation arose where there was not enough S106 monies then Members would be asked to select their preferred projects. It was noted that much due diligence was undertaken to ensure any potential partners were adequate. Officers outlined the detail and the nature of the specific S106 which had enabled monies to be allocated to DFGs. It was emphasised that an overview and update of S106 spend would be included in the Infrastructure Funding Statement and offers to share more detail around the internal process was made.

In responding to further questions Officers confirmed the additional funding being sought would only cover the mandatory element of DFGs. Whilst the Council had a discretionary policy, this was only in place when there was funding to finance it and it had been suspended in April. It was also brought to Members' attention that discretionary grants were often in place for customers who had already had a mandatory grant and, as such, acted like a top up or a contribution towards something additional not available through the mandatory scheme. This had no bearing on speeding up the process or the number of applications being dealt with.

In response to Members' questions Officers confirmed they were not in a position to know how many applications were made to LCC but not referred to WLDC, only the number of

referrals that were made. This had been discussed with the County Council but they did not log this data at present. It was suggested dual hatted Members could raise this with the County Council .

**RESOLVED** that: -

- (a) the allocation of £300,000 from the Capital Receipts Reserve to address the shortfall in Disabled Facilities Grant funding for 2022/23 be approved;
- (b) further lobbying take place with Lincolnshire County Council to obtain both further funding from the Better Care Fund for the current year and a larger allocation in future years due to the demographic pressures West Lindsey faced; and
- (c) it be noted that the Chief Executive would be preparing a letter for the MP Sir Edward Leigh, setting out the challenges the District faced in meeting demand for disabled adaptations.

## **42 BUDGET AND TREASURY MONITORING QUARTER 2 2022/2023**

Members considered a report which set out the revenue, capital and treasury management activity from 1 April 2022 to 30 September 2022.

In presenting the report, and in relation to revenue budgets, Members were advised the forecast outturn position was a net contribution to reserves of £216,000, this represented a movement of £254,000 from the £38,000 deficit reported to the Committee in the Quarter 1 report presented July.

The movement to a contribution to reserves position was primarily due to the following factors: -

- \* The Planning fee income forecasting to be overachieved by £177,000 and was based on actual income to-date, which included several applications for major developments.
- \* Net interest receivable was forecast to be £190,000 above budget. This was due to the budget being set when interest rates were historically low, combined with larger balances than expected in the early part of the year, which meant that the Council was forecast to exceed its interest receivable budget.
- \* This was offset by a pressure on employee costs of £37,000. With the forecast outturn now including the confirmed pay award for 22/23, and also the reduced National Insurance rate to be applied from the 6 November, announced in the Government's September mini-budget.
- \* Crematorium income had reduced by £36,000, to reflect the business plan reported to the Committee in July; and there was also a pressure within Property and Asset services relating to forecast electricity costs and repairs and maintenance expenditure.

In relation to Capital, Section 3.1 of the report detailed requested approvals to capital schemes, including £6.823m which it was proposed be moved to future financial years.

Members were also asked to approve the adjustments to the capital budgets as detailed at section 3.2 of the report and to approve the revised capital budget of £10.5m, which included the amended Disabled Facilities Grant capital scheme budget, considered and approved earlier in the meeting.

In responding to questions, Officers confirmed capital costs relating to the Market Square development would be funded from the Levelling Up Fund award.

**RESOLVED** that:

**REVENUE**

- (a) the forecast out-turn position of a £0.216m net contribution to reserves as of 30<sup>th</sup> September 2022 (see Section 2) relating to revenue activity be accepted;
- (b) the use of Earmarked Reserves during the quarter approved by the Chief Finance Officer using Delegated powers (2.4.1) be accepted;

**CAPITAL**

- (c) the current projected Capital Out-turn as detailed in 3.1.1 of the report be accepted;
- (d) the adjustments to the Capital Budget as detailed in 3.2 of the report be approved;
- (e) the revised Capital Budget of £10.5m be approved; and

**TREASURY**

- (f) the report, the treasury activity and the prudential indicators be accepted.

**43 RECOMMENDATION FROM PROSPEROUS COMMUNITIES COMMITTEE:  
PROPOSED FEES AND CHARGES 2022/2023 - INCLUDING CHRISTMAS  
PARKING AND DISTRICT PARKING CHARGES**

The Committee considered a report which detailed the proposed Fees and Charges to be implemented from the 1st of April 2023 for services within the remit of the Committee (Appendix A) as well as those recommended by Prosperous Communities Committee (Appendices B and C). Service specific detail relating to performance and demand were included within the report at Appendices 1 to 19.

Members noted that two additional recommendations had been made by the Prosperous Communities Committee when considering their fees and charges, namely for the free parking period in Gainsborough to be increased from one to two hours, in line with Market

Rasen to establish parity across the district; and that all charges relating to car parking fixed penalty notices be halved. Regarding the latter Members were advised that unfortunately the Council was not able to amend such fines as they were set by statute under the Road traffic Act 2007 and as such Members should reject the recommendation on legal grounds.

The net impact of the original fees and charges review was an increase in income of £6,700 in 2023/24, rising to £58,300 by 2027/28, however, the proposed increase in free parking in Gainsborough was forecasted to reduce this by £27,000 per year.

Members further noted inflation currently stood at 12.00% but it was being proposed that a lower rate of 6% be applied, to reflect the impact of the pay award on service provision, with employee costs and Officers, time being the main cost driver for many of the proposed fees. This reduced inflation rise would also ensure services remained accessible to all residents given the current cost of living crisis.

Furthermore, the proposal reflected the result of the budget consultation event, where the majority of respondents had felt that a cap less than inflation be used to increase fees and charges for 2023/24.

Two service areas had had income budgets reduced to reflect updated Business plans, presented to Committee earlier in the year, these related to the Crematorium and Markets. Members were also advised that car parking permit demand had also fallen and as such it was proposed to reduce the income budget to reflect this as part of the budget setting process for 23/24, the report before Members reflected an expected pressure on income in this area.

No new fees were being proposed, but the usual one-day free parking requests usually dealt with on Annual basis had been included with the report requesting not only approval for the current year but for each year up to 2025, covering the period of the current Parking Strategy, with a further review of this arrangement to be included in the next Parking Strategy, due in 2025.

Debate ensued and Members sought indication, given that Gainsborough's Christmas Event was held over three days, who had determined the date on which it should be held, and the process by which this would be determined each year up and until 2025.

Members were advised this had been determined with the event organisers and the free parking would be on the Saturday this year. Given the point raised regarding the process for future years, the Chief Executive indicated a process would be required. With Members debating whether there was a need for a formal process for future years and if so what that should look like. Agreement was reached a formal process would be required, and the Chief Executive made a suggestion for Members to consider.

As a result, a Member proposed the following additional recommendation be added, "Delegated Authority be granted to the Chief Executive to determine the date on which free parking is held each year, in consultation with Event Organisers and the Chairman of the Policy and Resources Committee"

During the course of further debate, it was identified that there was a discrepancy with the date stated with the report in relation to the Gainsborough Event in 2022, having earlier heard, free parking would be Saturday. In the absence of absolute clarity, it was suggested

the earlier proposal be further slightly amended to read as follows, “Delegated Authority be granted to the Chief Executive to determine and vary the date on which free parking is held each year, in consultation with Event Organisers and the Chairman of the Policy and Resources Committee.” This was duly seconded and on being put to the vote was carried.

