

COUNCIL
19 FEBRUARY 2016

PRESENT: COUNCILLOR W S WEBB (CHAIRMAN)

Councillors T M Trollope-Bellew (Vice-Chairman), B Adams, M G Allan, W J Aron, A M Austin, Mrs V C Ayling, J W Beaver, Mrs P A Bradwell, D Brailsford, C J T H Brewis, A Bridges, Mrs J Brockway, M Brookes, K J Clarke, C J Davie, R G Davies, P M Dilks, S R Dodds, G J Ellis, R G Fairman, I G Fleetwood, R L Foulkes, M J Hill OBE, D C Hoyes MBE, D M Hunter-Clarke, R J Hunter-Clarke, N I Jackson, M S Jones, B W Keimach, S F Kinch, R C Kirk, C E D Mair, C E H Marfleet, J R Marriott, R A H McAuley, D McNally, D C Morgan, N M Murray, Mrs A M Newton, P J O'Connor, Mrs M J Overton MBE, C R Oxby, C Pain, S L W Palmer, R B Parker, N H Pepper, R J Phillips, Mrs H N J Powell, Miss E L Ransome, Miss F E E Ransome, Mrs S Ransome, Mrs S Rawlins, Mrs J M Renshaw, R A Renshaw, Mrs A E Reynolds, P A Robinson, Mrs L A Rollings, R A Shore, Mrs N J Smith, Mrs E J Sneath, A H Turner MBE JP, S M Tweedale, M A Whittington, P Wood, Mrs S Woolley, L Wootten, R Wootten, C N Worth, Mrs S M Wray and B Young

Councillors: attended the meeting as observers

Officers in attendance:-

49 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors A G Hagues, J D Hough, A J Jesson, T Keywood-Wainwright, C K Strange and Mrs C A Talbot.

50 DECLARATIONS OF COUNCILLORS' INTERESTS

Councillor S R Dodds declared an interest as a Trustee of Magna Vitae in relation to any public health discussions.

51 MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE COUNCIL HELD ON 18 DECEMBER 2015

RESOLVED

That the minutes of the meeting held on 18 December 2015 be signed by the Chairman as a correct record.

52 SUBMISSION OF PETITIONS

(a) Petition requesting a safe crossing on the Horncastle Road (A158) in Wragby

In accordance with the Council's Petition Scheme, Mrs Julie Thacker spoke for not more than five minutes in explanation of the petition requesting a safe crossing on the Horncastle Road (A158) in Wragby.

It was reported that the Chief Executive had determined that the petition be referred to the Executive Councillor for Highways, Transport and IT.

(b) Petition objecting to any proposals which would lead to the closure of Leadenham Household Waste Recycling Centre.

In accordance with the Council's Petition Scheme, Mr Bob Sampson spoke for no longer than five minutes in explanation of the petition objecting to any proposals which would lead to the closure of Leadenham Household Waste Recycling Centre.

The Chairman advised that there would be an opportunity for Councillors to consider this petition as part of the budget debate later in the meeting. It was also reported that the petition would be referred to the Executive Councillor for Waste and Recycling.

(c) Petition requesting Lincolnshire County Council not to cut bus subsidies for Lincolnshire buses.

In accordance with the Council's Petition Scheme, Mr Dave Rimmington spoke for no longer than five minutes in explanation of the petition requesting that Lincolnshire County Council did not cut subsidies to Lincolnshire buses.

The Chairman advised that that there would again be an opportunity for Councillors to consider this petition as part of the budget debate later in the meeting. It was also reported that the petition would be referred to the Executive Councillor for Highways, Transport and IT.

(d) Petition requesting that the Council reconsiders the proposal to undertake a consultation on the closure of 15 phase three Sure Start Children's Centres in the County.

In accordance with the Council's Petition Scheme, Mrs Helena Mair spoke for not more than five minutes in explanation of the petition requesting that the Council reconsiders the proposal to undertake a consultation on the closure of 15 phase three Sure Start Children's Centres in the County.

The Chairman advised that there would be an opportunity for Councillors to consider this petition as part of the budget debate later in the meeting. It was also reported that the petition would be referred to the Executive Councillor for Adult Care and Health Services, Children's Services.

The Chairman reported that he had continued to carry out his civic engagements with pride.

The Chairman's Lady was thanked for supporting the Chairman on these engagements and also the Vice-Chairman and Lady, Councillor Martin Trollope-Bellew and Rosemary Woolley for providing representations at civic functions when the Chairman had been unable to attend.

The Chairman identified one highlight being when he was invited to present certificates at St Christopher's Special School in Lincoln. The Chairman and Lady were delighted to meet the staff and pupils and found the enthusiasm of the staff and the commitment of the children overwhelming.

