

Present: Councillor Alan Briggs (*in the Chair*),
Councillor Debbie Armiger, Councillor Biff Bean,
Councillor James Brown, Councillor Chris Burke,
Councillor Bob Bushell, Councillor Liz Bushell,
Councillor Natasha Chapman, Councillor
Martin Christopher, Councillor Annie Currier,
Councillor Laura Danese, Councillor Thomas Dyer,
Councillor Gary Hewson,
Councillor Rebecca Longbottom, Councillor Bill Mara,
Councillor Adrianna McNulty, Councillor Neil Murray,
Councillor Donald Nannestad,
Councillor Lucinda Preston, Councillor Callum Roper,
Councillor Anita Pritchard, Councillor Clare Smalley,
Councillor Hilton Spratt, Councillor Rachel Storer,
Councillor Dylan Stothard, Councillor Naomi Twedde,
Councillor Calum Watt, Councillor Joshua Wells and
Councillor Loraine Woolley

Apologies for Absence: Councillor Pat Vaughan, Councillor Aiden Wells and
Councillor Emily Wood

53. Confirmation of Minutes - 21 January 2025

RESOLVED that the minutes of the meeting held on 21 January 2025 be signed by the Mayor as a correct record.

54. Declarations of Interest

No declarations of interest were received.

55. Mayor's Announcements

The Mayor was pleased to report on some of the activities he had undertaken since the last meeting of the Council, which included his attendance at the following:

- the funeral of former Councillor Sue Burke;
- the opening of the Lincoln Community Diagnostic Centre;
- visits to the Guildhall;
- an array of concerts and plays;
- school visits;
- the 106th birthday celebration for a resident of Stones Place, Lincoln; and
- the City of Lincoln Council's Apprenticeship Awards Ceremony.

The Mayor also thanked the Civic Team for all their hard work in either arranging the above events or enabling the Mayor to attend.

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

There were no questions received.

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

Councillor Natasha Chapman to Councillor Donald Nannestad

Question

“Given the regularity of lift breakdowns in Shuttleworth House and the difficulties this causes in particular for residents with mobility issues, could the portfolio holder share the usual lifespan of lifts and therefore when lifts in large social housing buildings might be due for replacement?”

Answer

It was highlighted that there was no recognised life span on lifts, it was when it became past its economic service life in terms of failures and available parts.

However, in terms of replacements, it was advised that with respect of Shuttleworth House, a replacement was currently in the design process. The Council was in the process of engaging with a lift consultant, which was a delicate process due to the complexity of the building.

With regards to Trent View / Jarvis House, replacements were within the 30-year business plan and would be evaluated in the coming years.

Supplementary Question

It was queried whether it could be ensured that any lift replacement would stop at each floor within buildings, rather than one lift going to odd numbers and the other within the building going to even numbers. It was highlighted that this caused significant issues when a lift was out of action, as not all floors were accessible by lift.

Answer

It was highlighted that having both lifts stop at each floor within a building would require considerable investment as it would be changing how they currently operated. However, all options would be explored and considered as part of the replacement programme.

Councillor Clare Smalley to Councillor Naomi Twedde

Question

“What does the Leader think has improved for the residents of Lincoln, following a Labour government?”

Answer

The Leader of the Council recognised that the new Labour government was only a few months into its tenure. However, the Leader was pleased to see multi-year funding settlements for local government, which had been lacking in recent years and considered an improvement, as provided a level of certainty.

The Leader also highlighted the investment made to the NHS and the reversal of the decision relating to the former RAF Scampton airbase, which would have great impact on Lincoln.

Supplementary Question

“Could the Leader provide an insight into what she feels residents of Lincoln could look forward to next?”

Answer

The Leader highlighted that it was hoped sick pay would be improved for lowest earners and it was anticipated that the Employment Rights Bill would bring other positive changes.

