

Present: Councillor Biff Bean (*in the Chair*),
Councillor Debbie Armiger, Councillor Alan Briggs,
Councillor Chris Burke, Councillor Sue Burke,
Councillor Natasha Chapman, Councillor
Martin Christopher, Councillor David Clarkson,
Councillor Thomas Dyer, Councillor Matthew Fido,
Councillor Gary Hewson,
Councillor Rebecca Longbottom, Councillor Bill Mara,
Councillor Adrianna McNulty, Councillor Ric Metcalfe,
Councillor Donald Nannestad, Councillor
Lucinda Preston, Councillor Clare Smalley,
Councillor Hilton Spratt, Councillor Mark Storer,
Councillor Rachel Storer, Councillor Dylan Stothard,
Councillor Edmund Strengiel, Councillor Pat Vaughan,
Councillor Calum Watt, Councillor Aiden Wells,
Councillor Joshua Wells, Councillor Emily Wood and
Councillor Loraine Woolley

Apologies for Absence: Councillor Bob Bushell, Councillor Liz Bushell,
Councillor Neil Murray and Councillor Naomi Twedde

30. Declarations of Interest

Councillor Edmund Strengiel declared a Personal Interest with regard to the agenda item titled 'Medium Term Financial Strategy 2024/2029'.

Reason: He was the Chairman of the Pension Committee at Lincolnshire County Council. (Also in respect of anywhere else on the agenda where the Local Government Pension Scheme was mentioned.)

Councillor Pat Vaughan declared a Personal Interest with regard to the agenda item titled 'Medium Term Financial Strategy 2024/2029'.

Reason: Both his daughter and granddaughter worked in the finance department at the City of Lincoln Council.

31. Lord Patrick Cormack - Minute's Silence

Council observed a minute's silence in memory of the late Lord Patrick Cormack.

32. Mayor's Announcements

The Mayor advised that he had visited 30 schools to date to talk about the role of the Mayor and the history of the City, which he had found to be a great experience.

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

There were no questions received.

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

Councillor David Clarkson to Councillor Naomi Tweddle

Question

Many members of the public were disappointed by this Council's failure to open the new Central Market as per the initial plans. How many stalls had been let out, with signed contracts?

Answer

This Council was committed to ensuring that the quality of the new Cornhill Market experience matched the fantastic renovation works that had been undertaken to this important heritage asset. Getting the right mix of market offer that could showcase what Lincoln and Lincolnshire had to offer, working with local, small, independent and mainly family run businesses and being responsive to their concerns, needs and timescales had indeed taken longer than expected and planned for but was a recipe for success not failure.

To date:

- Eighteen traders were in the process of signing contracts (six had been signed and were ready to seal)
- Five further stalls were under offer (going through pre-contract checks)
- The Council was actively talking to 20 businesses about letting space (including pop-ups)
- There was a large waiting list (although some of these were duplicates of stalls that had already been let e.g. coffee provision, cookies etc)

The Council would soon be making an announcement as to when the market would open.

Councillor Alan Briggs to Councillor Sue Burke

Question

What work had the portfolio holder recently undertaken in respect to the City Council's PREVENT duties?

Answer

The Council continued to attend PREVENT steering groups where the priorities for PREVENT were assessed and agreed. Staff continued to complete PREVENT related e-learning when they joined the Council and this training was refreshed every 3 years. Face to Face training options were currently being explored for frontline staff. The Council was also introducing a venue hire policy to ensure that its buildings were not used for extremism, radicalisation, hate speech or other similar activities.

Supplementary question

Please can you provide details of the number of referrals made?

Answer

The councillor would be provided with these figures by an officer outside of the meeting.

Councillor Bill Mara to Councillor Sue Burke

Question

What investment had been made within the last year directly as a result of the City Council's Social Value Policies with contractors?

Answer

Social Value investment from contracts over the last year was estimated to be in the region of £11.695m. However, it should be noted that of this £11.54m was not tangible and was derived from contractors engaging Local Employment, Local Labour, Apprenticeships and local Supply Chains. Approximately £157k had provided support to local residents of Lincoln by way of Food Bank Contributions, Community Engagement schemes such as working with local schools/community groups and Skills Days for Council Tenants.