The Chairman took the opportunity to remind all councillors of a councillor development session taking place on 15 March 2016 which had been arranged by the cross party Councillor Development Group. The session would cover councillors' role as Corporate Parents. The Chairman urged members to attend if at all possible.

It was with deep sadness that the Chairman reported the death of former County Councillor Colin Fisher, who represented the Spalding West electoral division for three county council terms between May 1993 and May 2005.

Councillors paid tribute to the late former County Councillor Colin Fisher and afterwards stood in silent memory.

The Chairman advised that a list of civic engagements since the last meeting of this Council was available from the Civic Officer on request.

54 QUESTIONS TO THE CHAIRMAN, THE LEADER, EXECUTIVE
COUNCILLORS, CHAIRMAN OF COMMITTEES AND SUB-COMMITTEES

Questions pursuant to Council Procedure Rule 10.3 were asked and answered as follows:

<u>Question by</u>	<u>Answered by</u>	<u>Subject</u>
(a) S R Dodds	P A Robinson	Syrian refugees resettlement
(b) D McNally	Mrs P A Bradwell	Youth centre at Birbeck Academy
(c) Mrs M J Overton MBE	M J Hill OBE	Reduction of government grant
(d) R Wootten	M J Hill OBE	Devolution update
(e) R Kirk	R G Davies	Reductions to road

4
COUNCIL
19 FEBRUARY 2016

		safety budgets
(f) S L W Palmer	M J Hill OBE	Road crossing policy
(g) C E D Mair	R G Davies	Consistency in assessment of highways issues
(h) C J T H Brewis	B Young	Proposed reductions to magistrates courts
(i) C Pain	C J Davie	Boundary Commission proposals
(j) Mrs V C Ayling	R G Davies	Eligibility criteria for highways crossings
(k) K J Clarke	Mrs P A Bradwell	Implementation of Agresso in schools
(l) R A Renshaw	R G Davies	Call Connect service
(m) Mrs H N J Powell	C N Worth	Lincolnshire Rural Touring Events budget reductions
(n) I G Fleetwood	R G Davies	LEB liaison group
(o) P M Dilks	M S Jones	Serco
(p) R G Fairman	C J Davie	Planning and Regulation Committee
(q) B Adams	R G Davies	Update on IT outage
(r) A M Austin	C J Davie	Boston Barrier
(s) R B Parker	M J Hill OBE	Syrian refugees
(t) Mrs A E Reynolds	R A Shore	HWRC in Mablethorpe
(u) C R Oxby	C J Davie	RAF International Air Show update
(v) D C Morgan	C J Davie	Process for fracking applications

A report by the Executive Director Finance and Public protection had been circulated together with a separate document which detailed the Executive's budget and council tax proposals.

It was moved, seconded and

RESOLVED

- (1) That there be one debate;
- (2) That councillor M S Jones, Executive Councillor for Finance and Property, in introducing and moving the budget and in responding to issues raised during the debate be allowed to speak without limit of time;
- (3) That proposers of the amendments each be allowed to speak without limit of time;
- (4) That Councillors seconding the motions, each be allowed to speak to 6 minutes;
- (5) That other speakers be allowed to speak for 3 minutes
- (6) That no further substantial amendments be moved (other than the original amendments moved by Group Leaders)

An amendment was proposed and seconded as follows:

This year's budget was the subject of extensive consultation and engagement activity with a wide range of stakeholders. Unprecedented levels of feedback have been received and it's only right that the Council should seek to address some of the key issues identified by that activity.

The Government have themselves received extensive feedback on their own proposals published in December in the Provisional Local Government Finance Settlement. They have listened to representations from Shire Counties that those initial proposals were inequitable in terms of both sufficiently recognising the cost pressures of providing services in a rural environment but also the last minute redistribution of revenue support grant away from county areas to metropolitan areas and London Boroughs. Additional funding has been forthcoming for Lincolnshire in the form of £5.2m in rural services grant next year and £2.6m the year after - £7.7m in total. This had been added to the Financial Volatility Reserve prior to consideration of the final budget recommendations.

It is proposed that the recommended changes set out below are funded by the additional resources allocated by the Government. These were matters highlighted in budget engagement feedback from the public. This represents just under £5m over the next two years.

- i. Winter maintenance - there will be no reduction in the funding for this service over the next two years. Use will be made, as necessary, of the earmarked reserve set up for this service.
- ii. Bus subsidies - the proposed saving of £2.2m over the next two years be removed from the budget. As far as 2016/17 is concerned this requires £1.2m to be built back into the budget. The requirement for additional funding in the 2017/18 budget will be the full £2.2m.
- iii. Children's Centres – no Tier 3 Centres will close in the year ahead or in the year commencing April 2017. No saving had been proposed in 2016/17 as it was not envisaged feasible to close the Centres in that year given the need to undertake a formal consultation. A potential saving of £420k was under consideration for the 2017/18 budget. That will not now proceed.