Councillor Martin Christopher to Councillor Naomi Tweddle

Question

“What does the Leader think about the government funding only 1/3 of the increase in NI for local councils like Lincoln?”

Answer

The Leader expressed her disappointment in the national insurance changes not being fully funded for local government, as it had put pressure on the budgets of local authorities. However, in defence of the Government, the Leader highlighted that this was owing to the challenging situation with the economy.

Supplementary Question

“Would you include the changes in national insurance contributions on your list of positives about the Labour Government?”

Answer

The new Labour Government had inherited a significant challenge with regards to addressing the country’s finances, which was a result of years of neglect, and it was therefore necessary for the new Government to make challenging decisions to address what it had inherited.

Councillor James Brown to Councillor Bob Bushell

Question

Councillor Aiden Wells has been working with a local football club to get regular organised football back on King George's Field in his ward. However, discussions have not moved forward due to a lack of capacity at the Council. Why is the Communities and Environment directorate underfunded by the Executive?

Answer

It was highlighted that officers had been in dialogue for some months with Councillor Aiden Wells and he was aware of those conversations. The Portfolio Holder spoke regularly with the director and his senior officers within Directorate

of Communities and Environment (DCE) and was conscious of the many pressures placed on the various teams within the directorate to take forward new initiatives and projects driven by the community.

Whilst it was a great resource to have active community groups championing new initiatives, no authority could resource up to tackle all such requests all at once. Members would note that the Council was in the process of finalising Vision 2030, and within that the projects that were resourced in the first 18 months were detailed. This enabled the Council to focus on delivering fewer projects, but well.

As these projects were completed, the Portfolio Holder would discuss the next wave of projects with his Executive colleagues and bring those forward as the staff resources become available. He understood the director had given reassurances to Councillor Aiden Wells that he would keep him updated as the potential project moved up the list for action.

Supplementary Question

It was highlighted that St Giles was one of the City's most deprived areas and the football team was ready to go.

Answer

It was reiterated that this would be discussed within the directorate as other projects were completed and staff resources allowed.

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

(a) Medium Term Financial Strategy 2025/2030

It was moved, seconded 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 58a.

Councillor Naomi Tweddle, Leader of the Council, presented the report and proposed the recommendations as detailed on pages 17 and 200 of the agenda pack, in relation to the Medium-Term Financial Strategy 2025-2030. Councillor Donald Nannestad seconded the recommendations and reserved his right to speak.

The Mayor, having received notice 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). The Mayor reported, however, that each amendment would be voted upon separately.

Councillor Clare Smalley, Leader of the Liberal Democrats Group and Leader of the Opposition, proposed the following amendments to the Medium-Term Financial Strategy, which were seconded by Councillor Martin Christopher, Deputy Leader of the Opposition, who reserved his right to speak:

Amendments 1 - 5

One off allocation from the Vision 2030 earmarked reserve to fund the following proposals on a trial basis to assess the impact:

- £50k into fly tipping enforcement (to issue more fines and take on the perpetrators). (*Amendment 1*)
- £40k on CCTV (additional cameras to tackle hotspots where fly tipping, ASB and graffiti are worst). (*Amendment 2*)
- £10k on community skips (so everyone can dispose of bulky goods for free multiple times a year). (*Amendment 3*)
- £15k Christmas Market restoration fund (to develop a full proposal to bring back the Christmas Market). (*Amendment 4*)
- £33k Ward funding (£1000 per councillor) for improvements. (*Amendment 5*)

It was noted that the figures contained in the above amendments had been verified by Financial Services and were in accordance with the budget estimates included in the proposed MTFS 2025-2030.