Councillor Tom Dyer to Councillor Ric Metcalfe

Question

Could the Leader of the Council enlighten the Council with what the Labour party's position was in respect to local government finance for the City of Lincoln Council?

Answer

The Conservative Government had made cuts after cuts in public spending, and more specifically to local government spending and it was anticipated that the Conservative Government would further cut local government spending in its forthcoming budget announcement.

Supplementary question

What was the Labour party's position in respect to local government finance?

Answer

The Labour party was under no illusions on what it would inherit following the Conservative's cuts to local government finance. Any incoming Government would have to consider in detail finances for local government and consider moving to a multi-year funding settlement.

Councillor Mark Storer to Councillor Bob Bushell

Question

Could the portfolio holder please update on what the Council proposes to do about the increasing amount of unsightly graffiti around the City?

Answer

The Council had in place clear arrangements with contractors for the removal of graffiti from its property. It also offered that same service to third parties.

Unfortunately, the street scene was made up of areas with numerous owners, including other public agencies and many private individuals, whose property the City Council had little or no influence over. The Council urged those agencies or individuals who had graffiti on their property to get in touch with the Council, and to work with it, to keep Lincoln as free of graffiti as possible.

The Council also had an increasing CCTV network, and would use this, along with any other information it could obtain, to continue to work with the Police to try to catch perpetrators.

Councillor Martin Christopher to Councillor Bob Bushell

Question

Could you tell the Council where it ranked in the best and worst Councils for recycling?

Answer

Although a simple question on the face of it, it was important to understand that there were many aspects to consider and bear in mind as context to the answer.

Clearly no two Councils had identical budgets or demographic issues, and each Council therefore had services tailored to try to meet these needs. Their collection systems would therefore vary, and what was workable in one area may not be workable in another.

Over and above this the County Council, who took the city's recycling waste for sorting, set the criteria as to what they would accept as recyclable. Whilst broadly comparable across most areas of the country, things did vary, and this could also drive some variances.

To be clear therefore, the City Council's role was to have in place systems to collect the materials, as directed by the County Council, that were affordable, and contributed positively to national recycling targets. This was why it tried to work closely with the County Council through the Lincolnshire Waste Partnership.

Mindful of these important issues of context the Council regularly assessed the city's output against the stated performance of others, including what government set as our nearest neighbours. Ultimately high-level data was published accordingly.

For 2022/23, which was the most recent year for which verified national data was available, Lincoln had a recycling rate of 31.6%. The CPIFA Nearest Neighbour Group had a median of 31.4%.

The 'All England' median was 41.3%. However, it was not reliable to compare Lincoln against 'All England' for the reasons set out above, plus it should be noted that this included many unitary Councils who would be including data from HWRCs, which distorted their performance significantly.

Councillor Clare Smalley to Councillor Donald Nannestad

Question

With a huge number of people waiting for housing, and more and more people needing affordable homes turning to the Council, how many void properties does the Council currently have?

Answer

In General Needs (GN) housing at 14/02/2024, the Council had 53 in void (existing stock), the Council had other voids (34) resulting from buy backs and where it purchased additional properties to add to its stock as part of government incentives, they had to go into voids in order to be put into our lettable standard before the Council could add them to the stock. That was 0.6% of our stock being 53/7800.

As at 21/02/2024, the Council had 62 GN in void with 29 “others” that was 0.7% of our stock.

Supplementary question

Are you going to improve the time spent turning around voids?

Answer

The City of Lincoln Council was in the top 25% of other Councils, with some Councils taking over six months so the Council was currently in a good position.

35. To Consider the Following Recommendations of the Executive and Committees of the Council

(a) Medium Term Financial Strategy 2024/2029

It was moved by Councillor Biff Bean, seconded by Councillor Donald Nannestad and

RESOLVED that Council Procedure Rule 17.4 regarding the content and length of speeches be suspended to allow the Leader of the Council and the Opposition Group Leaders unlimited time to speak on Minute 35a.

Councillor Ric Metcalfe, Leader of the Council, proposed the recommendations contained within the report, as detailed on pages 21 and 22 of the agenda pack, in relation to the Medium Term Financial Strategy 2024-2029 and budget.