The Council still faces significant underlying cost pressures going forward with a potential budget shortfall for 2017/18 of around £30m even after implementing savings as proposed in this budget. It therefore makes sense to continue with the vast majority of the savings initiatives proposed in the budget whilst recognising some of the key concerns expressed by those responding to our engagement activity.

The timing and total funding required for both the above remains to be determined at this time but it is proposed to take the required funding from the Financial Volatility Reserve and that the Director of Finance & Public Protection be granted delegated authority to take such action.

The proposed action requires additional funding of £1.2m next year and this will be funded by reducing the Financial Volatility Reserve by that amount.

The Director of Finance & Public Protection has confirmed that these proposals are compliant with the Financial Strategy of the Council and present a balanced budget for 2016/17. The Council is predicting an ongoing budget deficit over the three financial years after 2016/17 and substantial savings or other actions will need to be found in those years to deliver a balanced budget. These proposals reduce the funding available to assist in balancing future budgets from the Financial Volatility Reserve to £21.5m.

Councillor M S Jones, as mover of the original motion, accepted this amendment which subsequently became part of the substantive motion.

It was moved and seconded:

- (1) That the responses to the consultation on the Council's budget proposals as contained in the appended Budget Book (Appendix D "Budget Consultation") be noted;
- (2) That the Section 151 Officer's Statement on the Robustness of the Budget and the Adequacy of Reserves as set out in the appended Budget Book (Section 10 – "Section 151 Officer's Statement on the Robustness of the Budget and Adequacy of Reserves") be noted;
- (3) That the Impact Analysis relating to the increasing of Council Tax by 3.95% in 2016/17 set out in the appended Budget Book (Appendix C – Equality Impact Analysis relating to the increasing the Council Tax by 3.95% in 2016/17) be noted;
- (4) That the service revenue budgets for 2016/17 contained in the appended Budget Book (Table 2 "Net Service Revenue Budget 2016/17") be agreed;
- (5) That the capital programme and its funding contained in the appended Budget Book (Section 7 "Capital Programme") and (Appendix M "Capital programme") be agreed;
- (6) That the County Council element of the council tax for a band D property at £1,128.83 for 2016/17 contained in the appended Budget Book (Appendix B "County Precept 2016/17") be agreed;

And that together these form the Council's Budget

- (7) That the Council's Financial Strategy contained in the appended Budget Book (Appendix E "Financial Strategy") be approved;
- (8) That the prudential targets for capital finance and notes the prudential indicators contained in the appended Budget Book (Appendix L – "Prudential Indicators") be noted;
- (9) That a minimum revenue provision (MRP) be based on the asset life method and made in equal instalments over the estimated life of the assets acquired through borrowing as set out in the appended Budget Book (Section 9 "Minimum Revenue Provision") be agreed.
- (10) That authority be delegated to the Executive Director of Finance and Public Protection to update the appended Budget Book to reflect any amendments agreed by the Council.
- (11) That the additional resources allocated by the government be used to continue funding for winter maintenance, bus subsidies and Children's Centres, as set out in the amendment above.

An amendment (i) was moved and seconded by the Labour Group as follows:

Local Government in Lincolnshire is facing unprecedented cuts in government funding. Public services are under attack because the Conservative Chancellor of the Exchequer thinks it is right to balance the nation's book by 2019/20. The consequence here in Lincolnshire with the 'deepest cuts we have ever faced' is that local people will be expected to pay more by way of Council Tax and get less by way of services; pay more, get less. The amendment set out below takes account of the expectation that council taxes should be used to a greater extent than is being proposed to pay for council services in the current year.

That is why this Labour proposal seeks to protect in the coming year the lives, welfare and interests of Lincolnshire people who are in need of vitally important council services like child and adult support services including Children's Centres, road maintenance work, community safety initiatives and subsidies to bus services.

Accordingly It is proposed that the following amendments are made to the circulated 'Council Budget 2016/17' report:

REVENUE

Restore Commission activities in Children's Centres (Page 93 line 4) £662k.

Restore School Improvement service and activities for non-statutory support for children with disabilities (Page 11 para 5.7) £1.511m.

Make planned efficiency savings in home to school transport but use funds released to protect the service (Page 95 line 4) £1.47m.

Readiness for Adult Life – spend more on child support services with increasing demands in light of the County being the lowest spending upper tier council (apportion over Page 98 lines 1-7) £1.318m.

In respect of Children are Safe & Healthy restore Family Support; Commissioning & Performance; Targeted Support for Young People; and CAMHS (Section 75) (Page 99 lines 4 to 7) £589k.

In respect on Adult Safeguarding partially restore funding to DoLs Best Interest Assessments (Page 101 line 4) £1.35m.

