

**Present:** Councillor Jackie Kirk (*in the Chair*),  
Councillor Jane Loffhagen, Councillor Liz Maxwell,  
Councillor Ralph Toofany, Councillor Pat Vaughan and  
Councillor Keith Weaver

**Apologies for Absence:** Councillor Andy Kerry

**10. Confirmation of Minutes - 26 June 2017**

RESOLVED that the minutes of the meeting held on 26 June 2017 be confirmed.

**11. Declarations of Interest**

No declarations of interest were received.

**12. Non Domestic Rate: Discretionary Relief Scheme - 2017 18 Options**

Claire Moses, Interim Head of Revenues and Benefits (Shared Service for Lincoln and North Kesteven)

- a. presented for comment and consideration a report on the implementation of a Non- Domestic Rate Discretionary Relief Scheme for the financial year 1 April 2017 to 31 March 2018.
- b. advised that there had been an establishment of a £300m discretionary fund over four years from 2017/18, to support those businesses that faced the steepest increases in their business rate bill as a result of the 2017 revaluation.
- c. gave a brief overview of the background to the report advising that full details of the Supporting Small Businesses Relief Scheme and Support for Pubs scheme was detailed at appendix 3 of the report.
- d. advised that for the new Discretionary Relief Scheme the total grant distributions for the City of Lincoln Council over the 4 years would be:
  - 2017/18: £198,000
  - 2018/19: £96,000
  - 2019/ 20: £40,000
  - 2020/21: £6,000
- e. referred to appendix 1 of the report and outlined the 6 options proposed for implementing a Non- Domestic Rate Discretionary Relief Scheme for the financial year 1 April 2017 to 31 March 2018.
- f. advised that consultation on the proposals would need to take place with the major precepting authorities to provide details of the options being considered by the Council.
- g. highlighted the exclusions at 4.11 of the report that had been identified and factored into the options set out in Appendix A of the report.

- h. referred to paragraph 4.12 of the report and highlighted that there were 640 properties that could be entitled to relief under any scheme.
- i. referred to paragraph 4.16 of the report and explained how the scheme would be publicised and that any relief would only be awarded once the ratepayer had returned a form and declared any relief awarded that would not exceed the state aid limit.
- j. advised that option 5 was the preferred option for implementation in 2017/18.
- k. invited members questions and comments.

**Question** – What information would be included in the letter sent to the businesses?

**Response** – The letter would include a banding figure and it would be made clear to individual businesses the amount of relief that they would receive.

**Question** – Were the businesses aware of the increase in their business rates?

**Response** – Businesses had received their bill for 2017 so they were aware of the increase, an update would be added to the website on the discretionary relief scheme.

**Question** – Referred to option 5 and commented that there was a small amount of relief given to the businesses in the £3k - £4k and £4k plus bill increase.

**Response** - The amount of extra relief received under the scheme was calculated on a percentage basis, it was felt that if there was an underspend it could be used to top up the amount of relief given.

**Question** – What would happen after 4 years when there was no further funding?

**Response** – We would be liaising with businesses over the next 3 years and would consider alternative options.

**Question** – Would it be better to save the extra money in the pot and use it for businesses who needed extra support.

**Response** – It was an option, there would be further options brought through committee over the next 3 years.

RESOLVED that Policy Scrutiny Committee support option 5 for implementing a Non-Domestic Discretionary Relief Scheme for the financial year 1 April 2017 to 31 March 2018.

### 13. Arboretum - Designated Public Place Order Review

Sam Barstow, Public Protection and Anti-Social Behaviour Service Manager

- a. presented the report to address the remaining DPPO which covered the Arboretum.
- b. advised that the ASB Crime and Police Act required that all DPPO's made under the old legislation needed to either be converted or repealed within three years of the enactment.