He reflected on strategic considerations and long-term financial sustainability, highlighting effective use of resources and demonstratable progress to support effective delivery of services and alignment with aspirations for strategic priorities. In addition, there were a number of Councils that had been served with or faced a Section 114 notice, a power given to s114 Officers within Council's to challenge the sustainability of a Council's plan. Due to the determination of elected Members, the skills of Officers and excellent financial stewardship, the City of Lincoln Council (CoLC) had not received such notice.

The Leader of the Council referred to section 4.4 of the report and confirmed that achievement for Council Taxpayers was significant when considered with the size of the authority in mind. He offered his thanks and gratitude to the hard working and dedicated staff for all achievements gained against the five strategic priorities.

Reference to achievements included, but were not limited to, growth within the City and urban regeneration projects, support for poorer households struggling with the cost of living crisis, the building of new homes and reduction in homelessness and aspirations for a carbon neutral city by 2030.

Councillor Donald Nannestad, Deputy Leader of the Council, seconded the proposition and reiterated the points made. In addition, he added that there was a series of additional pressures such as inflation, difficulties in the supply chain and the cost of living crisis, all of which affected residents. Reference was also made to the need to pay over £1million to Internal Drainage Boards in levies, which were each increasing levies or more. Circa 15% of the levies received by the Council were transferred to the Internal Drainage Boards.

The Council's housing stock was in good condition and the Medium Term Financial Strategy (MTFS) as seen at Appendix A to the report, outlined the considerable investments to be made to homes.

The Mayor, having received notice of the Leader of the Opposition's intention to propose a number of amendments and notice of the Liberal Democrats 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). He reported, however, that each amendment would be voted upon separately.

Councillor Thomas Dyer, Leader of the Conservative Group, proposed the following amendments to the Medium Term Financial Strategy, which were seconded by Councillor Rachel Storer, Deputy Leader of the Conservative Group:

Amendment 1 – Boosting the Lincoln economy

- Increase the City Council's "Events" budget by £190,000. The focus of this increase is to sustain the positive elements of the new events policy, but to also provide financial capacity to restore a new, sustainable, Lincoln Christmas Market.
- This increased budget is to be spent on increasing staffing capacity and to provide further resource for investment.
- The £190,000 will be funded by reducing a City Council budget within the DCE to £0. To keep this budget amendment in Part A, the specific service area cannot be detailed.
- Current staff working in the area proposed to have its budget removed will be redeployed into other service areas where there are vacancies. Alternatively, any redundancy costs can be funded from the earmarked reserves.

Amendment 2 – Temporary Accommodation

- The City of Lincoln Council continued to have significant difficulties with having enough suitable options for temporary accommodation within the City of Lincoln. The cost to 3rd party organisations continues to strain the City Council's budget.
- The City of Lincoln Council recognise that it must direct action to both increase the supply of temporary accommodation and to therefore support some of Lincoln's most vulnerable residents.
- The City of Lincoln Council, as part of its 24/25 budget, requests that officers put together a business plan for procuring a suitable temporary accommodation facility.
- The financing of such a scheme is to be paid back via the payments the City Council currently pay to 3rd party organisations.

Amendment 3 – Bus Shelter Investment Scheme

- The City of Lincoln Council currently own 45 bus shelters across Lincoln. There is currently no budget to maintain these assets.
- For the 2024/25 financial year a £50,000 budget, funded from the Vision 2025/2030 reserve will be utilised in repairing and cleaning these assets.
- The scheme will be reviewed at the end of the financial year and consideration will be given to permanently funding such a scheme.

It was noted that the figures contained in proposal 1 had been verified by Financial Services and were in accordance with the budget estimates included in the proposed MTFS 2024-2029.

In relation to proposal 2, subject to capacity within the relevant service area there were no direct financial implications arising from requesting that a business plan was developed. However, it was recommended that a discussion with housing colleagues was had, as work in response to the temporary accommodation pressures was already underway which included looking at suitable new accommodation. The financing of any actual scheme would be subject to a full financial assessment as part of the Council's usual governance processes.

The figures contained in proposal 3, in relation to the non-recurrent funding for 2024/25, had been verified by Financial Services and were in accordance with the budget estimates included in the proposed MTFS 2024-2029. Ongoing funding would need to be identified in the new MTFS 2025-2030.