In respect of Specialist Adult Services spend more on support for adults with learning disability, autism and mental health problems (apportion over Page 108 lines 1-6) £311k.

In respect of Adult Frailty do not increase user contributions (apportion over Page 103 lines 13-17) £2.478m.

Provide a budget for Local Welfare Support in addition to use of existing reserve (Page 109 line 11) £250k.

Partially restore Health Improvement activities (Page 111 line 4) £2.212m.

Partially restore Sexual Health Services (Page 111 line 9) £441k.

Substantially restore Prevention & Treatment of Substance Misuse (Page 111 line 10) £908k.

Restore spend for Transportation (bus subsidies) (Page 113 line 5) £1.563m.

Partially restore Highway Maintenance (Page 113 line 6) £1.400m.

Partially restore Highway Network Management (Page 113 line 7) £700k.

Protect spending on Household Waste Recycling Centres (Page 116 line 4) £298k.

Partially restore Sustaining and Growing Business and the Economy (apportion over Page 117 lines 4-7) £400k.

Substantially restore Fire & Rescue Services and remove threat of station closure (Page 119 line 8) £829k.

Partially restore Community Safety Initiatives budget (Page 119 line 5) £237k.

Restore Road Safety Partnership funding (Page 119 line 6) £119k.

FUNDING

The above measures total £19.046m and the proposed sources of funding are as follows:

Reduce the Strategic Communications budget by a further £90k (Page 123 line 11).

Apply £18.956m from the Financial Volatility Reserves in the expectation that this will be supplemented and the coming year end by at least £10million from the anticipated underspend across the Council budget.

The Director of Finance & Public Protection has confirmed that these proposals are compliant with the existing Financial Strategy of the Council and represent a balanced budget for 2016/17. The Council is predicting an ongoing budget deficit over the three financial years after 2016/17 and substantial savings or other actions will need to be found in those years to deliver a balanced budget. These proposals reduce the funding available to assist in balancing future budgets from the Financial Volatility Reserve to £3.75m.

An amendment (ii) was moved and seconded by UKIP as follows:

10
COUNCIL
19 FEBRUARY 2016

The UKIP Group would like to make the following amendments to the 2016/17 Council Budget.

Revenue Budget

The following changes are proposed to the Revenue Budget for next year.

- a) Remove the non-Adult Care precept element (1.95%) of the Council Tax increase (£4.549m).
- b) Restore the cuts made to the Bus Services & other transport initiatives (£1.563m).
- c) Restore the budget cut made to Highway Asset Maintenance (£3.084m).
- d) Include the sum of £300k to allow for the hire of more PSCOs.
- e) Under Children's Services - Kids are Safe & Healthy - give back the £589k reduction in budget and increase it by another £11k to round this up to £600k in total.
- f) Because the size of this council will not reduce this year we feel it is still important to retain the staff we have until after such changes are made. Therefore, we would like to re-fund the cuts in staff budgets on Business Support & Democratic Services (£1.328m).
- g) The Registrars, Celebrations & Coroners services will be moving into shared premises during this year to cut departmental costs. They will also be introducing initiatives which will provide income for their services. Once again, we would like to restore the modest cut of £60k to their department until after these changes have been made.
- h) A reduced saving in the revenue budget as a consequence of the proposal below to part fund the new capital allocation to Corporate Property from halving expenditure on the existing Street Lighting upgrade programme (£600k).

These proposals cost an additional £12.084m in 2016/17.

Capital Budget

The following changes are proposed to the Capital Budget for next year.

Add £5.0m to the Corporate Property Budget to give additional funding for the Adult Care 'Extra Care Housing Project'.

Funding – Revenue Budget

The following changes are proposed to fund the £12.084m.

Use of the Financial Volatility Reserve (£9.402m)

Reduction in the General Reserve to 3% (£2.114m)

Reduce the Economic Development budget further (£0.384m)

Reduce the increase in Adult Care charges (£0.184m)

Funding – Capital Budget

The following changes are proposed to fund the £5.0m.

Reduce the existing street lighting upgrade programme by £3m.

Allocate £2m from the Capital Contingency budget for next year.

We commend these changes to the Council.

The Director of Finance & Public Protection has confirmed that these proposals are compliant with the existing Financial Strategy of the Council and represent a balanced budget for 2016/17. The Council is predicting an ongoing budget deficit over the three financial years after 2016/17 and substantial savings or other actions will need to be found in those years to deliver a balanced budget. These proposals reduce the funding available to assist in balancing future budgets from the Financial Volatility Reserve to £13.3m.

An amendment (iii) was moved and seconded by the Lincolnshire Independents as follows:

This budget is too small to deliver the services that the residents of Lincolnshire expect and deserve. This government has severely reduced our income. At the same time they have added to the already rising demands, for example, by announcing a living wage, but not funding it. £44m Cuts proposed by the Conservatives in this budget are on top of the £125m taken out over the last four years.