Referencing the recommendation made by the Prosperous Communities Committee, which related to extending free parking in Gainsborough to two hours to establish parity across the District with Market Rasen, the Chairman of that Committee advised the meeting, that he would be unable to support the recommendation, outlining his reasoning. At the time of making the recommendation, there had been no evidence provided as to how it would support either businesses or car-park users in Gainsborough, nor was the financial impact of the proposal available to the Committee. Members were now aware extending free parking would result in a loss of income of £27,000 with additional costs for updating parking machines and infrastructure. The suggestion of achieving parity was questioned given the offer at the two towns was very different and in effect would have to be subsidised by residents across the entire district. The Council had also only just recently adopted its revised Car Parking Strategy.

Opposing Members outlined their reasoning as to why the Committee should support the recommendation acknowledging the financial impact, but also indicating this was not insurmountable in their view. Again, as it had been at the Prosperous Communities Committee it was suggested that there needed to be greater focus on the cost implications for the wider economic community, and recognition that the Cost of Living Crisis did not just impact households but was impacting the Council’s wider stakeholders. Consideration needed to be given to the impact of losing return visitors due to parking charges and how this reduced spend in the town impacted local businesses’ revenues regardless of their nature. There were concerns that the town centre was declining at an alarming rate and that the LUF investment would be too late if action was not taken. The suggestion that the offer between the two settlements was also disputed.

Returning to the cost of the proposal a Member indicated he had posed a number of questions to Officers outside of the meeting, to ascertain how this additional funding may be financed. Accepting there had been little time between the two Policy Committees for Officers to undertake work, but in light of this, proposed that recommendation four be deferred to allow Officers to give further consideration to financing options. Members were reminded they would need to raise the options and the Officers were charged with costing these.

The need for parity was supported by some Members however the timing was questioned, Members had already approved a Parking Strategy, which had been evidence based, had assessed various aspects such as short stay and long stay parking, geographical assessments and comparisons with similar locations and offers. It was even suggested if parity was being sought the free period should be one hour across both settlements.

Further debate ensued, Opposing Members suggested the schedule of charges did not reflect local people’s shopping habits, that additional hour allowed people to not only shop but to make those spontaneous spends a little more time allowed for, such as stopping for coffee. Human nature was not being reflected or recognised and this was impacting on local businesses. Local nearby towns were offering free parking and people would naturally migrate to those areas due to the ease of parking. It was suggested action needed to be

taken soon to save the town centre, as opposed to being rolled over into future reviews. This was the only charge across the District where people were charged differently dependent on where they lived. Some suggested there would be little value in the cinema opening if the town centre had closed down around it. It was disputed that business closures were as a result of car parking charges.

Having quoted a number of empty shops in the town centre, Members were challenged as to the accuracy of their statements, given the premise audit which had been undertaken in August 2022 and shared with Members.

The proposal to defer recommendation 4 was seconded, but a Member of the Committee, raised a Point of Order, seeking advice as to whether such an action was constitutionally acceptable.

Whilst advice was being sought, there was further lengthy debate on people's shopping habits and concerns again voiced by several Members that these were not being considered to a greater enough degree. The Chairman reminded the Committee, that whilst they were all valid points being raised, they were not charged with Policy setting, all these points were relevant to that matter, and not the recommendation under discussion.

During the course of the debate there had been concerns raised in reference to fixed penalty notices, the numbers issued and the Council's general approach to both on and off-street parking. Accepting the position in the report regarding charges, Members were still of the view there needed to be a wider debate and requested whether a report could be brought forward on this matter. A Member indicated that he had requested a break down of the type of infringements enforced, in assurance that a pragmatic approach was being adopted.

The Democratic Officer addressed the Point of Order, made earlier in the meeting and indicated she was content the request was constitutionally acceptable and should be treated like any other amendment. On request it was clarified if the amendment was carried at this stage, it would be voted on again at the conclusion of the debate, and if supported a further paper would be submitted to the next Committee in line with the amendment. If the amendment was lost, recommendation 4, as printed stood, and Members would need to vote on that at the end of the meeting either supporting or rejecting it.

Having proposed and seconded on being put to the vote the proposal to defer recommendation 4, for the reasons outlined in the debate, was not carried.

Having debated the matter at length, and in moving to the recommendations, a Member made a request for a recorded vote and this was duly seconded.

The Democratic Officer sought and received clarification that the Members required a recorded vote for all six recommendations, given they were to be taken individually.

Having been proposed and seconded recommendation one was put to the vote, with votes cast in the following manner: -

**For:-** Councillors Bierley, Devine, Fleetwood, McNeill, Summers, Waller and Welburn (7)

**Against:-** Councillors Boles, Bunney, Howitt-Cowan, Rollings Snee and Young (6)



With a total of 7 votes in favour and 6 votes against recommendation one was carried

Having been proposed and seconded recommendation two was put to the vote, with votes cast in the following manner: -

**For:-** Councillors Bierley, Boles, Bunney, Devine, Howitt-Cowan, Fleetwood, McNeill, Rollings, Snee, Summers, Waller, Welburn and Young (13)

**Against:-** None (0)

With a total of 13 votes in favour and 0 votes against recommendation two was carried.

Having been proposed and seconded recommendation three was put to the vote, with votes cast in the following manner: -

**For:-** Councillors Bierley, Boles, Bunney, Devine, Howitt-Cowan, Fleetwood, McNeill, Rollings, Snee, Summers, Waller, Welburn and Young (13)

**Against:-** None (0)

With a total of 13 votes in favour and 0 votes against recommendation three was carried.

Having been proposed and seconded recommendation four was put to the vote, with votes cast in the following manner: -

**For:-** Councillors Boles, Bunney, Howitt-Cowan, Rollings Snee and Young (6)

**Against:-** Councillors Bierley, Devine, Fleetwood, McNeill, Summers, Waller and Welburn (7)

With a total of 6 votes in favour and 7 votes against recommendation four was **NOT** carried

Having been proposed and seconded recommendation five was put to the vote, with votes cast in the following manner: -

**For:-** Councillors Bierley, Boles, Bunney, Devine, Howitt-Cowan, Fleetwood, McNeill, Rollings, Snee, Summers, Waller, Welburn and Young (13)

**Against:-** None (0)

With a total of 13 votes in favour and 0 votes against recommendation five was carried.

Having been proposed and seconded recommendation six, added earlier in the debate, was put to the vote, with votes cast in the following manner: -

**For:-** Councillors Bierley, Boles, Bunney, Devine, Howitt-Cowan, Fleetwood, McNeill, Rollings, Snee, Summers, Waller, Welburn and Young (13)

**Against:-** None (0)

With a total of 13 votes in favour and 0 votes against recommendation six was carried.