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

- A councillor stated that he was happy to support the proposed amendments and highlighted that the City of Lincoln had received one of the lowest financial settlements across the country. It was also commented that the street cleaning department had a budget underspend of circa £50k and therefore this could be used to help fund the proposed amendments. It was highlighted that there were a significant number of councils which had a councillor fund in place to enable ward councillors to fund small projects within their ward. He therefore strongly supported the proposed introduction of a councillor fund.
- Several councillors indicated they would be voting against the proposed amendments.
- It was highlighted that ward budgets had previously been allocated at the Council but these had ceased for a variety of reasons. A councillor commented that he had raised funds within his own ward without the need of a ward budget and encouraged councillors to raise funds for their areas.
- As part of Vision 2030, officers would be resourced to educate on fly tipping. Councillors were also encouraged to manage litter picking events within their areas.
- Community skips had previously been provided within the city. However, these were removed for good reasons, as they were not being used appropriately and the sites becoming a dumping ground for rubbish. It was highlighted that the Council offered a bulky items waste service for a reasonable fee. It was further noted that anyone from a low-income family or the elderly could use this service free of charge.
- It was highlighted that the Park Ward By-Election, which had been called by members of the Liberal Democrats Group, would cost the Council circa £20k, as it was a standalone election, rather than being combined with the scheduled polls in May which would have halved the cost. It was commented that the £20k could have been used to help fund some of the Group's proposed amendments.

- A councillor urged Council to vote against the proposed amendments. The Christmas Market had been discussed by Council, and it was disappointing to see a further amendment come forward from the Group. It was also commented that a significant number of residents were not supportive of a return of the Christmas Market and was pleased with the new events programme.

Councillor Martin Christopher, who had reserved his right to speak, expressed his disappointment in councillors being encouraged to litter pick, as fly-tipping could not be rectified by litter picking, owing to the volume of waste. It was also highlighted that he regularly litter picked within his area, and he estimated that he had collected between 3-4k bags of rubbish. It was commented that the proposed councillor fund would help support small projects within each ward. Councillor Christopher strongly encouraged Council to support the proposed amendments.

Councillor Naomi Tweddle, who moved the original motion took her right of reply and encouraged Council to vote against the proposed amendments. It was commented that for a Council with a multi-million budget, it would be taken as a compliment that only very minor amendments to the budget could be proposed by the opposition group. However, for the reasons already outlined by various councillors, those amendments should not be supported and reiterated the reasons why. It was further commented that the city had excellent CCTV coverage, and that Vision 2030 looked to educate residents on fly-tipping.

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 - £50k into fly tipping enforcement

For (9)

Councillor A Briggs
Councillor J Brown
Councillor N Chapman
Councillor M Christopher
Councillor T Dyer
Councillor B Mara
Councillor C Smalley
Councillor H Spratt
Councillor R Storer

Against (19)

Councillor D Armiger
Councillor B Bean
Councillor C Burke
Councillor B Bushell
Councillor L Bushell
Councillor A Currier
Councillor L Danese
Councillor G Hewson
Councillor R Longbottom
Councillor A McNulty
Councillor D Nannestad
Councillor L Preston
Councillor A Pritchard
Councillor C Roper
Councillor D Stothard
Councillor N Tweddle
Councillor C Watt
Councillor J Wells
Councillor L Woolley

Abstentions (0)

Amendment 1 was therefore declared lost.

Amendment 2 - £40k on CCTV

For (9)

Councillor A Briggs
Councillor J Brown
Councillor N Chapman
Councillor M Christopher
Councillor T Dyer
Councillor B Mara
Councillor C Smalley
Councillor H Spratt
Councillor R Storer

Against (19)

Councillor D Armiger
Councillor B Bean
Councillor C Burke
Councillor B Bushell
Councillor L Bushell
Councillor A Currier
Councillor L Danese
Councillor G Hewson
Councillor R Longbottom
Councillor A McNulty
Councillor D Nannestad
Councillor L Preston
Councillor A Pritchard
Councillor C Roper
Councillor D Stothard
Councillor N Tweddle
Councillor C Watt
Councillor J Wells
Councillor L Woolley

Abstentions (0)

Amendment 2 was therefore declared lost.

