

- Present:** Councillor Sue Burke (*in the Chair*),  
Councillor Biff Bean, Councillor Bill Bilton, Councillor Alan Briggs, Councillor Chris Burke, Councillor Bob Bushell, Councillor Liz Bushell, Councillor Thomas Dyer, Councillor Geoff Ellis, Councillor Gary Hewson, Councillor Ronald Hills, Councillor Jackie Kirk, Councillor Rosanne Kirk, Councillor Jane Loffhagen, Councillor Rebecca Longbottom, Councillor Helena Mair, Councillor Adrianna McNulty, Councillor Ric Metcalfe, Councillor Neil Murray, Councillor Bill Mara, Councillor Donald Nannestad, Councillor Lucinda Preston, Councillor Christopher Reid, Councillor Hilton Spratt, Councillor Edmund Strengiel, Councillor Ralph Toofany, Councillor Naomi Twedde, Councillor Pat Vaughan and Councillor Loraine Woolley
- Apologies for Absence:** Councillor Yvonne Bodger, Councillor Kathleen Brothwell, Councillor Andy Kerry and Councillor Laura McWilliams

**86. Confirmation of Minutes - 23 February 2021**

Councillor Ric Metcalfe proposed that the minutes of the previous meeting be confirmed as a correct record. The proposition was seconded by Councillor Donald Nannestad.

Councillor Thomas Dyer, further to advice from the Council's Monitoring Officer, could not provide a full explanation as to the reasoning but outlined that all members of the Conservative Group did not agree that the minutes reflected an accurate record of the meeting.

RESOLVED that the minutes of the meeting held on 23 February 2021 be confirmed.

Councillors Alan Briggs, Thomas Dyer, Ronald Hills, Bill Mara, Christopher Reid, Hilton Spratt and Edmund Strengiel requested that their votes against this resolution be recorded in the minutes.

**87. Declarations of Interest**

Councillor Pat Vaughan declared a Personal Interest with regard to the agenda item titled 'Medium Term Financial Strategy 2021 - 2026'.

Reason: His granddaughter worked in the Council's finance department.

**88. Receive Any Questions under Council Procedure Rule 11 from Members of the Public and Provide Answers thereon**

No questions had been received.

**89. Receive Any Questions under Council Procedure Rule 12 from Members and Provide Answers thereon**

Questions from members and answers provided were noted as follows:

(a) Question from Councillor Alan Briggs

Councillor Alan Briggs asked the Chair of the Ethics and Engagement Committee the following question:

“As Chair of the Ethics and Engagement Committee you are responsible for the Member Code of Conduct. You mentioned in your report to Council last week about Councillors interacting in a responsible and respectful way, therefore, do you believe it is appropriate for Councillors to repeatedly interrupt other Councillors during Full Council meetings? Quite clearly this is contrary to the new ways of working as set out by the Mayor. Would you have any comment for those members breaking these rules?”

Councillor Adrianna McNulty, Chair of the Ethics and Engagement Committee, said that Councillor Briggs was correct that the Ethics and Engagement Committee was responsible for promoting and maintaining high standards of conduct by members and that the Committee assisted Councillors in observing the members' Code of Conduct. The Committee also assessed and heard any alleged breach of the Member Code of Conduct but added that it was the Council's Monitoring Officer, along with the Independent Person, who had the power to determine whether a complaint merited formal investigation, and whether the Code of Conduct had been breached. Councillor McNulty reminded members that it was the Mayor at Full Council who had the absolute power to regulate and control the meeting, and their ruling was absolute. It was therefore the Mayor who had the power to preserve the conduct of all those present at meetings of Full Council.

Councillor Briggs asked, as a supplementary question, whether the Council had considered further training for those members who were unable to follow procedures, as well as Chairs of meetings in order that they could manage situations effectively.

Councillor McNulty made the point that all members were up to date with mandatory training which had been undertaken by the Monitoring Officer. The provision of any further training would be held at the advice of the Monitoring Officer or at the request of individual members.

(b) Question from Councillor Ronald Hills

Councillor Ronald Hills asked the Portfolio for Economic Growth the following question:

“To date, for the Western Growth Corridor project and its previous incarnations, what has been the total spending? Please include both staffing costs and any other associated costs.”

Councillor Neil Murray, Portfolio Holder for Economic Growth, reported that since 2007 £2,424,346 had been spent across revenue and capital budgets on the Western Growth Corridor project to date. This did not include grant funding contributions or internal staffing costs.

(c) Question from Councillor Christopher Reid

Councillor Christopher Reid asked the Portfolio Holder for Remarkable Place the following question:

“As you are aware, the Council recently had a consultation on plans to reduce the number of public toilets open across the city. With the recent announcement by the Prime Minister of the ‘roadmap’ for easing of coronavirus restrictions, could the Council commit to postponing any closure decisions on this until later in the year, to help encourage visitors and support our struggling businesses as we move out of these restrictions? In particular, I would like to see the Council commit to reopening toilets in Lucy Tower and Westgate at the very least until after the summer, as these are vital services for many visitors, and we saw with the last reopening that the limited toilet provision was something residents, businesses and visitors found very difficult.

Councillor Bob Bushell, Portfolio Holder for Remarkable Place, reported that the Council had received an excellent response to the public consultation and that consideration had been given to all views expressed as part of that exercise. It had been a useful process and the outcomes would help inform further development of proposals and next steps.

Councillor Bushell explained that the original proposal was to improve the quality of provision in the city centre, bus station, the lower high street and the Bailgate, with other facilities such as those at Lucy Tower Street, Westgate and South Park being opened up for specific events and the facilities at the Central Market being revamped to cater for males and females. Any proposed closures had included urinal facilities that catered only for males. He explained, as part of the proposals, that more signage would be introduced as well as greater use of technology using mobile applications such as ‘toilet finder’ in order that members of the public knew where public conveniences were located and accessible in the city. An alternative to the radar key solution for specific access to disabled facilities was also in the process of being developed.

Councillor Bushell gave an assurance that consideration would be given to what public conveniences could open and when in accordance with the Government’s roadmap in relation to the relaxation of Covid-19 restrictions.