In light of the above votes it was **RESOLVED** that:-

- (a) the proposed Fees and Charges at Appendix A, as well as those recommended by Prosperous Communities Committee detailed at Appendices B and C\* (commercially sensitive\*) be **RECOMMENDED** to Council for approval;
- (b) the recommendation from the Prosperous Communities Committee be **ACCEPTED** and as such, free car parking on 18/11/2022 (Gainsborough) and 10/12/2022 (Market Rasen) when Christmas Events are to be held (Section 5.1) be approved;
- (c) the recommendation from the Prosperous Communities Committee be **ACCEPTED** and as such, the request for one day of free parking in Gainsborough and Market Rasen when Christmas Events are to be held, for the years 2023, 2024 and 2025 (Section 5.1) be approved, with a further review to be included in the next Parking Strategy, due in 2025.
- (d) having reviewed the additional financial and legal implications, the recommendation from the Prosperous Communities Committee that the current free parking period in Gainsborough be extended to 2 hours in line with Market Rasen to establish parity across the District be **REJECTED**
- (e) having reviewed the additional legal implications, the recommendation from the Prosperous Communities Committee that car parking fixed penalty notices (FPNs) be reduced by 50% across all current charges, be **REJECTED**, as all such charges were set by Central Government through statute, and were therefore not within the legal powers of West Lindsey District Council to alter; and
- (f) Delegated Authority be granted to the Chief Executive to determine and vary the date on which free parking is held each year up until 2025, in consultation with Event Organisers and the Chairman of the Policy and Resources Committee

#### **44 OUTCOME OF THE SEPTEMBER 2022 COST OF LIVING SUMMIT**

Members gave consideration to a report which presented the findings from the multi-agency Cost of Living Summit which had been hosted by West Lindsey District Council on 26 September 2022.

In presenting the report the Chairman indicated she was aware some Members would feel disappointed at the lack of financial commitment within the report, but set out her reasoning as to why she considered this the best approach, given the significant unknowns the Council was facing and an ever-changing situation. The Authority's current sound financial position was as a result of prudent management over the last 12 years. Reserves once spent could not be replaced easily and as such it was important that any actions taken were sustainable and addressed real need. The impact of numerous financial support packages offered by Central Government, many of which were administered locally, was unknown as yet and would have impact on livelihoods. Gas and petrol prices had started to fall and there was a concern, given the risks identified in the report any commitments now would prevent the Council from assisting further if the situation continued to persist. There was also concern that other Council priorities which had been supported in the Chamber, would not be delivered if resources were diverted without due consideration.

Reference was made to the already existing funding gap and the unknowns the revised Government settlement presented, as such the Chairman was of the view that it would be more prudent to wait for the outcome of this settlement. The Council's core business needed to be secure in the first instance. It was not being suggested that the Council should not do anything, with the Chairman outlining numerous examples, but that there was a need to ensure the interventions had a longer lasting impact. It was also highlighted how the Council currently supported Voluntary and Community Groups and how offering greater support to such organisations could have the potential to provide community led support which matched need identified locally.

The Leader of the Council showed his support for the Chairman's position echoing her comments around increased partnership working and support, ensuring interventions had a real impact and the unprecedented levels and sources of uncertainties the Council and the Country faced at the current time, in respect of its finances, moving the recommendations in the report.

Debate ensued and Members from across the Chamber commented on the success of the Summit. Engagement from partners had been excellent and the knowledge gained invaluable. Members also spoke of the amount of information they had learned and the evening had made them more informed in terms of the support that currently existed across the District.

That being said, some Members, including Opposition Members, expressed disappointment, given the success of the Summit and the ideas generated, that the report lacked indication of any direct actions to be undertaken, and as such considered the need for urgent delivery had been overlooked. It was not accepted that all potential actions would incur a cost, and as such a more detailed action plan had been anticipated. The cost of consultants to-date was requested.

It was suggested by Opposition Members, that the Authority's offer was lacking, in comparison to other East Midland authorities, the pace of delivery was also challenged, with people already facing extremely difficult circumstances and wanting to see things put in place. It was accepted that any support needed to be appropriate and proportionate but moreover it needed to be quickly, not in a year's time.

This stance was shared by some Members, and whilst it was accepted that partnership

working was the way forward, that financial handouts were not the best solution and that a small amount of funding could have a huge impact to “grass roots” organisations, it was the pace of delivery that caused concern, with Members seeking to understand when such proposals would come forward given the word “future meeting” in the recommendation.

Responding to previous comments, it was disputed all Councils were taking immediate action but the Chairman indicated that Members should share any learning they have from what other Authorities were implementing so all options could be considered. Committee Members spoke of local organisations in the District creating warm spaces but already experiencing financial difficulty and of an initiative being run by a Town Council creating a fuel bank, suggesting supporting local parishes who may be more aware of residents’ direct needs at a local level, may be more appropriate and for consideration in any future action plan.

Referring to the proposal to promote the ‘Connect to Support Lincolnshire’ concern was raised that such websites were not often kept as up-to-date as they could be and this led to frustration. The Chief Executive, by way of reassurance, outlined how the Authority was working closely with Districts from across the county to co-ordinate the information of the website. Areas had been allocated to specific working groups; one looking at food banks; one looking at spaces; one at financial help and another at communications. It was a collaborative approach between the third sector and Districts and was supported by the Integrated Care Board, established as part of a new structure.

The Chief Executive took the opportunity to raise the risks detailed within the report and asked Members to consider these in any decision they made.

Many Members were supportive of the rationale outlined at the outset, supported the ethos to support partners, and community organisations, as opposed to direct financial support to residents but continued to share concerns around timescales. Members saw no reasoning as to why a plan could not be in place, regardless of the finances, and were of the view this could be revisited once the true settlement was known.

It was suggested it should be feasible for Officers to bring back a plan that set out measures, which wouldn’t necessarily have additional resource implications or only marginal resource implications, alongside additional measures which may have spending implications, which could be authorised subsequently by a further report when the spending position was known better.

Given the comments made by Members, the Chairman requested assistance with re-wording recommendation 2 to reflect the sentiment of the Committee, with the following suggested and subsequently proposed, seconded and accepted: -

In response to the Motion resolved by Council on 4 July 2022; Officers be requested to scope additional financial support measures for “socially vulnerable households”. Initial proposals to be brought to the December meeting, with future costings to be determined at a later date, by report to Committee.

On that basis it was **RESOLVED** unanimously that: -

- (a) the findings and emerging themes arising from the Cost of Living Crisis Summit be noted;
- (b) in response to the motion resolved by Council on 4 July 2022; Officers scope additional financial support measures for “socially vulnerable households” and initial proposals be brought forward to the December meeting, with future costings to be determined at a later date, by report to Committee.
- (c) the promotion and use of the ‘Connect to Support Lincolnshire’ website (<https://lincolnshire.connecttosupport.org/>) on the Council’s own website, as a central source of online help and advice; and as a community directory relating to the cost of living for all Lincolnshire residents, be approved.

#### **45 COMMITTEE WORK PLAN**

The Chairman took the opportunity to remind Members that suggestions for inclusion could be made and would be considered, referencing the suggestion made in earlier discussions and encouraging that Member to contact Officers.

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

The meeting concluded at 8.51 pm.