Amendment 3 - £10k on community skips

For (4)

Councillor J Brown
Councillor N Chapman
Councillor M Christopher
Councillor C Smalley

Against (24)

Councillor D Armiger
Councillor B Bean
Councillor A Briggs
Councillor C Burke
Councillor B Bushell
Councillor L Bushell
Councillor A Currier
Councillor L Danese
Councillor T Dyer
Councillor G Hewson
Councillor R Longbottom
Councillor B Mara
Councillor A McNulty
Councillor D Nannestad
Councillor L Preston
Councillor A Pritchard
Councillor C Roper
Councillor H Spratt
Councillor R Storer
Councillor D Stothard
Councillor N Tweddle
Councillor C Watt
Councillor J Wells
Councillor L Woolley

Abstentions (0)

Amendment 3 was therefore declared lost.

Amendment 4 - £15k Christmas Market restoration fund

For (9)

Councillor A Briggs
Councillor J Brown
Councillor N Chapman
Councillor M Christopher
Councillor T Dyer
Councillor B Mara
Councillor C Smalley
Councillor H Spratt
Councillor R Storer

Against (19)

Councillor D Armiger
Councillor B Bean
Councillor C Burke
Councillor B Bushell
Councillor L Bushell
Councillor A Currier
Councillor L Danese
Councillor G Hewson
Councillor R Longbottom
Councillor A McNulty
Councillor D Nannestad
Councillor L Preston
Councillor A Pritchard
Councillor C Roper
Councillor D Stothard
Councillor N Tweddle
Councillor C Watt
Councillor J Wells
Councillor L Woolley

Abstentions (0)

Amendment 4 was therefore declared lost.

Amendment 5 - £33k Ward Funding

For (4)

Councillor J Brown
Councillor N Chapman
Councillor M Christopher
Councillor C Smalley

Against (24)

Councillor D Armiger
Councillor B Bean
Councillor A Briggs
Councillor C Burke
Councillor B Bushell
Councillor L Bushell
Councillor A Currier
Councillor L Danese
Councillor T Dyer
Councillor G Hewson
Councillor R Longbottom
Councillor B Mara
Councillor A McNulty
Councillor D Nannestad
Councillor L Preston
Councillor A Pritchard
Councillor C Roper
Councillor H Spratt
Councillor R Storer
Councillor D Stothard
Councillor N Tweddle
Councillor C Watt
Councillor J Wells
Councillor L Woolley

Abstentions (0)

Amendment 5 was therefore declared lost.

NOTE: At this point in proceedings, Councillor B Bean left for the remainder of the meeting.

Councillor Tom Dyer, Leader of the Conservative Group, proposed the following four amendments to the Medium-Term Financial Strategy, which were seconded by Councillor Martin Rachel Storer, Deputy Leader of the Conservative Group, who reserved her right to speak:

1. Boosting the Lincoln Economy

To support the High Street, the proposed 12.6% increase in the two-hour parking charge at Lincoln Central Car Park would be scrapped, keeping the rate frozen at £3.33.

2. Flood Mitigation in Park Ward

Some areas of Park Ward experienced frequent flooding during storms. The City of Lincoln Council would allocate £218,000 per year to Property Flood Resilience measures, helping vulnerable residents protect their homes.

The £218,000 would be funded by reducing a City Council budget within the DCE to £0. The current staff will be redeployed into other service areas, where there are vacancies. Alternatively, any redundancy costs would be funded from earmarked reserves.

3. Investment in Park Facilities – Witham Ward

To support young people in the south of Lincoln, £100,000 from the Vision 2025/2030 reserve would be allocated to improving children's facilities.

4. Lincoln Armed Forces Day Fund

To honour and support our Armed Forces, £15,000 from the events budget would be allocated to Armed Forces Day events. This would include funding for officer time dedicated to event planning and preparation.