Councillor Reid, as a supplementary question, asked what defined a special event and whether this could be stretched out at least for this year to support the encouragement of people visiting the city. He also asked how much take up in respect of the responses received to the consultation came from people outside of the city, as visitors made up a huge amount of the people that used car parks where some of these facilities were located.

Councillor Bushell reported that the consultation had been widespread and over 800 responses had been received, not all of which had yet been fully examined. One of the key aspects of the proposed improvements was to make facilities much more accessible, especially for people with disabilities.

In terms of events, these related to things such as the Christmas Market or Santa Fun Run in the Bailgate or the fair at South Park, where a significant amount of people were attracted to an area over a relatively short space of time. Councillor Bushell hoped that many events would take place in the city in the future and that consideration of opening up facilities would be sympathetic to them.

(d) Question from Councillor Thomas Dyer

Councillor Thomas Dyer asked the Portfolio Holder for Economic Growth the following question:

“Can you provide an update regarding the current situation with the Usher Gallery and the artefacts? And how do you propose to resolve the ongoing dispute?”

Councillor Neil Murray, Portfolio Holder for Economic Growth, wanted to be able to resolve this issue but reported that the City Council had been in discussions with the County Council for some considerable time. The City Council was keen for the Usher Gallery to retain its intended use as a gallery of art and artefacts when originally donated to the city, which he said was unfortunately not necessarily a view shared by the County Council. He was of the view that the significant collection of art and artefacts should remain in Lincoln, with the Usher Gallery kept open as a gallery and that the City Council continued to try and persuade the County Council that this was the most appropriate way forward.

Councillor Thomas Dyer, as a supplementary question, asked what timescale applied to the transferring of art and artefacts from Lincoln.

Councillor Murray responded that he did not think this would happen and that he hoped the two authorities could reach an agreement to prevent the transfer of art and artefacts from Lincoln. He added that the Usher Gallery had been left to the city but as part of Local Government Reorganisation in 1974 responsibility for the building had been signed over to the County Council as opposed to the City Council, whereas the art and artefacts remained the property of the City Council. Councillor Murray made a commitment that discussions and negotiations would continue.

(e) Question from Councillor Hilton Spratt

Councillor Hilton Spratt asked the Portfolio Holder for Economic Growth the following question:

“On Wednesday 3 March the Conservative Chancellor, Rishi Sunak, is expected to announce successful Town's fund bids. If several of Lincoln's bids are successful, what impact do you believe this additional government funding will have on the local Lincoln economy?”

Councillor Neil Murray, Portfolio Holder for Economic Growth, reported that Lincoln's bid comprised of £25 million which, if awarded, would be a huge boost to the local economy. He hoped the bid was accepted as it would transform the central market and city square in particular. Councillor Murray also made reference to the County Council's bid for improvements to the Sincil Bank area of Park Ward, especially infrastructure in terms of improving traffic flow and addressing rat-running which was a significant issue in that part of the city.

As a supplementary question, Councillor Spratt asked Councillor Murray if this money would be well spent and whether he agreed that capital investment should be undertaken on a big scale in the city, together with the county and country as a whole, in order to create employment and growth.

Councillor Murray agreed with Councillor Spratt in that Lincoln needed the kind of capital investment included as part of the Town Deal fund which would really

benefit its economy. He provided an assurance that the City Council and partners had worked well together, with the Government, to ensure that this funding was invested in the right projects that would make a significant difference.

(f) Question from Councillor Bill Mara

Councillor Bill Mara asked the Portfolio Holder for Customer Experience and Review the following question:

“As a percentage how many customer interactions are via phone, email, web form, in person or other?”

Councillor Christopher Burke, Portfolio Holder for Customer Experience and Review, provided the following statistical information in response to the question:

2018/19;

- 119,223 telephone calls – 78.61%
- 20,027 face to face interactions – 13.22%
- 12,388 emails – 8.17%
- equating to a total of 151,658 communications.

2019/20;

- 133,923 telephone calls – 82.12%
- 14,878 face to face interactions – 9.12%
- 14,286 emails – 8.76%
- equating to a total of 163,087 communications.

2020/21 (up to the end of January 2021);

- 89,580 telephone calls – 81.19%
- 127 face to face interactions – 0.12%
- 20,633 emails – 18.70%
- Equating to a total of 101,340 communications.

Councillor Mara asked, as a supplementary question, what strategy was in place to encourage more online interactions and whether customers would receive the same service whichever way they chose to engage with the Council.

Councillor Burke reported that considerable investment had been made in the City Council's IT, supporting an increase in virtual interactions and a more flexible approach to the way in which the Council provided its services, which had taken place even before the Covid-19 pandemic but accelerated significantly as a consequence. He added that the Council still had its telephone service in place which would be maintained for those who had difficulties accessing the internet, with the Council ensuring that however people contacted the Council they would receive the same very high standards of service.

(g) Question from Councillor Edmund Strengiel

Councillor Edmund Strengiel asked the Portfolio Holder for Reducing Inequality the following question:

“As the portfolio holder responsible for CCTV, I am sure you value the importance of CCTV for policing our High Street. Will you protect our CCTV from any potential city council budget cuts?”

A significant amount of work had been undertaken to protect staff from infection during the pandemic in order that the CCTV service could continue to be provided by the Council. Moving forward, the authority continued to do all it could to protect the service which had become so vital.

**90. Receive Reports under Council Procedure Rule 2 (vi) from Members**  
**(a) Report by Councillor Donald Nannestad, Portfolio Holder for Quality Housing**

Councillor Donald Nannestad, Portfolio Holder for Quality Housing, provided an update report on the work of his portfolio.

Councillor Nannestad reported that the last twelve months had been an extraordinary time for everyone, with effects of the Covid-19 pandemic impacting all aspects of life. In terms of housing, the service the Council had been able to offer had varied in relation to what level of lockdown was in place at the relevant time. Many areas had been operating in different ways and, where possible, staff had worked from home with some areas, such as supported housing services, being delivered via telephone. The report provided further details in respect of how different elements of the service adapted to continue service delivery throughout the pandemic, with updates also provided on the following:

- homelessness;
- tenancy services;
- housing repairs;
- voids;
- housing investment;
- new build and allocations;
- private sector housing;
- health.