We propose that an all-party campaign starts now to tackle the government on the amount of income tax that is returned to us for essential local services in future years.

This conservative budget proposes massive cuts to essential services an increased council tax and we are presented with a plan that is already propped up with £20m from reserves. We propose raising that slightly by £5m to invest to save as follows;

- 1) We propose keeping services that enhance the economy on which our future income depends. Thus we propose restructuring but not cutting rural transport, which underpins our rural and urban businesses and communities (£2.2m)
- 2) We propose fair school transport to the nearest appropriate school. All Lincolnshire children should be treated equally when it comes to school transport. For fairness no child should be prevented from attending the nearest appropriate school,

12
COUNCIL
19 FEBRUARY 2016

when that is a grammar school, simply because their parents can't afford the bus fare. We propose this is implemented at cost, with a neutral effect on the budget.

3) We propose supporting youth, health and building the economy through converting our children's centres into family centres including help with work placements (£600k).

4) We propose keeping well supported local facilities that would only make a small saving if closed. Hence we propose Investing in our rural communities through the big society grant, rural touring and community grants and local facilities such as a recycling site (£400k).

5) We propose increasing the income to support our council services by a concerted effort to make our assets work better for us, not focused on selling them off. We recognise that means some sales, but also purchase and development of buildings to increase the rate of return in rents and build healthy communities at the same time. This could be through an arms-length profit-making organisation where the County Council is the shareholder. (Target 5pc return on capital investment.)

These proposals require £3.2m of revenue budget funding in 2016/17.

Funding

In response to comments from residents in our areas, the following changes are proposed to the Revenue Budget to fund the £3.2m.

Rebalancing the Special responsibility allowances to save 20% (£100k).

Restructure the Council's Communications activity to save 20% (£200k).

Reduce the Financial Volatility Budget (£2.9m)

The Director of Finance & Public Protection has confirmed that these proposals are compliant with the existing Financial Strategy of the Council and represent a balanced budget for 2016/17. The Council is predicting an ongoing budget deficit over the three financial years after 2016/17 and substantial savings or other actions will need to be found in those years to deliver a balanced budget. These proposals reduce the funding available to assist in balancing future budgets from the Financial Volatility Reserve to £20.1m.

A recorded vote was held for the amendment (i), and upon being put to the vote, the amendment was lost.

Details of recorded vote taken:

Those voting for the amendment (i):

K J Clarke, P M Dilks, S R Dodds, G J Ellis, N I Jackson, R C Kirk, D C Morgan, N M Murray, R B Parker, Mrs H N J Powell, J M Renshaw and R A Renshaw.

Those voting **FOR – 12**

Those voting against the amendment (i):

B Adams, M G Allan, W J Aron, A M Austin, J W Beaver, Mrs P A Bradwell, D Brailsford, C J T H Brewis, A Bridges, Mrs J Brockway, M Brookes, C J Davie, R G Davies, R G Fairman, I G Fleetwood, R L Foulkes, M J Hill OBE, D C Hoyes MBE, D M Hunter-Clarke, M S Jones, B W Keimach, S F Kinch, C E H Marfleet, J R Marriott, R A McAuley, D McNally, P J O'Connor, Mrs M J Overton MBE, C R Oxby, C Pain, N H Pepper, R J Phillips, Mrs S Ransome, Mrs S Rawlins, Mrs A E Reynolds, P A Robinson, Mrs L A Rollings, R A Shore, Mrs E J Sneath, T M Trollope-Bellew, A H Turner MBE JP, W S Webb, M A Whittington, P Wood, Mrs S Woolley, L Wootten, R Wootten, C N Worth, B Young.

Those voting **AGAINST – 49**

Those abstaining:

Mrs V C Ayling, R J Hunter-Clarke, C E D Mair, S L W Palmer, Mrs N J Smith.

ABSTENTIONS - 5

A recorded vote was held for the amendment (ii), and upon being put to the vote, the amendment was lost.

Details of recorded vote taken:

Those voting for the amendment (ii):

Mrs V C Ayling, J W Beaver, R G Fairman, R L Foulkes, D M Hunter-Clarke, R J Hunter-Clarke, C E D Mair, D McNally, Mrs H N J Powell, Mrs S Ransome, Mrs A E Reynolds, Mrs N J Smith,

Those voting **FOR – 12**

Those voting against the amendment (ii):

B Adams, M G Allan, W J Aron, A M Austin, Mrs P A Bradwell, D Brailsford, C J T H Brewis, A Bridges, Mrs J Brockway, M Brookes, C J Davie, R G Davies, I G Fleetwood, M J Hill OBE, D C Hoyes MBE, M S Jones, B W Keimach, S F Kinch, C E H Marfleet, J R Marriott, R A McAuley, P J O'Connor, Mrs M J Overton MBE, C R Oxby, C Pain, N H Pepper, S L W Palmer, R J Phillips, Mrs S Rawlins, P A Robinson, Mrs L A Rollings, R A Shore, Mrs E J Sneath, T M Trollope-Bellew, A H Turner MBE JP, W S Webb, M A Whittington, P Wood, Mrs S Woolley, L Wootten, R Wootten, C N Worth, B Young.