City of Lincoln Council Finance Comments

Proposal 1 – the financial implications of freezing the two-hour parking tariff at Lincoln Central Car Park would be £78,850pa, assuming the proposal was for a one-year freeze only. Being recurrent in nature this could not be funded from reserves so an alternative budget reduction elsewhere in the MTFS would need to be identified.

Proposal 2 – the proposed figures had been verified by Financial Services and were in accordance with the proposed MTFS 2025-2030, however there were potentially additional redundancy costs associated with this option.

Proposal 3 – the proposed figures had been verified by Financial Services and were in accordance with the budget estimates included in the proposed MTFS 2025-2030, however there may be an additional ongoing revenue requirement for repairs and maintenance for any new children's facilities. Unless additional revenue budgets were identified, this would place pressure on existing repairs and maintenance budgets.

Proposal 4 - the proposed figures had been verified by Financial Services and were in accordance with the budget estimates included in the proposed MTFS 2025-2030.

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

- Several councillors spoke in favour of the proposed amendment regarding the introduction of an Armed Forces Day and encouraged Council to vote in favour of this amendment. It was highlighted that discussions were already taking place with the organisers of the Cleethorpes Armed Forces weekend to gain knowledge and understanding on how this event was funded. The proposed funding was to aid the development of an event. Whilst several councillors supported the proposal of an Armed Forces Day in Lincoln, the amendment was considered premature and as the Council would want to support such event, it had to be arranged appropriately and not rushed.
- A councillor spoke against the amendment with regard to car parking, as the City of Lincoln Council's car parking charges were considerably cheaper than other alternative parking providers in the city.

Councillor Rachel Storer, who had reserved her right to speak, encouraged Council to vote in favour of the proposed amendments.

Councillor Naomi Tweddle, who had moved the original motion, took her right of reply and encouraged Council to vote against the proposed amendments. It was reiterated that the Council's car parking charges were lower than other providers within the city and all car parks were well used. It was highlighted that Lincolnshire County Council was responsible for flood mitigation and the Environment Agency and therefore any investment should come from both of these organisations, not a district council. With regards to the amendment on investment for park equipment in Witham Ward, it was highlighted that the play strategy should be looked at in its entirety across the city, not just in an individual ward. It was also reiterated that an Armed Forces Day for Lincoln would be explored for future years, but this would require partnership working and investment, and both would be explored.

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 - Boosting the Lincoln Economy

For (9)

Councillor A Briggs
Councillor J Brown
Councillor N Chapman
Councillor M Christopher
Councillor T Dyer
Councillor B Mara
Councillor C Smalley
Councillor H Spratt
Councillor R Storer

Against (18)

Councillor D Armiger
Councillor C Burke
Councillor B Bushell
Councillor L Bushell
Councillor A Currier
Councillor L Danese
Councillor G Hewson
Councillor R Longbottom
Councillor A McNulty
Councillor D Nannestad
Councillor L Preston
Councillor A Pritchard
Councillor C Roper
Councillor D Stothard
Councillor N Tweddle
Councillor C Watt
Councillor J Wells
Councillor L Woolley

Abstentions (0)

Amendment 1 was therefore declared lost.

Amendment 2 - Flood Mitigation in Park Ward

For (9)

Councillor A Briggs
Councillor J Brown
Councillor N Chapman
Councillor M Christopher
Councillor T Dyer
Councillor B Mara
Councillor C Smalley
Councillor H Spratt
Councillor R Storer

Against (18)

Councillor D Armiger
Councillor C Burke
Councillor B Bushell
Councillor L Bushell
Councillor A Currier
Councillor L Danese
Councillor G Hewson
Councillor R Longbottom
Councillor A McNulty
Councillor D Nannestad
Councillor L Preston
Councillor A Pritchard
Councillor C Roper
Councillor D Stothard
Councillor N Tweddle
Councillor C Watt
Councillor J Wells
Councillor L Woolley

Abstentions (0)

Amendment 2 was therefore declared lost.