In relation to the housing repairs service, this was a pilot project which had sought to scale back journeys from across the city. On average, a reduction of 4,200 miles a month and approximately £2,000 in fuel was being saved. The pilot had not been able to run properly in its first year due to the complexities of the pandemic and various restrictions impacting its operation but the next year would be monitored in order that a true reflection of changes to the service could be measured.

Councillor Nannestad reported that the pressure on allocations continued to be immense which showed how much the Right to Buy legislation affected the Council's ability to provide Council housing for those who needed it. He highlighted that, upon the introduction of the 1980 Housing Act, the City of Lincoln Council had approximately 11,000 Council houses for rent in the city. Right to Buy had reduced this by about 30% to approximately 7,800 with sales consistently outstripping any efforts the Council had been able to put in place to replace them. Furthermore, Councillor Nannestad reported that properties were being sold at a discount with restrictions on how the authority could spend the receipts and the vast majority of former Council houses inevitably being owned by private landlords. Private rents in the city could be around 80 to 90 percent higher compared to an identical Council property, which was a real concern.

Councillor Bob Bushell reported that feedback he had received in respect of the housing repairs pilot had been very positive. The fact that this pilot involved reducing the Council's carbon footprint by cutting out journeys across the city was

a good contribution to the Council's zero carbon ambitions. He also acknowledged improvements to the Council's fleet, highlighting the significant costs associated with electric vehicles compared to diesel equivalents at the current time, but looked forward to when the whole fleet would consist of electric vehicles.

Councillor Jackie Kirk asked if any further support would be provided to those tenants in rent arrears as a result of the Covid-19 pandemic.

Councillor Hilton Spratt reflected on the considerable financial support provided by the Government and was pleased in particular that sufficient support had been put in place to assist rough sleepers and those who were homeless. He took this opportunity to praise the work of the Housing Department who he said had done an amazing job in the circumstances throughout the pandemic. In terms of the sale of Council houses, Councillor Spratt said that people often aspired to get onto the housing ladder, with the Right to Buy scheme providing people with that opportunity, especially young people. He understood that the original intention of the 1980 Housing Act was to enable local authorities to sell Council houses and build more with the receipts, however, this was not what had happened with restrictions introduced on what Councils could do with the receipts. He agreed that local authorities should be building more Council housing. In terms of health, Councillor Spratt commended the excellent partnership working that had occurred with the health sector in respect of the rollout of the Covid-19 vaccination programme.

Councillor Edmund Strengiel agreed that the Right to Buy scheme had always been a contentious issue but was pleased that some new Council houses, albeit on a small scale, had been built in his local ward. Applications for Council housing continued to come through the Planning Committee which was positive, together with affordable units as part of new developments. Councillor Strengiel was of the view that a house sold through the Right to Buy scheme was not taking a house off someone on the Council's housing waiting list as those tenants already occupying the property were still living there. He also reflected on the number of new houses built that were classed as affordable since the reduction in the Council's housing stock from the early 1990's and queried how many new Council houses and affordable homes had been built in that time.

Councillor Ric Metcalfe reported that when he joined the Council in 1982 the Council had more than 12,000 Council houses on its books which equated for 25% of the city's housing stock whereas it now owned less than 8,000. The perception that those houses bought under the Right to Buy scheme were still occupied by the tenants that bought them was untrue in that the vast majority of former Council houses acquired through the scheme were now owned by private landlords who charged extortionate rents in comparison to rents charged by the City Council for the same size and type of property. Tenants of these properties would not receive the same security of tenure, repair or maintenance as the City Council could offer as a landlord.

Councillor Christopher Burke was of the opinion that the Conservative Government had no intention of building Council houses and instead wanted to see an increase in private rented housing, the result of which had been a disaster.

Councillor Thomas Dyer asked whether the Portfolio Holder could provide statistics as to how many Council houses had been built between the Labour

Government of 1997 and 2010 in comparison to the Conservative Government of 2010 to date.

Councillor Nannestad agreed that the Council's Housing Department had been fantastic throughout the pandemic and should be thanked by the Council for their commitment and hard work.

In terms of further support for people in rent arrears, support had been provided for Council tenants, however, this could not be applied to those in private rented accommodation due to restrictions associated with the Housing Revenue Account. It was noted, however, that the Housing Revenue Account had received no additional support from the Government throughout the pandemic. A debt respite scheme had been established to assist people in private rented accommodation which provided a period of two months where landlords could not take any action against tenants in arrears.

Councillor Nannestad reminded Council that consideration should also be given to what the Council acquired as well as built in respect of new homes. 65 additional properties had recently been bought as part of the purchase and repair scheme.

In respect of the Right to Buy scheme, Councillor Nannestad agreed with the points raised by Councillor Metcalfe in respect of the vast majority of houses bought under the scheme being owned and operated by private landlords. He understood that people aspired to own their own homes but also reminded Council that people also aspired to have a Council house, with the security of tenure and reliable maintenance and repair associated with such a tenancy. Councillor Nannestad reiterated his earlier comments regarding the impact of the restrictions imposed on Councils as to how they used receipts from houses sold under the Right to Buy scheme, with the City Council having lost over £100 million over the years in the sale of properties which it had not been able to replace. This did not take into account the significant amount of rent the City Council had lost out of as a consequence of such sales.

The report was noted.

**(b) Report by Councillor Naomi Tweddle, Chair of the Equality and Diversity Group**

Councillor Naomi Tweddle, Chair of the Equality and Diversity Advisory Panel, provided an update on the work of the Panel.

Councillor Tweddle reminded Council that the Equality and Diversity Panel was an informal advisory working group rather than a formal committee, but played a vital role in ensuring the Council embraced equality and diversity. She took this opportunity to thank all members of the Panel, together with officers for their support, particularly Heather Grover, Ali Thacker, Claire Burroughs and Kate Ellis.