Councillor Rachel Storer, as seconder of the motion, stated that the budget amendments were reasonable and would bring back a sustainable Christmas Market and there was a clear need for a budget for bus shelters and therefore would ask Council to support the amendments of the Conservative Group.

During the discussion on the proposed amendments, the following points were noted:

- It was commented that the proposed reinstatement of the Christmas Market had not been fully costed nor had it taken into account issues such as not being able to change or extend road closures or the safety of staff or anyone visiting the market.

- There was a need for the Government to provide additional funding for temporary accommodation.
- Several members reiterated that responsibility for bus shelters lay with Lincolnshire County Council and therefore any proposals relating to bus shelters should be directed to that council. However, as bus shelters were branded with 'City of Lincoln Council' logos, it was suggested that the state of disrepair reflected badly on the Council and therefore it should consider supporting this amendment.

Councillor Ric Metcalfe, using his right to reply, advised that he would not be in support of any of the amendments. Referencing amendment one, Council was reminded that the decision relating to the Lincoln Christmas Market was made at a public meeting of the Executive and upon advice from an independent body relating to safety, the decision to close the Christmas Market was taken. The amendment did not address how the safety concerns would be addressed.

Referencing amendment two, it was noted that the Council could not run effectively in the absence of suitable management. Housing services within the Council employed over 300 individuals and spent millions of pounds of tenants' money on a wide range of investment – under the supervision of appropriate management.

Referencing amendment three, it was reiterated that bus shelters come under the remit of Lincolnshire County Council and therefore not a responsibility of the City of Lincoln Council.

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

Amendment 1:

For (12)

Councillor A Briggs
Councillor M Christopher
Councillor D Clarkson
Councillor T Dyer
Councillor M Fido
Councillor B Mara
Councillor C Smalley
Councillor H Spratt
Councillor M Storer
Councillor R Storer
Councillor E Strengiel
Councillor A Wells

Against (16)

Councillor D Armiger
Councillor B Bean
Councillor C Burke
Councillor S Burke
Councillor G Hewson
Councillor R Longbottom
Councillor A McNulty
Councillor R Metcalfe
Councillor D Nannestad
Councillor L Preston
Councillor D Stothard
Councillor P Vaughan
Councillor C Watt
Councillor J Wells
Councillor E Wood
Councillor L Woolley

Abstention (1)

Councillor N Chapman

Amendment 2

For (12)

Councillor A Briggs
Councillor N Chapman
Councillor D Clarkson
Councillor T Dyer
Councillor M Fido
Councillor B Mara
Councillor C Smalley
Councillor H Spratt
Councillor M Storer
Councillor R Storer
Councillor E Strengiel
Councillor A Wells

Against (17)

Councillor D Armiger
Councillor B Bean
Councillor C Burke
Councillor S Burke
Councillor M Christopher
Councillor G Hewson
Councillor R Longbottom
Councillor A McNulty
Councillor R Metcalfe
Councillor D Nannestad
Councillor L Preston
Councillor D Stothard
Councillor P Vaughan
Councillor C Watt
Councillor J Wells
Councillor E Wood
Councillor L Woolley

Abstention (0)

Amendment 3

For (13)

Councillor A Briggs
Councillor N Chapman
Councillor M Christopher
Councillor D Clarkson
Councillor T Dyer
Councillor M Fido
Councillor B Mara
Councillor C Smalley
Councillor H Spratt
Councillor M Storer
Councillor R Storer
Councillor E Strengiel
Councillor A Wells

Against (16)

Councillor D Armiger
Councillor B Bean
Councillor C Burke
Councillor S Burke
Councillor G Hewson
Councillor R Longbottom
Councillor A McNulty
Councillor R Metcalfe
Councillor D Nannestad
Councillor L Preston
Councillor D Stothard
Councillor P Vaughan
Councillor C Watt
Councillor J Wells
Councillor E Wood
Councillor L Woolley

Abstention (0)

Amendments 1 to 3 were therefore declared lost.

Returning to the debate on the original motion, Councillor Clare Smalley, Leader of the Liberal Democrats Group proposed the following amendments, which were seconded by Councillor Martin Christopher, Deputy Leader of the Liberal Democrats Group:

Amendment 1 - Bus Shelter Improvement Programme

- (a) £20K to be allocated from the Corporate Repairs and Maintenance Reserve. This new programme will provide repairs, replacement and new installations where necessary across the city to City of Lincoln branded/owned bus shelters.