Chairman

## Corporate Policy & Resources Committee Matters Arising Schedule

**Purpose:** To consider progress on the matters arising from previous Corporate Policy & Resources Committee meetings.

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

Status	Title	Action Required	Comments	Due Date	Allocated To
Black	<b>P and D Q2 report - information requested during debate</b>	<p>arising from mtg on 10/11/22</p> <p>During the debate related to performance and delivery additional information was requested in the following areas and officers undertook to circulate outside of the meeting</p> <p>*data specifically in relation to the 3G facilities at Market Rasen LC, their occupancy and usage across the week.</p> <p>*A break down of the recycling rates for each District</p> <p>*The total cost of the flytipping service over the last few years was also requested</p>	<b>information circulated to Members via e-mail on 17 November and 1 December</b>	30/11/22	Claire Bailey
Black	<b>to determine the date of free parking in Gainsborough for Xmas 2022</b>	<p>extract from mins of meeting 10/11/22</p> <p>Delegated Authority be granted to the Chief Executive to determine and vary the date on which free parking is held each year up until 2025, in consultation with Event Organisers and the Chairman of the Policy and Resources Committee</p>	<b>delegation will be added to the constitution as part of the annual review until 2025 - for transparency - noted</b> <b>Members were advised of the decision re Gainsborough Parking this this year by notice on 16 November</b>	18/11/22	Ian Knowles
Black	<b>cost of living - report to next meeting</b>	<p>Extract from mins of mtg 10/11/22</p> <p>in response to the motion resolved by Council on 4 July 2022; Officers scope additional financial support measures for "socially vulnerable households" and initial proposals be brought forward to the December meeting, with future costings to be determined at a later date, by report to Committee.</p>	<b>Requested report is on December's agenda</b>	07/12/22	Nova Roberts
Black	<b>Use of Earmarked Reserves</b>	To consider the use of general reserves to earmarked reserves for social support	<b>Relevant report is on December's agenda</b>	30/11/22	Emma Foy
Green	<b>Use of CCTV for Fly-tipping</b>	To consider options for increased use of CCTV to prevent fly-tipping/identify offenders	<b>For CCTV Manager and Enforcement Manager</b>	31/12/22	Grant White Andy Gray
Green	<b>WEST LINDSEY UK SHARED PROSPERITY FUND</b>	Extract from mins of Mtg 7/7/21 - CONCURRENT CTTEE a final Business Case for each of the three Investment	<b>Please ensure these are added to the CPR work plan in due course - logged here for work planning</b>	31/12/22	Sally Grindrod-

	<b>INVESTMENT PLAN - Business Cases</b>	Objectives, namely;  > Communities and Place > Supporting Local Businesses; and > People and Skills  be submitted to appropriate meetings of the Corporate Policy and Resources Committee for consideration.	<b>purposes - please amend due date as appropriate</b>		Smith
Green	<b>PUBLIC SECTOR DECARBONISATION FUND (3B) - FUNDING BID FOR GUILDHALL IMPROVEMENTS - Development of Business Case</b>	Extract from mins of meeting 29/9/22 Officers be supported in continuing to work with Midland Net Zero hub to develop a detailed business case, for consideration and final decision by this Committee, should the grant application be successful, noting notification was expected by the end of January 2023; and	<b>Please ensure this report is added to the forward plan /committee work plan for feb - business case if grant successful will need cttee approval - as per resolution made</b>	31/12/22	Steve Leary
Green	<b>Lobbying of LCC re further funding from the Better Care Fund</b>	extract from mins of mtg 10/11/22  further lobbying take place with Lincolnshire County Council to obtain both further funding from the Better Care Fund for the current year and a larger allocation in future years due to the demographic pressures West Lindsey faced;	<b>this has been allocated a matters arising as Members wanted assurance lobbying was happening . - Any progress can be reported against this action</b>	31/12/22	Diane Krochmal
Green	<b>Letter to be issued to Sir Edward Leigh re disabled adaptations</b>	Extract from mins of mtg 10/11/22 resolved that it be noted that the Chief Executive would be preparing a letter for the MP Sir Edward Leigh, setting out the challenges the District faced in meeting demand for disabled adaptations.	<b>this is logged as a matter arising as Members wanted assurance any lobbying or letters referenced in the report would happen. Please advise when letter has been issued</b>	15/12/22	Ian Knowles

# Agenda Item 6a



**Corporate Policy and  
Resources Committee**

**Thursday 15 December  
2022**

**Subject: Local Council Tax Support (LCTS) Scheme 2023/24**

Report by:	Director of Change Management, ICT & Regulatory Services
Contact Officer:	Alison McCulloch Revenues Manager  <a href="mailto:alison.mcculloch@west-lindsey.gov.uk">alison.mcculloch@west-lindsey.gov.uk</a>
Purpose / Summary:	To adopt a Local Council Tax Support Scheme for 2023/24 as recommended by Corporate Policy and Resources Committee.

## **RECOMMENDATION(S):**

**That the Corporate Policy and Resources Committee recommends to Full Council the adoption of Option 1 of the report for the Local Council Tax Support Scheme for West Lindsey District Council for 2023/24.**

**To summarise Option 1 provides:**

**To apply any new legislative requirements and the uprating of the non-dependent charges, 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 'Upratings'.**



## IMPLICATIONS

### Legal:

The Council has to determine a local scheme for council tax reduction by 31 January 2023

### Financial: FIN/109/23/CPR/SSc

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

Year	Total	WLDC 12.5%	LCC 75%	PCC 12.5%
2022/23	£6,531,706	£816,463	£4,898,780	£816,463
2023/24 Option 1	£6,159,130	£769,891	£4,619,348	£769,891
2023/24 Option 2	£6,053,074	£756,634	£4,539,806	£756,634

- If Option 1 is approved, no additional costs are forecast for the LCTS scheme for 2023/24. This doesn't include any adjustments such as new legislation affecting the default/pension age scheme or uprated non-dependent deductions, applicable amounts and allowances as per the Department for Works and Pensions annual 'Up-ratings'.
- To comply with the Council budget guiding principles, the scheme should fit within the level of available government grant. Due to the way that the funding is now provided to the Council, 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.

When this figure was calculated it did not include an estimated % increase in the council tax due it was just based on the actual estimated spend for 2022/23 with the DWP increase and did not account for the annual council tax increase.

### Staffing:

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

### Equality and Diversity including Human Rights:

Please see appendix A – Local Council Tax Support Scheme 2023/24 Equality Impact Assessment.

---

**Data Protection Implications:**

None arising from this report.

**Climate Related Risks and Opportunities:**

None arising from this report.

**Section 17 Crime and Disorder Considerations:**

None arising from this report.

**Health Implications:**

None arising from this report.

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

Local Government Finance Act 2012 -

<https://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukpga/2012/17/contents/enacted>

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

<https://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukpga/2018/25/enacted>

**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 have 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 31<sup>st</sup> January otherwise a default scheme, similar to the current Council Tax Support default scheme applied to customers of pension age, will have to be implemented. Applying a similar scheme to all working age customers would increase the annual expenditure on Council Tax Support.
- d. The amount of council tax support awarded last year was just over £6.6 million however; at the 24 October 2022 this had decreased slightly to £6.5 million.