Amendment 3 - Investment in Park Facilities – Witham Ward

For (9)

Councillor A Briggs
Councillor J Brown
Councillor N Chapman
Councillor M Christopher
Councillor T Dyer
Councillor B Mara
Councillor C Smalley
Councillor H Spratt
Councillor R Storer

Against (18)

Councillor D Armiger
Councillor C Burke
Councillor B Bushell
Councillor L Bushell
Councillor A Currier
Councillor L Danese
Councillor G Hewson
Councillor R Longbottom
Councillor A McNulty
Councillor D Nannestad
Councillor L Preston
Councillor A Pritchard
Councillor C Roper
Councillor D Stothard
Councillor N Tweddle
Councillor C Watt
Councillor J Wells
Councillor L Woolley

Abstentions (0)

Amendment 3 was therefore declared lost.

Amendment 4 - Lincoln Armed Forces Day Fund

For (9)

Councillor A Briggs
Councillor J Brown
Councillor N Chapman
Councillor M Christopher
Councillor T Dyer
Councillor B Mara
Councillor C Smalley
Councillor H Spratt
Councillor R Storer

Against (18)

Councillor D Armiger
Councillor C Burke
Councillor B Bushell
Councillor L Bushell
Councillor A Currier
Councillor L Danese
Councillor G Hewson
Councillor R Longbottom
Councillor A McNulty
Councillor D Nannestad
Councillor L Preston
Councillor A Pritchard
Councillor C Roper
Councillor D Stothard
Councillor N Tweddle
Councillor C Watt
Councillor J Wells
Councillor L Woolley

Abstentions (0)

Amendment 4 was therefore declared lost.

Council returned to the original motion.

During discussion of the original motion, the following points were noted:

- A councillor advised that he could not support the budget as presented, as it was very city-centre focused, and the outer city was neglected and not accounted for. It was also commented that with regard to housing investment, the Council should be taking care of its existing stock, rather than building new properties.
- It was commented that the national changes in bus fares would be detrimental to the residents of Lincoln.

Councillor Donald Nannestad, who had reserved his right to speak, spoke in favour of the original motion and strongly encouraged Council to vote in favour.

Councillor Naomi Tweddle, as mover of the original motion, took her right of reply and outlined all of the investment taking place across the City, including outer areas, and reminded councillors that it was important to invest in the City to ensure its economy prospered.

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

For (18)

Councillor D Armiger
Councillor C Burke
Councillor B Bushell
Councillor L Bushell
Councillor A Currier
Councillor L Danese
Councillor G Hewson
Councillor R Longbottom
Councillor A McNulty
Councillor D Nannestad
Councillor L Preston
Councillor A Pritchard
Councillor C Roper
Councillor D Stothard
Councillor N Tweddle
Councillor C Watt
Councillor J Wells
Councillor L Woolley

Against (9)

Councillor A Briggs
Councillor J Brown
Councillor N Chapman
Councillor M Christopher
Councillor T Dyer
Councillor B Mara
Councillor C Smalley
Councillor H Spratt
Councillor R Storer

Abstentions (0)

The motion was declared carried.

It was therefore RESOLVED that the Medium-Term Financial Strategy 2025-2030 and the Capital Strategy 2025-2030, including the following specific elements, be approved:

- A proposed Council Tax increase of 2.9% for 2025/26.
- The Council being a member of the Lincolnshire Business Rates Pool in 2025/26.
- The General Fund Revenue Forecast 2025/26-2029/30, as shown in Appendix 1 to the report, and the main basis on which this budget had been calculated (as set out in paragraph 4 of the report).
- The Housing Revenue Account Forecast 2025/26-2029/30, as shown in Appendix 2 to the report, and the main basis on which this budget had been calculated (as set out in paragraph 5 of the report).
- The General Investment Programme 2025/26-2029/30, as shown in Appendix 3 to the report, and the main basis on which the programme had been calculated (as set out in paragraph 6 of the report).
- The Housing Investment Programme 2025/26-2029/30 as shown in Appendix 4, and the main basis on which the programme had been calculated (as set out in paragraph 7 of the report).