Amendment 2 - Pride in Lincoln Programme

- (a) £33K to be allocated from the Community Chest Fund. This funding will retain its community focus but will empower Lincoln's community by investing in targeted improvements. Funding would be allocated per member (£1K per member) and will allow local wards to invest directly in improvements to local communities, from installing new benches to making grants to community and voluntary organisations.

In proposing the amendments, Councillor Clare Smalley advised that the figures in amendments 1 and 2 had been verified by Financial Services and were in accordance with the budget estimates included in the proposed MTFS 2024-2029. Councillor Martin Christopher seconded the proposal but reserved his right to speak.

During the discussion on the proposed amendments, the following points were noted:

- It was commented that the City of Lincoln Council had previously had something similar to the proposed Pride in Lincoln Programme, which the councillor commented had worked well, however the Labour Party had removed it as part of budget cuts.
- A councillor commented on the vast financial savings the council had previously had to make, with a further £1.75million of savings required.
- It was commented that similar schemes in neighbouring authorities had worked well.

Councillor Martin Christopher, who had reserved his right to speak as seconder to the amendments, advised that an effective bus shelter improvement programme was important and a vital step for the Council. The use of public transport was essential in the achievement of net zero emissions by 2030. Bus shelters displayed the City of Lincoln Council logo upon them and as such, if a bus shelter fell into disrepair, there was the potential that the perception of the Council could be negatively affected. Referencing amendment 2, it was noted that a small pot of funding to represent a number of people individually was positive.

Councillor Ric Metcalfe, using his right to reply, advised that bus shelter in disrepair would require the deployment of considerable resource. The Council position was that there was not surplus funding within the corporate repairs and management revenue. The issue arose from a legacy element. It was not the City of Lincoln Council's responsibility nor was a financial contribution possible. It was also advised that amendment 2 would not be supported, as it was considered a duplication of the Prosperity Fund in each ward.

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

Amendment 1:

For (13)

Councillor A Briggs
Councillor N Chapman
Councillor M Christopher
Councillor D Clarkson
Councillor T Dyer
Councillor M Fido
Councillor B Mara
Councillor C Smalley
Councillor H Spratt
Councillor M Storer
Councillor R Storer
Councillor E Strengiel
Councillor A Wells

Against (16)

Councillor D Armiger
Councillor B Bean
Councillor C Burke
Councillor S Burke
Councillor G Hewson
Councillor R Longbottom
Councillor A McNulty
Councillor R Metcalfe
Councillor D Nannestad
Councillor L Preston
Councillor D Stothard
Councillor P Vaughan
Councillor C Watt
Councillor J Wells
Councillor E Wood
Councillor L Woolley

Abstention (0)

Amendment 2:

For (13)

Councillor A Briggs
Councillor N Chapman
Councillor M Christopher
Councillor D Clarkson
Councillor T Dyer
Councillor M Fido
Councillor B Mara
Councillor C Smalley
Councillor H Spratt
Councillor M Storer
Councillor R Storer
Councillor E Strengiel
Councillor A Wells

Against (16)

Councillor D Armiger
Councillor B Bean
Councillor C Burke
Councillor S Burke
Councillor G Hewson
Councillor R Longbottom
Councillor A McNulty
Councillor R Metcalfe
Councillor D Nannestad
Councillor L Preston
Councillor D Stothard
Councillor P Vaughan
Councillor C Watt
Councillor J Wells
Councillor E Wood
Councillor L Woolley

Abstention (0)

Amendments 1 and 2 were therefore declared lost.

Returning to the debate on the original motion, Councillor Bill Mara proposed the following amendment, which was seconded by Councillor Hilton Spratt:

Amendment 1 – Investment in Children’s Areas in Witham Ward

Allocate £75,000 from the Vision 2025/2030 reserve for a new children’s play park / picnic area in the Brant Road area.

It was noted that the figures contained in proposal 1 had been verified by Financial Services and were in accordance with the budget estimates included in the proposed MTFS 2024-2029, however there would be an additional ongoing revenue requirement for repairs and maintenance for any new play area. Unless additional revenue budgets were identified, this would place pressure on existing repairs and maintenance budgets.