An overview of the body's membership and topics considered by the Panel since February 2019 were noted, together with a commitment to working towards the Council's five equality objectives adopted for the period April 2020 to March 2024 as follows:

- Objective 1: Our services are accessible and do not discriminate on any unjustifiable grounds



- Objective 2: Local communities, partners and stakeholders are empowered to influence the way our services are provided to them
- Objective 3: Equality is at the heart of decision making at all levels within the council
- Objective 4: Our workforce at all levels reflects the makeup of the local community
- Objective 5: Equalities, social inclusion and community cohesion have all improved with our communities

Councillor Tweddle was pleased to report that the City Council's gender pay gap had reduced and continued to move in the right direction. This would continue to be monitored by the Panel which was due to meet again on 3 March 2021. Work was also taking place to ensure more gender balance on the Council's Job Evaluation Panels which would also be considered at that meeting, together with a review of the Council's Equality Action Plan.

It was reported that better, more consistent and more frequent equality and diversity training was being put in place for staff which was extremely positive given that the above objectives should be reflected across the organisation.

It was noted that Councillor Hilton Spratt had been appointed onto the Equality and Diversity Advisory Panel, which had not been reflected in the report.

The report was noted.

**91. To Consider the Following Recommendations of the Executive and Committees of the Council**  
**(a) Medium Term Financial Strategy 2021 - 2026**

Councillor Ric Metcalfe, Leader of the Council, proposed the recommendations contained within the report in relation to the Medium Term Financial Strategy 2021-2026 and budget.

He reflected on the events of the previous year and its humanitarian impact, with 123,000 deaths in the United Kingdom attributable to Covid-19, 1,500 of those cases being in Lincolnshire. In addition to this, a significant number of individuals, families and businesses had been severely impacted by the virus which had in some cases left them losing everything. He felt it was important, therefore, that in making reference to the plight of the Council's finances that it be set in that wider sobering context.

Covid-19, combined with a number of measures that the Council had to undertake due to the restrictions imposed at different times throughout the last twelve months, had led to significant costs and a dramatic drop in many traditional sources of income for the Council. Councillor Metcalfe reported that it did take some time to convince the Government that additional support was necessary to effectively prevent many Councils across the country from going bankrupt. The City Council was very well financially managed and due to its excellent financial stewardship had been able to stabilise the position and rebuild its finances for a sustainable future in line with continuing to support the Council's vision. Councillor Metcalfe took this opportunity, however, to remind Council that there were lots of financial challenges ahead and further difficult decisions to be made.

Councillor Metcalfe made reference to a recent report which had been published and documented the excellent way in which the Council had responded to Covid-

19 and how existing services and the establishment of new services had performed as part of addressing the significant challenges presented. He praised the Chief Executive, her team and the whole Council workforce, together with all members of the Council, for their part in this outstanding response and said that everyone should be very proud. Councillor Metcalfe added that this was a reminder of how this Council and other district authorities across the country knew their local communities.

Councillor Donald Nannestad, Deputy Leader of the Council, seconded the proposition and reiterated the points made in relation to the Covid-19 pandemic, adding that the last twelve months had been the most challenging in living memory. However, he was of the opinion that the Council had risen to the challenge and highlighted the following aspects of the Council's response to the pandemic as outstanding examples of work:

- the establishment of the new befriending service;
- the provision of financial assistance to housing tenants;
- the partnership approach to provision of Covid-19 testing centres;
- the allocation of business support grant funding;
- the continuation of waste collection services throughout the pandemic;
- the continuation of building new council homes.

The next step for the Council would be to focus on recovery and he wanted the city to be in the best possible position for when restrictions were lifted in accordance with the Government's plans.

The Mayor, having received notice of the Leader of the Opposition's intention to propose a number of amendments, permitted that more than one amendment may be discussed and debated at once to facilitate the proper and efficient conduct of the Council's business in accordance with Council Procedure Rule 17.6(b). She reported, however, that each amendment would be voted upon separately.

Councillor Thomas Dyer, Leader of the Opposition, took the opportunity to thank the Council's finance team for their work over the last year and echoed Councillor Metcalfe's remarks in respect of the challenging year the Council had faced during the Covid-19 pandemic. He added that the City Council had been negatively impacted by the pandemic, particularly in relation to key income streams such as car parking revenue. Councillor Dyer therefore called for a more diversified investment plan together with a variety of income streams and said that further investment, especially local investment, should never be written off.

Councillor Dyer, on behalf of the Conservative Group, added his thanks to the Chief Executive and all Council staff for their work in response to the pandemic, stating that local government had been critical. He also took this opportunity to praise the superb efficiency with which the City Council facilitated payment of grant funding to businesses and thanked all staff concerned. Councillor Dyer agreed that local authorities knew their communities better than anyone, with local knowledge and local decision making being key. This, in his opinion, stated a strong case for further devolution deals with the Government and local government reorganisation in Lincolnshire.

In terms of the Medium Term Financial Strategy, Councillor Dyer was of the opinion that the car parking strategy would be key, particularly in the context of supporting the city's high street businesses alongside the Government's roadmap

to recovery. He proposed the following amendments to the Medium Term Financial Strategy, which were seconded by Councillor Christopher Reid, Deputy Leader of the Opposition:

Amendment 1 – the increasing of Enforcement Fines:

- (a) Littering - Amendment to page 117 of the agenda pack. Appendix A. Delete £75 proposed fine for littering and insert £100.
- (b) Dog Fouling – Amendment to page 117 of the agenda pack. Appendix A. Delete £50 proposed fine for Dog Fouling and insert £100.
- (c) Breach of Community Protection – Amendment to page 117 of the agenda pack. Appendix A. Delete £75 proposed fine for Breaching of Community Protection and insert £100.
- (d) Breach of a Public Space Protection Order – Amendment to page 117 of the agenda pack. Appendix A. Delete £75 proposed fine for Breach of a Public Space Protection Order and insert £100.
- (e) Breach of S46 Notice (Presentation of Waste) – Amendment to page 117 of the agenda pack. Appendix A. Delete £75 proposed fine for Breach of S46 Notice (Presentation of Waste) and insert £100.