**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**

**X**

**No**

## **Executive Summary**

Council Tax Benefit was a national scheme providing means-tested financial help for low-income households to pay their Council Tax liability. This was abolished on 31 March 2013 by the Local Government Finance Act 2012 which placed a legal requirement on every billing authority to adopt a Localised Council Tax Support (LCTS) scheme.

Since the inception of the LCTS scheme on 1<sup>st</sup> April 2013 relatively minor changes have been made which has enabled claimants to receive a similar level of support each year and enabled the council to maintain an annual council tax collection rate of around 98%.

In 2020 and 2021, following the Covid-19 pandemic, the Government awarded a grant to all local authorities for a payment to be paid to all working aged council tax support claimants. This was paid direct to council tax accounts. It also permitted the use of any surplus to support economically vulnerable people and households.

Following the allocation of these awards, it was also possible to introduce discretionary hardship funds for all council taxpayers to apply for if they continued to experience financial difficulties caused by the pandemic. These funds are now exhausted but supported 374 families.

A further discretionary hardship fund was agreed by Corporate Policy and Resources Committee for 2022/23 in the sum of £31,717.85 which was the result of a refund of overpaid Magistrates court fees. To date 27 families have been assisted from this fund.

A significant change to the LCTS scheme for 2023/24 is likely to have a negative impact on the collection rate and reduce the yield over the year.

Full Council must approve and adopt the finalised LCTS scheme by 31<sup>st</sup> January 2023 at the very latest.

## **1 Introduction**

- 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 legislation which means 'local schemes must give the same pre-2013 level of assistance to pensioners. West Lindsey District Council also made the decision in 2013/14 to protect those in receipt of a War Pension and those claimants receiving a Disability Benefit.

## **2 Current Situation**

We currently have 6,081 council tax support claimants and of these 2,455 are pensioners and 3,626 are working age claimants. This equates to 60% of our total caseload who would be impacted by any changes to the scheme.

Our council tax collection rate for 2021/22 was 98% which was in the top quartile performance being 66<sup>th</sup> position out of 308 local authority reported outturns. The national average was only 95.8% so this is considerably higher. Some of this success can be attributed to the Government's hardship award and to the council tax discretionary hardship relief scheme which has enabled our most financially vulnerable residents to receive some financial support from the Council.

The Council recognise that many of our residents are feeling the effects of the increased cost of energy, petrol, and food prices. We are working with our partners across the public and voluntary sectors to support our residents, and particularly those who are vulnerable and hardest hit by the cost-of-living crisis. The current West Lindsey scheme is one of the most generous in Lincolnshire and if we were to look at changing the scheme we may be impacting on those most affected by the cost of living increases and adding to their financial burden.

## **3. Consultation**

- 3.1 Consultation was undertaken between 26<sup>th</sup> August and 7<sup>th</sup> October 2022. Invites to the consultation were sent electronically to the Citizen Panel members who received electronic surveys, a total of 1,002 members. This was also published on the West Lindsey District Council website and advertised through Facebook. In total, there were 50 responses received.

### 3.2 The questions and responses asked are detailed below:

1. Do you agree that the only change that should be made to the scheme is the up-rating of all allowances and premiums in line with Department for Work and Pensions allowances?

Yes	46	(92%)
No	1	(2%)
Don't know	3	(6%)

2. Are you currently in receipt of Council Tax Support?

Yes	7	(14%)
No	43	(86%)
Don't know	0	(0%)

### 3.3 The results

These results show that the majority of respondents were not in receipt of council tax support but would agree to increasing the uprating of all allowances and premiums in line with Department for Work and Pensions allowances.

## 4. Consultation with major preceptors

Before a Council can determine to revise or replace its LCTS scheme it must consult with any major precepting authority which have the powers to issue a precept to it.

Consultation has taken place with both the Lincolnshire County Council and the Police and Crime Commissioner for Lincolnshire and both have submitted responses agreeing to make no change to the scheme for 2023/24 but both would agree to increasing the uprating of all allowances and premiums in line with Department for Work and Pensions allowances (option 1 of this report).

## 5. Costings

The current estimates for the 2022/23 scheme are £6,531,707 being split as below:

Total	LCC – 75%	PCC – 12.5%	WLDC – 12.5%
£6,531,707	£4,898,780	£816,463	£816,463

## 6. Options

Two options have been considered for the 2023/24 scheme being to maintain or slightly reduce the level of financial support as detailed below:

### 6.1 Option 1

To apply any new legislative requirements and the uprating of the non-dependent charges, 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'.

To apply any additional changes to government welfare benefit regulations during the year which are intended to increase the income of benefit recipients to avoid unintended consequences to customers.

#### Costs/Savings

Initial estimates for 2023/24 show that there would be no direct saving to the council under this option as it would just maintain the current scheme. Any reductions in the cost of the scheme would be due to a reduction in council tax support claimants.

Based on a 3% increase in up-ratings this equates to an approximately cost of:

<b>Total</b>	<b>LCC – 75%</b>	<b>PCC – 12.5%</b>	<b>WLDC – 12.5%</b>
£6,159,130	£4,619,348	£769,891	£769,891

<b>Advantages</b>	<b>Disadvantages</b>
The financial modelling shows that West Lindsey District Council can still bridge the funding by continuing with the current scheme for a further year.	
The existing scheme works well and offers a high level of support for low income families who may otherwise find themselves in debt.	
There has been a slight decrease this year in the number of households claiming LCTS which suggests that the situation is improving gradually as more claimants return to work or are	

receiving private pensions that reduces their CTR entitlement. .	
Collection rates are being maintained under the current scheme.	
This option ensures the LCTS rules stay consistent with the DWP rules which avoids confusion for claimants.	
Retaining existing policy principles of keeping LCTS in line with other key welfare benefits promotes equality.	

## 6.2 Option 2

To make no changes to the current scheme for 2023/24 ie: do not apply the up-rate household allowances and deductions

### Costs/Savings

Initial estimates for 2023/24 show that there would be a slight saving to the council under this option however, it would effectively create a reduction in income for those affected.

If we do not apply the applicable amount up-ratings to working age claimants their Department for Works and Pensions (DWP) income will exceed their applicable amount and they will be entitled to less council tax support. This in turns means their council tax bills will increase which will require more council tax to be collected.

Based on no increase in up-ratings this equates to an approximately cost of:

Total	LCC – 75%	PCC – 12.5%	WLDC – 12.5%
£6,053,074	£4,539,806	£756,634	£756,634

Advantages	Disadvantages
Slight reduction in costs to the council	The Council would have three sets of rules to apply for families applying for financial help. This will cause confusion for the claimants, will lead to increased modification to IT, additional training for the Benefits Team



	and an additional set of regulations to be prepared and implemented.
	Loss of reputation to the council in that it would show a lack of support to those in most financial hardship.

**7. Recommendations**

It is recommended that the Members consider the two options and agree to Option 1 being to adopt the scheme for 2023/24 based on the 2022/23 scheme adjusted for the uprating of incomes and allowances for 2023-24.