Furthermore, it was advised that this proposal would enhance the mental health of both young people and old and also go a long way to making young people feel valued. It was also highlighted that the election labour candidate for Witham Ward and Labour MP candidate were also lobbying for investment in children’s areas in Witham Ward.

Councillor Hilton Spratt, who had reserved his right to speak as seconder to the amendment, reiterated the above and requested that Council supported this amendment.

Councillor Ric Metcalfe, using his right to reply, advised that the amendment would not be supported as no consideration had been given to the additional ongoing revenue requirement for repairs and maintenance for any new play area, and therefore adding a budget pressure. Furthermore, the appropriateness of a ward councillor bringing forward an amendment of this type was put into question, as it was not appropriate for amendments on individual ward matters.

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

Amendment 1:

For (12)

Councillor A Briggs
Councillor M Christopher
Councillor D Clarkson
Councillor T Dyer
Councillor M Fido
Councillor B Mara
Councillor C Smalley
Councillor H Spratt
Councillor M Storer
Councillor R Storer
Councillor E Strengiel
Councillor A Wells

Against (16)

Councillor D Armiger
Councillor B Bean
Councillor C Burke
Councillor S Burke
Councillor G Hewson
Councillor R Longbottom
Councillor A McNulty
Councillor R Metcalfe
Councillor D Nannestad
Councillor L Preston
Councillor D Stothard
Councillor P Vaughan
Councillor C Watt
Councillor J Wells
Councillor E Wood
Councillor L Woolley

Abstention (1)

Councillor N Chapman

Amendment 1 was therefore declared lost.

Council returned to the original motion.

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

For (16)

Councillor D Armiger
Councillor B Bean
Councillor C Burke
Councillor S Burke
Councillor G Hewson
Councillor R Longbottom
Councillor A McNulty
Councillor R Metcalfe
Councillor D Nannestad
Councillor L Preston
Councillor D Stothard
Councillor P Vaughan
Councillor C Watt
Councillor J Wells
Councillor E Wood
Councillor L Woolley

Against (13)

Councillor A Briggs
Councillor N Chapman
Councillor M Christopher
Councillor D Clarkson
Councillor T Dyer
Councillor M Fido
Councillor B Mara
Councillor C Smalley
Councillor H Spratt
Councillor M Storer
Councillor R Storer
Councillor E Strengiel
Councillor A Wells

Abstention (0)

The motion was declared carried.

It was therefore RESOLVED that the Medium Term Financial Strategy 2024-2029 and the Capital Strategy 2024-2029, including the following specific elements, be approved:

- A council tax increase of 2.92% for 2024/25.
- The Council being a member of the Lincolnshire Business Rates Pool in 2024/25.
- The General Fund Revenue Forecast 2024/25-2028/29 as shown in Appendix 1 and the main basis on which this budget had been calculated (as set out in paragraph 4).
- The Housing Revenue Account Forecast 2024/25-2028/29 as shown in Appendix 2 and the main basis on which this budget had been calculated (as set out in paragraph 5).
- The General Investment Programme 2024/25-2028/29 as shown in Appendix 3, and the main basis on which the programme had been calculated (as set out in paragraph 6).
- The Housing Investment Programme 2024/25-2028/29 as shown in Appendix 4, and the main basis on which the programme had been calculated (as set out in paragraph 7).

(b) Council Tax 2024/25

The recommendations to the Council, as set out in the report, were moved and seconded and in accordance with the Council Procedure Rule 19.7, a recorded vote was taken, the result of which was as follows:

For (25)**Against (4)****Abstention (0)**

Councillor D Armiger
Councillor B Bean
Councillor A Briggs
Councillor C Burke
Councillor S Burke
Councillor D Clarkson
Councillor T Dyer
Councillor M Fido
Councillor G Hewson
Councillor R Longbottom
Councillor B Mara
Councillor A McNulty
Councillor R Metcalfe
Councillor D Nannestad
Councillor L Preston
Councillor H Spratt
Councillor M Storer
Councillor R Storer
Councillor D Stothard
Councillor E Strengiel
Councillor P Vaughan
Councillor C Watt
Councillor J Wells
Councillor E Wood
Councillor L Woolley