Amendment 2 – freeze all parking charges until undertaking a full car parking review:

Delete all proposed charges for 21/22 and insert all current rates on pages 132, 133 & 134 of the council agenda pack.

Amendment 3 – introduce one hours free parking at the Lincoln Central Car Park until the outcome of the parking review:

Delete charges for one hour parking at the Lincoln Central Car Park on page 131 of the council agenda pack and replace with “£0 until outcome of parking review”.

Amendment 4 – freeze the rent for all City of Lincoln Council managed office spaces for the 21/22 financial year:

Insert a new line on page 31 of the council agenda pack. Following 13.1 which will read “13.2 The Full Council determines that all managed office space rents will be frozen for the 21/22 financial year”.

Amendment 5 – the Council notes that freezing the remuneration of all staff earning over £30,000 for the financial year 21/22 would save £121,000:

Insert a new line on page 31 of the council agenda pack. Following 13.1 (or 13.2 if amendment 4 is approved) which will read “13.2(or13.3) The Council notes that freezing the remuneration of all staff earning over £30,000 for the financial year 21/22 would save £121,000”.

Amendment 6 – the Council to establish a “City of Lincoln Big Clean” similar to a successful scheme in South Kesteven, funded via the Vision 2025 reserve:

Insert within 6.2 on page 28 of the council agenda pack following the heritage action zone scheme “City of Lincoln Big Clean - £200,000pa”.

Amendment 7 – introduce a Plastic Free discount for Christmas Market Stall Holders:

Insert within page 143, appendix A of the council agenda pack within the “Craft/Fairtrade Discount” section add the words “/Plastic Free” following “Fairtrade” so the line will read “Craft/Fairtrade/Plastic Free Discount”.

Councillor Reid, in seconding the amendments, felt that they represented improvements to the Medium Term Financial Strategy and strongly agreed that enforcement fines should be increased in line with other fees and charges, together with Council Tax, in order that they acted as a deterrent and had a proper impact. In respect of car parking, he welcomed the car parking review but was of the view that it would be premature to impose further costs on people at the current time by increasing fees and charges in this respect, advocating a scheme of one hour of free car parking in the Central Car Park which he and his group had been pushing for some time to help incentivise people to visit the city. He felt that this proposal seemed even more appropriate for introduction alongside the Government’s roadmap.

Reflecting on the amendment in respect of the Council’s managed office spaces, Councillor Reid said that the Council needed to provide support to these business in anyway it could, with a potential increase in rents not being something they needed at the current time. He also commended the work of South Kesteven District Council in its ‘Big Clean’ scheme and welcomed the opportunity for the City Council to introduce a similar scheme. With regard to the amendment regarding a plastic free discount for stall holders at the Christmas Market, he was of the opinion that this could be introduced easily alongside discounts for Fairtrade and, in supporting the green agenda, felt that this should be put in place.

Councillor Metcalfe, as a right of reply, responded to Councillor Dyer’s point in respect of investment stating that the City Council at an early stage had sought to make a number of commercial investments in order to provide a greater financial sustainable future. He added that, unfortunately, the Government had made changes to the prudential code which made it more difficult for local authorities to work in a more entrepreneurial way but committed that the Council would continue to seek further opportunities.

Regarding local government reform, Councillor Metcalfe reported that he had a long held aspiration for a Greater Lincoln Council reflective of an area the current City Council actually served. He cited car parking as an example whereby 75% of users were people from outside of the city boundary yet did not have any democratic say on how these services should be managed. The City Council therefore provided services, such as car parking, to a much larger proportion of people who it received Council Tax for with this being a clear example of democratic deficit.

Councillor Metcalfe made reference to climate change and an assertion that the Council had made limited investment in this agenda. He reminded Council of the devotion he personally contributed to the subject of climate change as Leader of the Council, the fact that he chaired the Lincoln Climate Commission and that the Council had very recently added a Climate Change Manager to its establishment to drive the agenda forward.

In respect of each amendment, as proposed, Councillor Metcalfe made the following comments:

- Amendment 1 – enforcement fines were not meant to be sources of income and were intended as a deterrent and were reviewed on an annual basis. The proposed increase would be insignificant and would not solve the Council's financial problems;
- Amendments 2 and 3 – the Council was already supporting businesses in a very significant way in utilising its new discretion to support recovery locally. Loss of income, particularly from car parks, had been a major factor in near bankruptcy for the Council. Car parking charges had been relaxed at various points throughout the pandemic, quite rightly, but income from car parks was a vital revenue stream for the Council to provide much needed public services. To cut car parking charges would only benefit a small number of people at the expense of wider Council Tax payers in Lincoln;
- Amendment 4 – the Council had been extremely helpful and offered support to all businesses within its managed workspaces during the pandemic, with a number of schemes coming forward by way of further support;
- Amendment 5 – the Council would not depart from nationally agreed pay schemes;
- Amendment 6 – the Council already maintained good standards of cleaning in the city centre. The proposal to introduce a 'Big Clean' scheme and costs it would incur offered no merit at all;
- Amendment 7 – insufficient notice of the amendment had been received in order for necessary advice to be taken to give this due consideration but, in principle, the suggestion was good and would be explored further.

Having been proposed and seconded, each amendment was voted upon individually. In accordance with Council Procedure Rule 19.7, a recorded vote was taken for each amendment, the results of which were as follows:

Amendment 1:

<b>For</b>	<b>Against</b>	<b>Abstention</b>
Councillor Briggs	Councillor Bean	
Councillor Dyer	Councillor Bilton	
Councillor Hills	Councillor C Burke	
Councillor Mara	Councillor S Burke	
Councillor Reid	Councillor B Bushell	
Councillor Spratt	Councillor L Bushell	
Councillor Strengiel	Councillor Ellis	
	Councillor Hewson	
	Councillor J Kirk	
	Councillor R Kirk	
	Councillor Loffhagen	
	Councillor Longbottom	
	Councillor Mair	
	Councillor McNulty	
	Councillor Metcalfe	
	Councillor Murray	
	Councillor Nannestad	
	Councillor Preston	

Councillor Tweddle  
Councillor Vaughan  
Councillor Woolley

Due to problems associated with connectivity, Councillor Toofany could not be heard to ascertain which way he wished to vote for this amendment and was therefore unable to participate. His vote was therefore not recorded.