Those voting **AGAINST – 43**

Those abstaining:

14
COUNCIL
19 FEBRUARY 2016

K J Clarke, P M Dilks, S R Dodds, G J Ellis, N I Jackson, R C Kirk, D C Morgan, N M Murray, R B Parker, R A Renshaw.

ABSTENTIONS – 10

A recorded vote was held for the amendment (iii), and upon being put to the vote, the amendment was lost.

Details of the recorded vote taken:

Those voting for the amendment (iii):

M G Allan, A M Austin, Mrs M J Overton MBE, S L W Palmer, Mrs H N J Powell, P Wood.

Those voting **FOR – 6**

Those voting against the amendment (iii):

B Adams, W J Aron, Mrs V C Ayling, Mrs P A Bradwell, D Brailsford, C J T H Brewis, A Bridges, Mrs J Brockway, M Brookes, C J Davie, R G Davies, I G Fleetwood, R L Foulkes, M J Hill OBE, D C Hoyes MBE, D M Hunter-Clarke, M S Jones, B W Keimach, S F Kinch, C E H Marfleet, J R Marriott, D McNally, P J O'Connor, C R Oxby, C Pain, N H Pepper, R J Phillips, Mrs S Ransome, Mrs S Rawlins, P A Robinson, Mrs L A Rollings, R A Shore, Mrs E J Sneath, T M Trollope-Bellew, A H Turner MBE JP, W S Webb, M A Whittington, Mrs S Woolley, L Wootten, R Wootten, C N Worth, B Young.

Those voting **AGAINST – 42**

Those abstaining:

J W Beaver, K J Clarke, P M Dilks, S R Dodds, G J Ellis, R G Fairman, R J Hunter-Clarke, N I Jackson, R C Kirk, C E D Mair, R A McAuley, D C Morgan, N M Murray, R B Parker, Mrs A E Reynolds, R A Renshaw, Mrs N J Smith.

ABSTENTIONS – 17

A recorded vote on the amended motion was taken. Upon being put to the vote, the motion was carried.

Details of the recorded vote taken:

Those voting for the amended motion:

B Adams, W J Aron, A M Austin, Mrs P A Bradwell, D Brailsford, C J T H Brewis, A Bridges, Mrs J Brockway, M Brookes, C J Davie, R G Davies, R G Fairman, I G Fleetwood, R L Foulkes, M J Hill OBE, D C Hoyes MBE, M S Jones, B W Keimach, S

F Kinch, C E H Marfleet, J R Marriott, R A McAuley, P J O'Connor, C R Oxby, N H Pepper, R J Phillips, Mrs S Rawlins, P A Robinson, Mrs L A Rollings, R A Shore, Mrs E J Sneath, T M Trollope-Bellew, A H Turner MBE JP, W S Webb, M A Whittington, P Wood, Mrs S Woolley, L Wootten, R Wootten, C N Worth, B Young.

Those voting **FOR – 41**

Those voting against the amended motion:

K J Clarke, P M Dilks, S R Dodds, G J Ellis, N I Jackson, R C Kirk, D C Morgan, N M Murray, Mrs M J Overton MBE, C Pain, R B Parker, Mrs J M Renshaw, R A Renshaw.

Those voting **AGAINST – 13**

Those abstaining:

M G Allan, Mrs V C Ayling, J W Beaver, D M Hunter-Clarke, R J Hunter-Clarke, C E D Mair, D McNally, S L W Palmer, Mrs H N J Powell, Miss F E E Ransome, Mrs A E Reynolds, Mrs N J Smith.