Councillor N Chapman
Councillor M Christopher
Councillor C Smalley
Councillor A Wells

RESOLVED

That the following, as submitted, be approved:

1. Acceptance of the 2nd January 2024 Executive Committee recommendation that the Council Tax Base for 2024/25, as calculated in accordance with The Local Authorities (Calculation of Council tax Base) (England) Regulations 2012, be 25,669.23
2. That the following amounts be calculated for the year 2024/25 in accordance with Sections 31 to 36 of the Local Government Finance Act 1992:
 - a) £109,979,120 being the aggregate of the amounts which the Council estimated for the items set out in Section 31A(2) of the Act taking into account all precepts issued to it by Parish Councils.
 - b) £102,073,510 being the aggregate of the amounts which the Council estimated for the items set out in Section 31A(3) of the Act.
 - c) £7,905,610 being the amount by which the aggregate at 2(a) above exceeded 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) £307.98 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) £307.98 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**

A	B	C	D
£205.32	£239.54	£273.76	£307.98
E	F	G	H
£376.42	£444.86	£513.30	£615.96

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, was applicable to dwellings listed in a particular band divided by the number which in proportion was 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 2024/25 Lincolnshire County Council had provisionally stated the following amounts in precepts issued to the Council, in accordance with the dwelling bandings shown below:

Lincolnshire County Council

A	B	C	D
£1,052.46	£1,227.87	£1,403.28	£1,578.69
E	F	G	H
£1,929.51	£2,280.33	£2,631.15	£3,157.38

4. That it be noted that for the year 2024/25 Police & Crime Commissioner Lincolnshire had provisionally stated the following amounts in precepts issued to the Council, in accordance with the dwelling bandings shown below:

Police & Crime Commissioner Lincolnshire

A	B	C	D
£202.80	£236.60	£270.40	£304.20
E	F	G	H
£371.80	£439.40	£507.00	£608.40

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 2024/25 in accordance with the dwelling bandings shown below:

Total Council Tax Charge 2024/25			
A	B	C	D
£1,460.58	£1,704.01	£1,947.44	£2,190.87
E	F	G	H
£2,677.73	£3,164.59	£3,651.45	£4,188.24*

***Addendum:** Since the meeting of the Council on 27 February 2024, it had been highlighted that there was a clerical error in the total amount of Council Tax Charge 2024/25 for a Band H dwelling and that the individual elements when aggregated together should be £4,381.74.

(c) Prudential Indicators 2023/24 to 2026/27 and Treasury Management Strategy 2024/25

It was moved, seconded and

RESOLVED

- (1) That the Treasury Management Strategy for 2024/25, including the Prudential Indicators, be approved.
- (2) That the Minimum Revenue Provision Policy for 2023/24 be approved.
- (3) That the Treasury Management Practices be approved.

(d) Furnished Properties Without a Resident- Council Tax Premium

It was moved, seconded and

RESOLVED

That approval be given to the introduction of a council tax premium charge of 100% from 1st April 2025 for dwellings where:

- (a) There is no resident of the dwelling, and
- (b) The dwelling is substantially furnished.

(e) Pay Policy Statement 2024/25

It was moved, seconded and

RESOLVED

That the Pay Policy Statement for 2024/25 be approved.

36. 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, presented his report to Council, as detailed on pages 297 to 312 of the agenda pack.

In response to a question on the number of homeless cases, it was agreed that details of the proportion of that number being veterans was unknown but this would be provided to Councillor Strengiel outside of the meeting.

The content of the report was noted.

37. Planning Committee Arrangements - Western Growth Corridor

It was moved, seconded and

RESOLVED that moving forward all planning applications for the Western Growth Corridor would be taken to Planning Committee, as per the constitutional arrangements for planning decisions.

38. Proposed Amendment to the Terms of Reference for the City Council's Scrutiny Committee

It was moved, seconded and

RESOLVED that the changes to the terms of reference for the City Council's Select Scrutiny Committee, as detailed in Appendix A, be approved.

39. Thanks to Outgoing Leader

The Council took the opportunity to thank the outgoing Leader for his service to the City of Lincoln Council, which involved speeches from Group Leaders, individual councillors and a presentation.