- c. referred to paragraph 3 and advised on the background to the report highlighting the reasonable grounds that must be met to make a PSPO order.
- d. referred to table 4.4 of the report which set out the level of issues, broken down to total ASB and alcohol related ASB incidents over the previous 3 years.
- e. summarised that the data did not represent a compelling case which could support the introduction of a PSPO.
- f. further advised that the enforcement of a PSPO would be challenging to justify and deliver based on the limited levels of reports. It would not be currently practical for Council officers to deliver the enforcement within the resources currently available.
- g. advised that consultation had taken place through local boards and the Park Advisory Group and it was clear that members of these boards would like to see the introduction of a PSPO however most accepted that the evidence did not exist.
- h. advised that the figures would be kept under review and the position could be revised at any time.
- i. further advised that agencies had a frequent established meeting structure to discuss both individuals and areas of concerns and it would therefore monitor through its partners, relevant issues in the area.
- j. invited member's questions and comments.

**Question** – What were residents views based on when they expressed concern about repealing the order?

**Response** – It was based on anecdotal views as they had seen people drinking in the Arboretum.

**Question** – There were regularly people sleeping in the Arboretum, was there any evidence of drinking and drugs?

**Response** – The reporting of incidents in the Arboretum needed to be encouraged, if the reporting of incidents rose it would provide an evidence base.

**Question** – Why was there a lack of people reporting incidents?

**Response** – There could be a number of reasons why people did not report incidents including a perception that nothing would get done. Reports needed to happen to find a solution.

**Question** – Would a PSPO cost the Council extra money?

**Response** – It would cost for extra signage and also the Council would have to enforce the PSPO as the Police would not put any extra resources into enforcing it.

**Comment** – A multi-agency response would be more effective than enforcement, issues may be resolved more effectively.

**Question** – Had responses been received from the ward Councillors?

**Response** – Ward Councillors had been consulted with and given the opportunity to comment on the proposal.

**Question** – What was the process for putting a PSPO in place?

**Response** – There needed to be an established evidence base, a consultation exercise would need to take place and it would then go to Policy Scrutiny Committee and Executive.

RESOLVED that the proposal to withdraw the DPPO and to monitor the Arboretum area be supported.

**14. Animal Welfare Policy (Inc Welfare Statement)**

Sam Barstow, Public Protection and Anti-Social Behaviour Manager

a) gave a presentation on the draft Animals Policy and covered the following key points:

- a. Animal Welfare Charter
- b. The Role of the Council
- c. Policy Overview
- d. Aims and Objectives
- e. Welfare Statement
  - i. Covered a range of subjects that the Council did not always have a direct role.
- f. Policy areas covered by the Council
  - i. Dogs
  - ii. Animal nuisance
  - iii. Horses
  - iv. Dangerous Wild Animals. Breeding and Boarding Establishments
  - v. Pet Shop licensing
- g. Combined Policy Information
  - i. Legal Framework
  - ii. Standards of Service
  - iii. Monitoring
  - iv. Review

b) invited members questions and comments

**Comment** – People were reluctant to report dog fouling.

**Response** - Significant work was being done to address this issue. It had been difficult to enforce, people needed to report the issue to customer service and the enforcement officer would visit.

**Comment** – It was good to see that the Council was making a Policy Statement.

**Question** – How closely did we work with other Authorities in relation to blood sports?

**Response** – The council was working closely with the Police and RSPCA In relation to blood sports such as rabbiting.

RESOLVED that the Policy be supported and be referred to Executive for approval.

**15. Policy Scrutiny Work Programme 2017-18 and Executive Work Programme Update**

The Democratic Services Officer:

- a. presented the report 'Policy Scrutiny Work Programme 2017-2018 and Executive Work Programme Update'.
- b. presented the Executive Work Programme August 2017 – August 2018.

- c. requested councillors to submit what items they wished to scrutinise from the Executive Work Programme and policies of interest.
- d. invited members questions and comments.

Members made no further comments or suggestions regarding the Policy Scrutiny work programme.

RESOLVED that:

1. the Policy Scrutiny work programme be noted.
2. the Executive work programme be noted.

## **16. Health Scrutiny Update**

The Chair of Policy Scrutiny Committee updated members of the business that had been discussed at the Health Scrutiny meeting held on 19 July 2017, these were:

- United Lincolnshire Hospitals NHS Trust – Care Quality Commissioning Report April 2017
- Lincoln Walk in Centre – Consultation by Lincolnshire West Clinical Commissioning Group
- Lincolnshire Partnership NHS Foundation Trust – Update
- Joint Health and Wellbeing Strategy Prioritisation.

RESOLVED that the report be noted.