NOTE: At this point in proceedings, Councillor N Murray joined the meeting.

(b) Council Tax 2025/2026

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 (23)

Councillor D Armiger
 Councillor A Briggs
 Councillor C Burke
 Councillor B Bushell
 Councillor L Bushell
 Councillor A Currier
 Councillor L Danese
 Councillor T Dyer
 Councillor G Hewson
 Councillor R Longbottom
 Councillor B Mara
 Councillor A McNulty
 Councillor D Nannestad
 Councillor L Preston
 Councillor A Pritchard
 Councillor C Roper
 Councillor H Spratt
 Councillor R Storer
 Councillor D Stothard
 Councillor N Tweddle
 Councillor C Watt
 Councillor J Wells
 Councillor L Woolley

Against (4)

Councillor J Brown
 Councillor N Chapman
 Councillor M Christopher
 Councillor C Smalley

Abstention (0)**RESOLVED**

That the following, as submitted, be approved:

1. Acceptance of the 6th January 2025 Executive Committee recommendation that the Council Tax Base for 2025/26, as calculated in accordance with The Local Authorities (Calculation of Council tax Base) (England) Regulations 2012, to be 25,764.25.
2. That the following amounts be calculated for the year 2025/26 in accordance with Sections 31 to 36 of the Local Government Finance Act 1992:
 - a) £123,900,580 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 the Parish Councils.
 - b) £115,733,830 being the aggregate of the amounts which the Council estimated for the items set out in Section 31A(3) of the Act.
 - c) £8,166,750 of the Act 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) £316.98 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) £316.98 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 |
| £211.32 | £246.54 | £281.76 | £316.98 |
| E | F | G | H |
| £387.42 | £457.86 | £528.30 | £633.96 |

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 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 2025/26 Lincolnshire County Council had 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 |
| £1,083.90 | £1,264.55 | £1,445.20 | £1,625.85 |
| E | F | G | H |
| £1,987.15 | £2,348.45 | £2,709.75 | £3,251.70 |

4. That it be noted that for the year 2025/26 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 |
| £212.10 | £247.45 | £282.80 | £318.15 |
| E | F | G | H |
| £388.85 | £459.55 | £530.25 | £636.30 |

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 set the following as the amounts of Council Tax for the year 2025/26 in accordance with the dwelling bandings shown below:

| Total Council Tax Charge 2025/26 | | | |
|---|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| A | B | C | D |
| £1,507.32 | £1,758.54 | £2,009.76 | £2,260.98 |
| E | F | G | H |
| £2,763.42 | £3,265.86 | £3,768.30 | £4,521.96 |

(c) Prudential Indicators 2024/2025 to 2027/2028 and Treasury Management Strategy 2025/2026

It was moved, seconded and

RESOLVED that:

1. The Treasury Management Strategy 2025/26 including the Prudential Indicators be approved.
2. The Minimum Revenue Provision Policy 2025/26 be approved.
3. The Treasury Management Practices be approved.

(d) Pay Policy Statement 2025/2026

It was moved, seconded and

RESOLVED that the Pay Policy Statement 2025/26 be approved.

(e) Vision 2030 Strategic Plan

The recommendation on the report to the Council was duly moved and seconded.

Each Portfolio Holder presented their respective section of Vision 2030, highlighting key elements.

RESOLVED that the Vision 2030 Strategic Plan and the Vision 2030 Delivery Plan be approved.

(f) Procurement Act 2023 and Contract Procedure Rules

It was moved, seconded and

RESOLVED

- (1) That the new Procurement Act be noted.
- (2) That the revised Contract Procedure Rules, as set out in the report, be approved.
- (3) That the Council's Constitution be amended accordingly.