Amendment 2:

<b>For</b>	<b>Against</b>	<b>Abstention</b>
Councillor Briggs	Councillor Bean	
Councillor Dyer	Councillor Bilton	
Councillor Hills	Councillor C Burke	
Councillor Mara	Councillor S Burke	
Councillor Reid	Councillor B Bushell	
Councillor Spratt	Councillor L Bushell	
Councillor Strengiel	Councillor Ellis	
	Councillor Hewson	
	Councillor J Kirk	
	Councillor R Kirk	
	Councillor Loffhagen	
	Councillor Longbottom	
	Councillor Mair	
	Councillor McNulty	
	Councillor Metcalfe	
	Councillor Murray	
	Councillor Nannestad	
	Councillor Preston	
	Councillor Toofany	
	Councillor Tweddle	
	Councillor Vaughan	
	Councillor Woolley	

Amendment 3:

<b>For</b>	<b>Against</b>	<b>Abstention</b>
Councillor Briggs	Councillor Bean	
Councillor Dyer	Councillor Bilton	
Councillor Hills	Councillor C Burke	
Councillor Mara	Councillor S Burke	
Councillor Reid	Councillor B Bushell	
Councillor Spratt	Councillor L Bushell	
Councillor Strengiel	Councillor Ellis	
	Councillor Hewson	
	Councillor J Kirk	
	Councillor R Kirk	
	Councillor Loffhagen	
	Councillor Longbottom	
	Councillor Mair	
	Councillor McNulty	
	Councillor Metcalfe	
	Councillor Murray	

Councillor Nannestad  
Councillor Preston  
Councillor Toofany  
Councillor Tweddle  
Councillor Vaughan  
Councillor Woolley

Amendment 4:

<b>For</b>	<b>Against</b>	<b>Abstention</b>
Councillor Briggs Councillor Dyer Councillor Hills Councillor Mara Councillor Reid Councillor Spratt Councillor Strengiel	Councillor Bean Councillor Bilton Councillor C Burke Councillor S Burke Councillor B Bushell Councillor L Bushell Councillor Ellis Councillor Hewson Councillor J Kirk Councillor R Kirk Councillor Loffhagen Councillor Longbottom Councillor Mair Councillor McNulty Councillor Metcalfe Councillor Murray Councillor Nannestad Councillor Preston Councillor Toofany Councillor Tweddle Councillor Vaughan Councillor Woolley	

Amendment 5:

<b>For</b>	<b>Against</b>	<b>Abstention</b>
Councillor Briggs Councillor Dyer Councillor Hills Councillor Mara Councillor Reid Councillor Spratt Councillor Strengiel	Councillor Bean Councillor Bilton Councillor C Burke Councillor S Burke Councillor B Bushell Councillor L Bushell Councillor Ellis Councillor Hewson Councillor J Kirk Councillor R Kirk Councillor Loffhagen Councillor Longbottom Councillor Mair Councillor McNulty Councillor Metcalfe Councillor Murray Councillor Nannestad	

Councillor Preston  
Councillor Toofany  
Councillor Tweddle  
Councillor Vaughan  
Councillor Woolley

Amendment 6:

<b>For</b>	<b>Against</b>	<b>Abstention</b>
Councillor Briggs Councillor Dyer Councillor Hills Councillor Mara Councillor Reid Councillor Spratt Councillor Strengiel	Councillor Bean Councillor Bilton Councillor C Burke Councillor S Burke Councillor B Bushell Councillor L Bushell Councillor Ellis Councillor Hewson Councillor J Kirk Councillor R Kirk Councillor Loffhagen Councillor Longbottom Councillor Mair Councillor McNulty Councillor Metcalfe Councillor Murray Councillor Nannestad Councillor Preston Councillor Toofany Councillor Tweddle Councillor Vaughan Councillor Woolley	

Amendment 7:

<b>For</b>	<b>Against</b>	<b>Abstention</b>
Councillor Briggs Councillor Dyer Councillor Hills Councillor Mara Councillor Reid Councillor Spratt Councillor Strengiel	Councillor Bean Councillor Bilton Councillor C Burke Councillor S Burke Councillor B Bushell Councillor L Bushell Councillor Ellis Councillor Hewson Councillor J Kirk Councillor R Kirk Councillor Loffhagen Councillor Longbottom Councillor Mair Councillor McNulty Councillor Metcalfe Councillor Murray Councillor Nannestad Councillor Preston	



Councillor Toofany  
Councillor Tweddle  
Councillor Vaughan  
Councillor Woolley

Amendments 1 to 7 were therefore lost.

Returning to debate on the original motion, Councillor Bill Mara proposed the following amendment:

That £75,000 from the Vision 2025 fund be allocated for a new children's play park in the Brant Road Area:

Insert within 6.2 on page 28 of the council agenda pack following the heritage action zone scheme "Brant Road Play Park - £75,000".

In proposing the amendment Councillor Mara highlighted that Witham Ward had a growing population of young people who did not have many facilities within the ward, resulting in antisocial behaviour in the area. He had been contacted on numerous occasions from residents requesting the provision of a play park on Brant Road to address this issue and highlighted the benefits in relation to physical and mental health a new play park could provide.

Councillor Hilton Spratt seconded the amendment and agreed that Witham Ward had not received much investment from the City Council in this respect over the years, reflecting on marvellous facilities provided outside of the city border in North Hykeham and Waddington. He had also been contacted directly by residents requesting such a facility and agreed that the Council should listen to them.

Councillor Jackie Kirk clarified that Section 106 monies from developments usually sought to enhance areas in this way by providing community facilities such as play parks.