**8. Local Council Tax Support Scheme 2024/25**

It is recognised that whatever decision is reached this would only be a scheme for 2023/24. 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 – Local Council Tax Support Scheme 2023/24 - EQUALITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT**

<p><b>Name, brief description and objectives of policy, procedure, function?</b></p>	<p>For Council to agree the Local Council Tax Support Scheme for West Lindsey DC for 2023/24.</p> <p>To ensure that all council tax payers are treated fairly under the local scheme.</p> <p>To ensure that council tax support is payable to the most vulnerable residents of the district.</p>
<p><b>Have you consulted on the policy, procedure, function and if so, what were the outcomes?</b></p>	<p>Consultation has taken place with Lincolnshire County Council and the Crime and Police Commissioner for Lincolnshire who have both agreed to the recommendation.</p> <p>Consultation has taken place digitally with the residents of West Lindsey and the majority of people who completed the consultation agreed with the process of applying the 2023-24 upratings of income and allowances.</p>
<p><b>What barriers may these individuals or groups face, and how can you promote equality (where possible)</b></p>	
<p><b>Gender</b></p>	<p>There is no evidence that this policy would impact on people in any way because of this characteristic.</p>
<p><b>Age</b></p>	<p>Working age claimants of Council Tax Support may receive a reduced level of assistance as compared with the former Council Tax Benefit Scheme. This scheme aims to redistribute support and be more generous to those applicants on the lowest incomes.</p> <p>The government has stated that council tax support for older people will not be reduced as a result of the introduction of the council tax reduction scheme reform. This is because the government wants to ensure that low income pensioners, who would struggle to pay council tax without additional support, and whom the government does not expect to work to increase their income, will continue to receive support for their council tax.</p> <p>Pensioner protection will be achieved by keeping in place national rules which broadly replicate the former council tax benefit scheme.</p>

<b>Disability</b>	There is no evidence that this scheme would impact on people in any way because of this characteristic except in the case of War Pension and those claimants receiving a Disability Benefit who are protected by the Government.
<b>Race</b>	There is no evidence that this policy would impact on people in any way because of this characteristic.
<b>Religion or Belief</b>	There is no evidence that this policy would impact on people in any way because of this characteristic.
<b>Sexual Orientation</b>	There is no evidence that this policy would impact on people in any way because of this characteristic.
<b>Gender Reassignment</b>	There is no evidence that this policy would impact on people in any way because of this characteristic.
<b>Pregnancy, maternity or paternity</b>	There is no evidence that this policy would impact on people in any way because of this characteristic.
<b>Marriage and Civil Partnership</b>	There is no evidence that this policy would impact on people in any way because of this characteristic.
<b>Rural Isolation</b>	There is no evidence that this policy would impact on people in any way because of this characteristic.
<b>Socio-economic factors</b>	There is no evidence that this scheme would impact on people in any way because of this characteristic. However, any person unable to complete the application form will be offered assistance from the Benefits Teams in completing the application form and also be signposted to outside agencies such as Citizens Advice and Money Advice Service
<b>Other (eg: those with dependants/caring responsibilities, asylum seeker and refugee communities, children in the care system etc)</b>	There is no evidence that this scheme would impact on people in any way because of this characteristic. However, any person unable to complete the local council tax support application form will be offered assistance from the Benefits Team in completing the form and also be signposted to outside agencies such as Citizens Advice and Money Advice Service
<b>Is there any evidence or research that demonstrates why some individuals or groups are, or are not, affected?</b>	There is no evidence or research available. This policy is based on nationally applicable legislation and it covers all applicants who must all meet a set of standards and criteria intended to ensure that evidence of hardship justifies a reduction in council tax liability.

<p><b>If there is a potential adverse impact, please state why and whether this is justifiable.</b></p>	<p>There is no potential adverse impact from this policy.</p>
<p><b>Outcome of EIA</b></p>	<p> <b>No major change needed</b> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>      <b>Adverse impact but continue</b> <input type="checkbox"/>  <b>Adjust the policy /proposal</b> <input type="checkbox"/>      <b>Stop and remove the policy/proposal</b> <input type="checkbox"/> </p>
<p><b>How will you monitor your policy, procedure, function to ensure there is no adverse effect on the protected characteristics (eg: gender, age, etc) in the future?</b></p>	<p>Due to the nature of the reductions in the level of support, all working age claimants have the potential to have reductions in their support, however, they can be considered for further assistance under the exceptional hardship policy.</p>

age 36



**Corporate Policy &  
Resources Committee**

**Thursday, 15 December  
2022**

**Subject: Recommendation from the Community Awards Panel - 2023  
Award Proposal**

Report by:	Chairman and Members of the Community Awards Panel
Contact Officer:	Ele Snow Senior Democratic and Civic Officer  Ele.Snow@west-lindsey.gov.uk
Purpose / Summary:	To approve the recommendation from the Community Awards Panel to sponsor an award within an existing awards scheme in lieu of holding a West Lindsey District Council Community Awards ceremony in 2023

**RECOMMENDATION(S):**

- 1. That the recommendation from the Community Awards Panel, to sponsor an award within an existing awards scheme, in lieu of holding a West Lindsey District Council Community Awards Ceremony in 2023, be approved in principle; and**
- 2. That, subject to approval of recommendation 1, Officers continue to meet with the Community Awards Panel to determine details of the sponsored award; and**
- 3. That, subject to approval of the above two recommendations, final details of the sponsored award, and how to submit nominations, be communicated to Members via the Member Newsletter.**

## IMPLICATIONS

### **Legal:**

(N.B.) Where there are legal implications the report **MUST** be seen by the MO

### **Financial: FIN/118/23/SL**

Within the civic budgets, there is a maximum amount of £1500 allocated to hosting and delivering the Community Awards scheme. The approval of the recommendation before the Committee would enable the Community Awards budget to be redirected into a sponsored award in lieu of a 2023 ceremony.

### **Staffing:**

Organisation and delivery of the Community Awards scheme sits within the existing resources of the Democratic Services Team. There would be no staffing implications arising from the approval of this proposal.

### **Equality and Diversity including Human Rights:**

The premise behind sponsoring an award within an existing scheme would continue the West Lindsey District Council ethos of being open to all. Nominations for the sponsored award would be reviewed on their own merits.

### **Data Protection Implications:**

Data requested for nominations would be held and used for the sole purpose of determining an award winner and notifying them as such. It would be anticipated that much of this data would be under the control of the award scheme operators. Applications would be made direct to the event organiser and not handled by WLDC.

### **Climate Related Risks and Opportunities:**

Traditional arrangements for the Community Awards Ceremony would see people from all over the district travelling to one place, with climate implications re use of carbon emitting transport. The proposal provides an opportunity to reduce those emissions by sponsoring a single award (fewer people travelling) and by joining with an existing scheme (one ceremony creating travel emissions rather than two.)

### **Section 17 Crime and Disorder Considerations:**

N/A

**Health Implications:**

There are no health implications arising from this report, however, it is recognised that there is a positive impact on a person’s wellbeing in being nominated or winning an award. The Panel is keen to support ongoing recognition for the people of West Lindsey.