ABSTENTIONS – 12

RESOLVED

- (1) That the responses to the consultation on the Council's budget proposals as contained in the appended Budget Book (Appendix D "Budget Consultation") be noted;
- (2) That the Section 151 Officer's Statement on the Robustness of the Budget and the Adequacy of Reserves as set out in the appended Budget Book (Section 10 – "Section 151 Officer's Statement on the Robustness of the Budget and Adequacy of Reserves") be noted;
- (3) That the Impact Analysis relating to the increasing of Council Tax by 3.95% in 2016/17 set out in the appended Budget Book (Appendix C – Equality Impact Analysis relating to the increasing the Council Tax by 3.95% in 2016/17) be noted;
- (4) That the service revenue budgets for 2016/17 contained in the appended Budget Book (Table 2 "Net Service Revenue Budget 2016/17") be agreed;
- (5) That the capital programme and its funding contained in the appended Budget Book (Section 7 "Capital Programme") and (Appendix M "Capital programme") be agreed;
- (6) That the County Council element of the council tax for a band D property at £1,128.83 for 2016/17 contained in the appended Budget Book (Appendix B "County Precept 2016/17") be agreed;

And that together these form the Council's Budget

- (7) That the Council's Financial Strategy contained in the appended Budget Book (Appendix E "Financial Strategy") be approved;
- (8) That the prudential targets for capital finance and notes the prudential indicators contained in the appended Budget Book (Appendix L – "Prudential Indicators") be noted;
- (9) That a minimum revenue provision (MRP) be based on the asset life method and made in equal instalments over the estimated life of the assets acquired through borrowing as set out in the appended Budget Book (Section 9 "Minimum Revenue Provision") be agreed.
- (10) That authority be delegated to the Executive Director of Finance and Public Protection to update the appended Budget Book to reflect any amendments agreed by the Council.
- (11) That the additional resources allocated by the government be used to continue funding for winter maintenance, bus subsidies and Children's Centres, as set out in the amendment above.

56 PAY POLICY STATEMENT

A report by the Executive Director Children's Services had been circulated.

It was moved, seconded and

RESOLVED

That the Pay Policy Statement attached at Appendix A to the report be agreed.

57 MEMBERS' ALLOWANCES 2016/17

A report by the Executive Director responsible for Democratic Services had been circulated.

It was moved, seconded and

RESOLVED

That the Members Allowance Scheme as detailed in Appendix A of the report be adopted.

58 COUNCIL BUSINESS PLAN 2016/17

A report by the Chief Information and Commissioning Officer had been circulated.

It was moved, seconded and

RESOLVED

That the Council Business Plan 2016-2017 be agreed.

59 AMENDMENT TO ARTICLE 9 OFFICERS AND PART 3 (RESPONSIBILITY FOR FUNCTIONS) OF THE CONSTITUTION

A report by the Monitoring Officer had been circulated.

It was moved, seconded and

RESOLVED

That the amendments to Article 9 (Officers) and Part 3 (Responsibility for Functions) of the Council's Constitution set out in Appendix A of the report be agreed.

60 MOTIONS ON NOTICE SUBMITTED IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE COUNCIL'S CONSTITUTION

(1) Motion by Councillor Mrs V C Ayling

Prior to discussion of this motion Councillors Mrs M J Overton MBE and Mrs H N J Powell declared an interest as they held paid positions in the LGA and left the meeting at 3.20pm for the duration of the debate.

It was moved and seconded that:

The Government has imposed savage cuts upon this council, and there are more to come. Front line services are in desperate straits, so to preserve what's left we must be absolutely ruthless in getting rid of unnecessary spending.

One area in particular stands out as being 'especially' in need of the chop - the Local Government Association. It costs this council, in cash terms alone, £60,000 a year - and add to this the time spent on expenses and officer time.

We're asking taxpayers to stump up an extra 3.9%, so we must ask, "what benefit does the LGA bring to this council, and more importantly, the taxpayers of Lincolnshire?" It is little more than another bureaucratic talking shop which makes a lot of noise but achieves little. Could any of you here today justify it to your constituents whilst asking them for more money?

In this on-going Era of Austerity, we must now, more than ever, spend what little money we have for the benefit of our residents. The £60,000 would be far better spent on such things as adult or children's services. Officers could spend the time

gained on making life better for 'all' the people of Lincolnshire, and have the satisfaction that they're really working for the people who pay their wages.

I therefore propose that Lincolnshire County Council agrees to leave the Local Government Association as soon as possible.

During debate, an amendment was proposed that the subject of the benefits of membership of the LGA be discussed by a scrutiny committee. This was accepted by the mover of the motion and became part of the substantive motion.

Upon being put to the vote, the motion was lost.

The Chairman determined that the motions by Councillors A Bridges and C Pain, and the amendment submitted by UKIP would be debated concurrently, but that there would be three separate votes.

(2) Motion by Councillor A Bridges

It was moved and seconded that:

The council welcomes The Prime Minister's decision to hold an in out referendum on our nation's membership of the EU so that we can all have a vote on this vital issue. In the ensuing negotiations the PM identified some clear objectives covering matters such as immigration, welfare and sovereignty which could form part of a revised relationship if we were to remain in.

Unfortunately, due to European intransigence the current "deal" offers very little in terms of delivering a sustainable and fair welfare and immigration policy for the UK or the ability to repatriate some powers back to this country.