Councillor Helena Mair reported that the Council's Play Strategy was in the process of being reviewed and that such a suggestion should be considered as part of that wider city strategy.

Councillor Biff Bean reflected on his recent fundraising activities in respect of a closed play park in Hartsholme and a recently successful national lottery grant bid which contributed to in excess of £200,000 having been raised to date to provide facilities, which included a multi-use games area at the park. He highlighted, therefore, that there were other ways of raising funds and providing activities for communities locally without relying on the Council.

Councillor Edmund Strengiel agreed that there were limited play facilities in this area and the south of the city when compared to the north.

Councillor Christopher Burke commended Councillor Mara for the sentiment of the amendment and agreed that more play areas were need across the city, but was disappointed that the amendment lacked further clarity as to how it would be funded in the context of the Council's budget.

Councillor Metcalfe made the point that consideration of the Council's Medium Term Financial Strategy and budget was not the place for members to put

forward specific projects relevant to their particular wards and agreed that consideration of this amendment should take place in the context of the Council's wider Play Strategy.

Having been proposed and seconded, the amendment was voted upon. In accordance with Council Procedure Rule 19.7, a recorded vote was taken, the result of which was as follows:

<b>For</b>	<b>Against</b>	<b>Abstention</b>
Councillor Briggs	Councillor Bean	
Councillor Dyer	Councillor Bilton	
Councillor Hills	Councillor C Burke	
Councillor Mara	Councillor S Burke	
Councillor Reid	Councillor B Bushell	
Councillor Spratt	Councillor L Bushell	
Councillor Strengiel	Councillor Ellis	
	Councillor Hewson	
	Councillor J Kirk	
	Councillor R Kirk	
	Councillor Loffhagen	
	Councillor Longbottom	
	Councillor Mair	
	Councillor McNulty	
	Councillor Metcalfe	
	Councillor Murray	
	Councillor Nannestad	
	Councillor Preston	
	Councillor Toofany	
	Councillor Tweddle	
	Councillor Vaughan	
	Councillor Woolley	

The amendment was lost.

Debate continued on the original motion.

Councillor Ronald Hills made reference to the Western Growth Corridor which had been commented upon at the meeting of Budget Review Group and was a project that the Council had now invested £2.5 million into, without taking into account officer time. When reviewing the answer to his previous question on this subject earlier in the meeting, Councillor Hills reflected that there were three capital sums, namely the money required to build the entrance to the site, with the remaining two capital sums coming forward once planning permission had been granted for the project. The planning application had been lodged in April 2019 yet Councillor Hills could not find any reference to a live planning application on the Council's website in relation to the Western Growth Corridor. He noted that the application had been revised following comments from Lincolnshire County Council in respect of the transport policy in September 2020. He referred members to page 94 of the agenda pack for this meeting which referenced a £100,000 earmarked reserve for the Western Growth Corridor which he said was not much in the context of the cost of the scheme. Councillor Hills felt, therefore, that there was not sufficient money available to pursue the scheme and that it would be necessary to borrow. Additionally, he was concerned that necessary finance would not be available to pay for necessary infrastructure,

particularly significant structural elements such as the proposed bridge. He therefore questioned how the Medium Term Financial Strategy stood in the context of this major project, questioning its achievability and whether it would ever be realised, adding a further question as to when the planning application would be considered by the Council.

Councillor Metcalfe, as a right of reply on the original motion, reported that all of the central Lincolnshire local authorities and the County Council had signed up to the Western Growth Corridor a long time ago as a key means of delivering growth targets as the biggest sustainable urban extension in Lincoln. He explained that targets had been agreed with Government which they expected to be delivered. Councillor Metcalfe accepted that there were significant infrastructure costs associated with the scheme and the costs necessary to develop the site were very well known by the Government, adding that there was always a conundrum to consider in delivering infrastructure prior to beginning to yield gain from developing a site. This was the case for the Western Growth Corridor site, and other sites across the country, but it was his view that there needed to be public investment to realise these benefits. Another delay in respect of the project had not been down to the City Council with very unhelpful contributions from partners having been received in respect of the planning application. He was not in a position at this stage to confirm when the planning application would be considered by the Council but he hoped it would not be too long, adding that the will and co-operation from partners was there to deliver the project. Councillor Metcalfe closed by saying that the Western Growth Corridor held the future for Lincoln in terms of significant growth, infrastructure improvements and lots of other benefits to the city.

Having been proposed and seconded, the original motion was voted upon and it was RESOLVED that the Medium Term Financial Strategy 2021-2026 and the Capital Strategy 2021-2026, including the following elements, be approved:

- A proposed council tax Increase of 1.9% for 2021/22.
- The Council being member of the Lincolnshire Business Rates Pool in 2021/22
- The General Fund Revenue Forecast 2021/22-2025/26 as shown in Appendix 1 and paragraph 4 of the report and the main basis on which this budget had been calculated.
- The General Investment Programme 2021/22-2025/26 as shown in Appendix 2 and paragraph 6 of the report and the main basis on which the programme had been calculated.
- The Housing Revenue Account Forecast 2021/22-2025/26 as shown in Appendix 3 and paragraph 5 of the report and the main basis on which this budget had been calculated.
- The Housing Investment Programme 2021/22-2025/26 as shown in Appendix 4 and paragraph 7 of the report and the main basis on which the programme had been calculated.