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

Wherever possible please provide a hyperlink to the background paper/s  
If a document is confidential and not for public viewing it should not be listed.

**Risk Assessment:**

N/A

**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

- 1.1 For the past decade, West Lindsey District Council has run an awards scheme in order to recognise the dedication and achievements of individuals, community groups, volunteers and Parish Councils across the district. There have been a variety of award categories, developing over time to reflect the changing nature of community involvement.
- 1.2 The last 'in person' awards ceremony was held at Hemswell Court in 2019. The 2020 ceremony was required to be cancelled as a result of the Covid-19 pandemic. Because of the national lockdown restrictions, winners of the award categories received their trophies without ceremony, with recognition being publicised via social media and the WLDC website.
- 1.3 Subsequent meetings of the Community Awards Panel discussed options for a 2021 Awards Ceremony, and similar in 2022, at length. Members of the Panel were cautious of undertaking such a ceremony, initially due to ongoing uncertainty in 2021 regarding national lockdown restrictions, whilst also recognising that there had been so many 'Community Champions' during the pandemic, it was felt to be somewhat counterintuitive seeking nominations for a limited number of award categories. For these reasons, the Community Awards did not take place in 2021 or 2022.
- 1.4 With this year fast disappearing, Officers convened a meeting of the Community Awards Panel which took place on Tuesday 15 November. The meeting was quorate with a unanimous recommendation arising from in depth discussions.

## **2 Meeting of the Community Awards Panel**

- 2.1 Members of the Community Awards Panel, at their meeting on 15 November 2022, were requested to provide Officers with a clear mandate in relation to the 2023 ceremony. It was recognised that support for the Community Awards had been waning even prior to the pandemic, with nominations tending to be received from the same individuals and in relation to the same groups, councils, volunteers.
- 2.2 Members of the Panel were advised that it would be necessary for any ceremony to be held prior to the commencement of the pre-election period (commonly known as purdah), this being due to commence on 13 March 2023.
- 2.3 It was acknowledged, and Members were keen to highlight, that there was great work undertaken across the district and they continued to want to recognise that, whilst voicing concerns regarding the success, or otherwise, of recent ceremonies.
- 2.4 It was also acknowledged that there were a number of successful award schemes across the district and Lincolnshire, some of which, such as the Business Awards and Lincs Care Awards, were already supported by West Lindsey District Council.



### **3 Proposals for the West Lindsey District Council Community Awards Ceremony 2023**

3.1 Based on discussions of the Community Awards Panel, it was suggested to Members that there were three options available to them, those being:

- to proceed with the Community Awards 2023, culminating in an Awards Ceremony to take place prior to 13 March 2023; or
- not to proceed with the Community Awards 2023, whilst requesting Officers to undertake a full review of the scheme; or
- seeking an alternative option such as the sponsorship of an award within an existing, well supported, awards scheme (such as the Business Awards, Lincs Care Awards or Lincs FM county-wide awards).

3.2 Based on these options, and given the desire to continue to recognise groups and individuals across the district, Members did not wish to cancel the awards completely for another year. However, there was an acceptance that the previous iterations of the Community Awards had been decreasingly successful.

3.3 The Community Awards Panel was therefore minded to agree the exploration of the third option, that being to seek sponsorship of an award within an existing awards scheme, suggesting that this would provide a suitable alternative for 2023 as the Council, and communities alike, moved away from the restrictions of the pandemic and returned to 'business as usual'.

3.4 It was suggested that this option be explored for 2023, with further work undertaken by Officers to ascertain future options for 2024 onwards.

3.5 Panel Members expressed their hope that West Lindsey District Councillors be involved in identifying nominees for the sponsored award.

### **4 Conclusion**

4.1 Whilst the proposal will fall within the budget already allocated, given the deviation from a previously agreed annual event, and in the absence of national or local restrictions preventing the event taking place in its usual guise, the Community Awards Panel is seeking support and approval from the Corporate Policy and Resources Committee, as its parent Committee, that:

- the recommendation from the Community Awards Panel to sponsor an award within an existing awards scheme, in lieu of holding a West Lindsey District Council Community Awards Ceremony in 2023, be approved in principle; and

- subject to approval of recommendation 1, Officers continue to meet with the Community Awards Panel to determine details of the sponsored award; and
- subject to approval of the above two recommendations, final details of the sponsored award, and how to submit nominations, be communicated to Members via the Member Newsletter.



**Corporate Policy &  
Resources Committee**

**Thursday, 15 December  
2022**

**Subject: Amendments to approved Committee Timetable arising from the earlier commencement of the pre-election period in West Lindsey**

Report by:

Chief Executive

Contact Officer:

Katie Storr  
Democratic Services & Elections Team Manager

katie.storr@west-lindsey.gov.uk

Purpose / Summary:

To approve amendments to the agreed Committee Timetable as a result of the earlier commencement of the pre-election period in West Lindsey.

## **RECOMMENDATION(S):**

**That Committee approves the following changes to the 2022/23 approved timetable, due to the Pre-Election period now starting on the 13 March 2023 namely: -**

- (a) that the meeting of the Prosperous Communities Committee currently scheduled for 21 March 2023 be moved to Tuesday 7 March 2023; and**
- (b) that the meeting of the Corporate Policy and Resources Committee currently scheduled for 23 March 2023 be moved to Wednesday 8 March 2023.**

## IMPLICATIONS

### **Legal:**

The Local Government Act 1972 requires the Council to agree and publish a schedule of meeting dates.

The Head of Paid Service's delegation does not extend to amending already approved dates.

The pre-election period commences when the notice of election is published – this must be published 35 days before the election but can be published earlier by decision of the Returning Officer. West Lindsey will be calling their elections early on 13 March 2022, alongside some other Lincolnshire Authorities.

### **Financial : FIN/116/23**

This proposal does not change the total number of meetings and therefore there is no additional financial impact.

### **Staffing :**

The early calling of the election will assist in allowing additional time to process what is anticipated to be large volume of nominations at time of considerable change within the service.

### **Equality and Diversity including Human Rights :**

None arising from this report

### **Data Protection Implications :**

None arising from this report

### **Climate Related Risks and Opportunities:**

This proposal does not change the total number of meetings so has a no greater either positive or negative impact on the travel etc.

### **Section 17 Crime and Disorder Considerations:**

None arising from this report

**Health Implications:**

None arising from this report

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

Pre-Election Period guidance – LGA  
the Code of Recommended Practice on Local Authority Publicity

**Risk Assessment :**

**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 The Council is required under the Local Government Act 1972 to produce a schedule of its meetings. Corporate Policy and Resources are responsible for approving that timetable (schedule) annually, having approved the timetable for 22/23 at its meeting on 14 April 2022.

## 2. Reason for Changes

- 2.1 The need has arisen to amend two dates within that timetable, as a result of a decision, having been taken by a number of Lincolnshire Returning Officers to publish the Notice of Election in May 2023 earlier than the statutory 35 days required, the impact being, the pre-election period (historically and commonly referred to as purdah) commences earlier.