59. Local Government Reorganisation

Councillor Naomi Tweddle, Leader of the Council, presented a report on *Local Government Reorganisation (LGR)*, which provided an opportunity to contribute to the debate on LGR in response to the Government's invitation to submit details of proposed unitary authorities, as per section 2 of the Local Government Public Involvement in Health Act 2007. The Leader invited views from Council so a submission could be formulated by 21 March 2025.

During discussion, the following points were noted:

- It was recognised that it was unlikely to be a consensus across Lincolnshire on the future of local government in the county and it was therefore likely multiple options would be put forward. Furthermore, a councillor felt that Lincoln was not large enough in size to warrant its own unitary authority.
- A councillor expressed disappointment that the Government was looking to reorganise local government, which would come at a significant cost to the tax payer, when there were other more pressing priorities such as addressing the overspend within the NHS.
- Several councillors expressed concern over any potential suggestion of a 'mega-council' for Greater Lincolnshire, as Lincoln would get lost amongst it. It was therefore felt that an option should be developed for Lincoln.
- It was suggested that the Leader and other colleagues liaised with councils who had already gone through local government reorganisation, if they had not done so already, to gain an understanding of what to expect and any challenges, as these could help develop a proposal for Lincoln.
- It was recognised that LGR would not disappear and therefore it was important to develop an option best for Lincoln. Furthermore, it was commented that the Government was beginning to soften its approach of 500k residents and therefore an option for Lincoln was viable.
- A councillor commented that LGR had been successful in other areas, and it would work in Lincolnshire.
- A councillor spoke against any option for Lincoln and felt that two unitary authorities for Greater Lincolnshire would be the best option, and this would not disadvantage Lincoln. The councillor requested regular member briefings on this topic.
- It was confirmed that key information would be shared amongst councils to ensure each proposal was using the same and accurate data sets when developing proposals. Regular meetings were also taking place with Leaders and Chief Executives across Lincolnshire on the topic of LGR. It was confirmed that there was no intention to defer the elections in May 2025 and at present, these were going ahead as scheduled. It was also confirmed that proposals could cut across district council boundary lines.
- It was commented that a number of villages on the outskirts of Lincoln identified as living in Lincoln and it was likely these areas could be included in a proposal for Lincoln.
- It was reiterated that the future of LGR would involve unitary councils, as the current system was confusing to most residents. Work would continue to develop a proposal for Lincoln, which would involve expanding its boundary into other areas. It was emphasised that Lincoln was a vibrant City and had outgrown its current boundary and this provided an excellent opportunity for Lincoln to self-govern.

The Leader expressed her thanks to officers for all their hard work to date on local government reorganisation.

The report was noted.

60. Combined Authority (Mayoral Elections) Order 2017 - Appointment of Local Returning Officer

It was moved, seconded and

RESOLVED

1. That the Chief Executive and Town Clerk be appointed as local Returning Officer for the Greater Lincolnshire Combined County Authority Mayoral elections.
2. That the Council's Constitution be amended accordingly.

61. Extension of Six Month Attendance Rule

It was moved, seconded and

RESOLVED that a six month dispensation for Councillor Aiden Wells from attending meetings of the Council until 9 December 2025, in order to avoid Councillor Aiden Wells potentially ceasing to be a member of the authority under Section 85 of the Local Government Act 1972, be approved.

62. Rule 15 Scrutiny Procedure Rules: Decision Taken as a Matter of Urgency - Executive - 20 January 2025 - Leisure Services Contract Update

It was moved, seconded and

RESOLVED that the decision taken by the Executive as a matter of urgency on 20 January 2025 under Rule 15 of the Scrutiny Procedure Rules be noted.

63. Amendments to Representatives on Committees

It was moved, seconded and

RESOLVED that the amendment to the membership of the Shared Revenues and Benefits Joint Committee, in accordance with paragraph 2.2 of the report, be approved.