In accordance with Council Procedure Rule 19.7, a recorded vote was taken, the result of which was as follows:

**For****Against****Abstention**

Councillor Bean  
Councillor Bilton  
Councillor C Burke  
Councillor S Burke  
Councillor B Bushell  
Councillor L Bushell  
Councillor Ellis  
Councillor Hewson  
Councillor J Kirk  
Councillor R Kirk  
Councillor Loffhagen  
Councillor Longbottom  
Councillor Mair  
Councillor McNulty  
Councillor Metcalfe  
Councillor Murray  
Councillor Nannestad  
Councillor Preston  
Councillor Toofany  
Councillor Tweddle  
Councillor Vaughan  
Councillor Woolley

Councillor Briggs  
Councillor Dyer  
Councillor Hills  
Councillor Mara  
Councillor Reid  
Councillor Spratt  
Councillor Strengiel

**(b) Council Tax 2021/22**

It was proposed, seconded and RESOLVED that Council:

- (1) Accepts the 4 January 2021 Executive recommendation that the Council Tax Base for 2021/22, as calculated in accordance with The Local Authorities (Calculation of Council Tax Base) (England) Regulations 2012, be 24,372.50.38.
- (2) Calculates the following amounts for the year 2021/22 in accordance with Sections 31 to 36 of the Local Government Finance Act 1992:
  - a) £116,497,330 being the aggregate of the amounts which the Council estimates for the items set out in Section 31A(2) of the Act taking into account all precepts issued to it by Parish Councils.
  - b) £109,541,700 being the aggregate of the amounts which the Council estimates for the items set out in Section 31A(3) of the Act.
  - c) £6,955,630 being the amount by which the aggregate at 2(a) above exceeds the aggregate at 2(b) above, calculated by the Council in accordance with Section 31A(4) of the Act as its Council Tax requirement for the year. (Item R in the formula in Section 31A (4) of the Act).
  - d) £285.39 being the amount at 2(c) above (Item R), all divided by Item T (1 above), calculated by the Council, in accordance with Section 31B(1) of

the Act, as the basic amount of its Council Tax for the year (including Parish precepts).

- e) £0 being the aggregate amount of all special items (Parish precepts) referred to in Section 34(1) of the Act
- f) £285.39 being the amount at 2c) above less the amount at 2e) above, all divided by the amount at 1 above, calculated by the Council in accordance with Section 33(1) of the Act, as the basic amount of its Council Tax for the year

g) **City of Lincoln Council**

<b>A</b>	<b>B</b>	<b>C</b>	<b>D</b>
£190.26	£221.97	£253.68	£285.39
<b>E</b>	<b>F</b>	<b>G</b>	<b>H</b>
£348.81	£412.23	£475.65	£570.78

being the amounts given by multiplying the amount at 2f) above by the number which, in proportion set out in Section 5(1) of the Act, is applicable to dwellings listed in a particular band divided by the number which in proportion is applicable to dwellings listed in Valuation Band D, calculated by the Council, in accordance with Section 36(1) of the Act, as the amounts to be taken for the year in respect of categories of dwellings listed in different bands.

- (3) That it be noted that for the year 2021/22 Lincolnshire County Council have stated the following amounts in precepts issued to the Council, in accordance with the dwelling bandings shown below:

**Lincolnshire County Council**

<b>A</b>	<b>B</b>	<b>C</b>	<b>D</b>
£909.44	£1,061.01	£1,212.59	£1,364.16
<b>E</b>	<b>F</b>	<b>G</b>	<b>H</b>
£1,667.31	£1,970.45	£2,273.60	£2,728.32

- (4) That it be noted that for the year 2021/22 Police & Crime Commissioner Lincolnshire have provisionally stated the following amounts in precepts issued to the Council, in accordance with the dwelling bandings shown below:

**Police & Crime Commissioner Lincolnshire**

<b>A</b>	<b>B</b>	<b>C</b>	<b>D</b>
£177.54	£207.13	£236.72	£266.31
<b>E</b>	<b>F</b>	<b>G</b>	<b>H</b>
£325.49	£384.67	£443.85	£532.62

- (5) That having calculated the aggregate in each case of the amounts at 2g, 3 and 4 above, the Council, in accordance with Section 30(2) of the Local Government Finance Act 1992, hereby sets the following as the amounts of Council Tax for the year 2020/21 in accordance with the dwelling bandings shown below:

**Total Council Tax Charge 2021/22**

<b>A</b>	<b>B</b>	<b>C</b>	<b>D</b>
£1,277.24	£1,490.11	£1,702.99	£1,915.86
<b>E</b>	<b>F</b>	<b>G</b>	<b>H</b>
£2,341.61	£2,767.35	£3,193.10	£3,831.72

In accordance with Council Procedure Rule 19.7, a recorded vote was taken, the result of which was as follows:

<b>For</b>	<b>Against</b>	<b>Abstention</b>
------------	----------------	-------------------

Councillor Bean  
 Councillor Bilton  
 Councillor Briggs  
 Councillor C Burke  
 Councillor S Burke  
 Councillor B Bushell  
 Councillor L Bushell  
 Councillor Dyer  
 Councillor Ellis  
 Councillor Hewson  
 Councillor Hills  
 Councillor J Kirk  
 Councillor R Kirk  
 Councillor Loffhagen  
 Councillor Longbottom  
 Councillor Mair  
 Councillor Mara  
 Councillor McNulty  
 Councillor Metcalfe  
 Councillor Murray  
 Councillor Nannestad  
 Councillor Preston  
 Councillor Reid  
 Councillor Spratt  
 Councillor Strengiel  
 Councillor Toofany  
 Councillor Tweddle  
 Councillor Vaughan  
 Councillor Woolley

**(c) Prudential Indicators 2020/21 - 2023/24 and Treasury Management Strategy 2021/22**

It was proposed, seconded and RESOLVED that Council:

- (1) Approves the Prudential Indicators detailed in paragraph 4.1 and Appendix 1 of the report.
- (2) Approves the Treasury Management Strategy, including the Treasury Prudential Indicators and the Investment Strategy, set out in paragraph 4 and Appendix 3 of the report.
- (3) Approves the MRP Policy set out in Appendix 2 of the report.

**92. Annual Timetable of Meetings 2021/22**

Councillor Ric Metcalfe proposed the timetable of meetings for the 2021/22 municipal year, which was seconded by Councillor Donald Nannestad.

Councillor Thomas Dyer indicated that he had raised some suggestions with the Leader of the Council via email, to which he had not received a response. Councillor Metcalfe agreed to respond in due course.

RESOLVED that the timetable of meetings for 2021/22 be approved.

Councillors Alan Briggs, Thomas Dyer, Ronald Hills, Bill Mara, Christopher Reid, Hilton Spratt and Edmund Strengiel requested that their votes against this resolution be recorded in the minutes.