- 2.2 This decision has been taken given the changes arising from the Elections Bill and the introduction of voter ID, which will result in additional duties and tasks on the Electoral Registration and Elections Team and the fact that all 700 plus seats across the District are up for election. Calling the election early means the nomination period is extended by two weeks thereby allowing greater time for candidates to submit nominations and for the teams to process them, alongside the other changes being implemented into the Service at this time.

- 2.3 The pre-election period will therefore now commence on Monday 13 March 2023 in West Lindsey. During the pre-election period, extra sensitivities around communications and large decisions need to be considered. Two of the Council's key policy Committees' meetings, as a result of this early calling of election, are currently scheduled within that pre-election period namely: -

- Prosperous Communities Committee on 21 March 2023; and
- Corporate Policy and Resources Committee on 23 March 2023.

- 2.4 Whilst the Head of Paid Service has a number of delegations in relation to the Committee timetable, as set out at page Part IV- Page 32 of the Constitution, namely:

- “9. In the event of extreme inclement weather; or insufficient business to warrant calling a meeting or other unforeseen circumstance including periods of national mourning/national emergencies to **cancel or postpone** a meeting of the Council, a committee, sub-committee etc. or, where business dictates that **a meeting, not already set out in the timetable, be required** to be held, that meeting be called, in consultation with the relevant Chairman.

This delegation does not extend to changing already approved dates, in order that the delegation does not compete with the legal requirement to produce a schedule of meetings (ref 1.1 above).

- 3.1 To ensure any risks during the pre-election period are removed the Corporate Policy and Resources Committee are therefore asked to approve the following changes to the timetable:-
- (a) that the meeting of the Prosperous Communities Committee currently scheduled for 21 March 2023 be moved to Tuesday 7 March 2023; and
  - (b) that the meeting of the Corporate Policy and Resources Committee currently scheduled for 23 March 2023 be moved to Wednesday 8 March 2023.

**CP&R Work Plan (as at 7 December 2022)**

**Purpose:**

This report provides a summary of items due at upcoming meetings.

**Recommendation:**

1. That Members note the contents of this report.

Date	Title	Lead Officer	Purpose of the report	Date First Published
<b>15 DECEMBER 2022</b>				
15 Dec 2022	Council Debt Write Offs 2022/232	Alison McCulloch, Revenues Manager	Write offs for council debts including council tax, business rates, sundry debtor accounts and housing benefit overpayments.	02 November 2022
15 Dec 2022	Recommendation from the Community Awards Panel - 2023 Award Proposal	Ele Snow, Senior Democratic and Civic Officer	To approve the recommendation from the Community Awards Panel to sponsor an award within an existing awards scheme in lieu of holding a West Lindsey District Council Community Awards ceremony	
15 Dec 2022	Amendments to approved Committee Timetable arising from the earlier commencement of the pre-election period in West Lindsey	Katie Storr, Democratic Services & Elections Team Manager	to amend 2 Committees dates in the agreed Committee timetable as a result of purdah starting earlier across the district. The ability to change cttee dates falls outside of the HPS's delegation	
15 Dec 2022	Potential RAF Scampton Purchase	Sally Grindrod-Smith, Director Planning, Regeneration & Communities	For Committee to decide whether to purchase RAF Scampton and determine the outcome of the competitive dialogue process to procure a development partner	02 November 2022
23 Jan 2023	Local Council Tax Support Scheme 2023/24	Alison McCulloch, Revenues Manager	Local Council Tax Support Scheme	02 November 2022

Page 48



**9 FEBRUARY 2023**

9 Feb 2023	Commercial Waste Solutions Business Plan	Elaine Bilton, Senior Waste Administration Officer	Annual service business plan	21 September 2022
9 Feb 2023	Budget and Treasury Monitoring Quarter 3 2022/2023	Sue Leversedge, Business Support Team Leader	This report sets out the revenue, capital and treasury management activity from 1 April 2021 to 31 December 2022.	20 July 2022
9 Feb 2023	Corporate Policy and Resources Committee Draft Budget 2023/24 & estimates to 2027/28	Sue Leversedge, Business Support Team Leader	The report sets out details of the overall Draft Revenue Budget 2023/2024 including that of this Committee and those recommended by the Prosperous Communities Committee for the period 2023/2024, and estimates to 2027/2028 to be included in the Medium Term Financial Plan.	20 July 2022
9 Feb 2023	Safeguarding Policy	Grant White, Enterprising Communities Manager	To approve updated council safeguarding policy.	21 September 2022
9 Feb 2023	2023/24 Measure and Target Setting for Progress and Delivery	Claire Bailey, Assistant Planning Services Team Manager	2023/24 Measure and Target Setting for Progress and Delivery.	02 November 2022
9 Feb 2023	Committee Timetable 2023/24 for approval (Draft timetables for 24/25, 25/26, 26/27)	Katie Storr, Democratic Services & Elections Team Manager	To approve the Committee timetable for 2023/24 and to note the indicative committee dates for the following 3 civic years	02 November 2022
9 Feb 2023	IT Policy Update	Cliff Dean, ICT Manager	Policy updates and approval.	
9 Feb 2023	Community Grants Programme	Grant White, Enterprising Communities Manager	To approve financial resources for continuation of the Community Grants Programme including the Councillor Initiative Fund.	

---

**23 MARCH 2023 DATE TO BE CHANGED**

---

23 Mar 2023	Land and Investment Policy	Gary Reeve, Property & Assets Manager	Policy document that considers the strategic approach to acquisition, management, retention and disposal of investment property assets held for income generation (yield), local area regeneration and regional business support	20 July 2022
23 Mar 2023	Levelling Up Fund Public Realm Options	Sally Grindrod-Smith, Director Planning, Regeneration & Communities, Amy Potts, Senior Project Support Officer, Matthew Snee, Community Engagement Officer	A report detailing the business case and options for Public Realm interventions (Market, Park and Pocket Park) for member approval following on from recommendation in report from 1st June 2022.	21 September 2022
23 Mar 2023	West Lindsey District Council Draft Corporate Plan, 2023-2027	Ellen King, Senior Performance Officer	The Council's Corporate Plan, 2019-2023 is due to be refreshed for the period 2023-2027. This report presents the proposed new Corporate Plan for approval in draft form by the Corporate Policy and Resources Committee.	02 November 2022

---

By virtue of paragraph(s) 1,2,3 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A of the Local Government Act 1972.

Document is Restricted

By virtue of paragraph(s) 3 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A of the Local Government Act 1972.

Document is Restricted

Document is Restricted

Document is Restricted

By virtue of paragraph(s) 3 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A  
of the Local Government Act 1972.

Document is Restricted

By virtue of paragraph(s) 3 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A  
of the Local Government Act 1972.

Document is Restricted



By virtue of paragraph(s) 3 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A  
of the Local Government Act 1972.

Document is Restricted

Document is Restricted

Document is Restricted

By virtue of paragraph(s) 3 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A  
of the Local Government Act 1972.

Document is Restricted

Document is Restricted

Document is Restricted

By virtue of paragraph(s) 3 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A  
of the Local Government Act 1972.

Document is Restricted

Document is Restricted



By virtue of paragraph(s) 3 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A  
of the Local Government Act 1972.

Document is Restricted

Document is Restricted