Lincolnshire, particularly on the east coast has seen unprecedented rise in economic migration which inevitably has put pressure on public services many of which this council provides. It has also undermined social cohesion and confidence in some areas.

It is accepted that most migrants come to provide necessary labour and contribute in many ways. However, as the EU has totally failed to deal satisfactorily with mass migration from outside Europe it is vital that this country is able to control its borders before the situation becomes untenable.

We also need to reduce unnecessary interference and bureaucracy from the EU in order to successfully grow the Lincolnshire economy which does not seem currently likely.

This Council therefore resolves

That the current UK/EU deal does not offer a good opportunity for Lincolnshire and unless a better arrangement can be negotiated, the United Kingdom would be better placed to grow and develop outside the European Union.

An amendment (i) was proposed and seconded by UKIP as follows:

The council welcomes The Prime Minister's decision to hold an in out referendum on our nation's membership of the EU so that we can all have a vote on this vital issue. ~~In the ensuing negotiations the PM identified some clear objectives covering matters such as immigration, welfare and sovereignty which could form part of a revised relationship if we were to remain in.~~

Unfortunately, due to European intransigence the current "deal" offers very little in terms of delivering a sustainable and fair welfare and immigration policy for the UK or the ability to repatriate some powers back to this country.

Lincolnshire, particularly on the east coast has seen unprecedented rise in economic migration which inevitably has put pressure on public services many of which this council provides. It has also undermined social cohesion and confidence in some areas.

It is accepted that most migrants come to provide necessary labour and contribute in many ways. However, as the EU has totally failed to deal satisfactorily with mass migration from outside Europe it is vital that this country is able to control its borders before the situation becomes untenable.

We also need to reduce unnecessary interference and bureaucracy from the EU in order to successfully grow the Lincolnshire economy which does not seem currently likely.

This Council therefore resolves:

~~That the current UK/EU deal does not offer a good opportunity for Lincolnshire and unless a better arrangement can be negotiated, the United Kingdom would be better placed to grow and develop outside the European Union.~~

That the current UK/EU deal does not offer a good opportunity for Lincolnshire. Therefore this council supports a vote to leave the European Union.

(3) Motion by Councillor C Pain

It was moved and seconded that:

Lincolnshire, particularly on the east coast, has seen an unprecedented rise in economic migration which inevitably has put pressure on public services, many of which this council provides. It has also undermined social cohesion and confidence in some areas.

This has devastated Boston by increasing rental prices beyond affordability for locals. It has pushed the hospital, Doctors surgeries, policing, schooling, services to a breaking point. The last census of the population is inaccurate as the majority of mass occupancy homes did not submit the number of people in their dwellings, this means that there are an estimated 10,000 plus EU Migrants in the Boston area that are unaccounted for, meaning that we are not funded by government for this extra amount of population.

Often the migrants themselves are working on minimal wage with no contract of employment plus they are deducted over half of their money for accommodation, transport and the right for casual employment.

There have been many incidences of these migrants being found living in glass houses or old caravans that are unsuitable / unfit to live in. The effect of Unlimited Mass EU Migration has devastated the local community by forcing families, who have always done this type of work, into permanent unemployment leaving their siblings to a life on benefit payment dependency.

The migrants themselves send the majority of their money out of the local community and country, stopping the redistribution of money in local businesses. Then if the EU migrants go home for two months per year, they can claim back all of the tax and NI that they have paid in our country. They then can come back the next year, hence having a total negative effect on society.

A leading agricultural firm, are a prime example, where local people have always worked in the fields and pack houses, with some employees having worked there for 15-20 years. Then a large majority of its work force were needlessly made redundant and replaced with foreign labour. Locals have always gathered the produce from the fields and undertaken pack house work and still would do if given half a chance. In 2004 locals were doing piece work on the land were earning £14-£18 per hour whilst now EU Migrants are on day's pay less vast expense deductions.

At this firm they are charged for accommodation, bedding, transport etc and I roughly believe this levies the firm a further million pounds per year in monies. The cost to the local community is drastic.

The power industry have to pay all of their employees on NAECI (blue book) rates £15.28 per hour. EU companies quoting for the same work pay their EU employees far less with some paying minimum wage rate. Foreign Companies are quoting for the same jobs on power stations in the UK, but are paying the following reduction in pay to European workers.

Bulgarians pay £9.20 per hour

The Italians pay £7.56 per hour.

How can this be right that EU companies have the advantage of paying their employees less money on the same contracts and obviously making them more competitive than British ones?

Our off shore oil companies workers in Lincolnshire have also suffered similar disparities in wages.

The mass of Unlimited EU Migration into the UK has meant that the minimum wage has now become the maximum wage and that's if you're lucky enough to get employment. In fact the current EU Migration criterion is racist to all of those countries outside of the EU, especially to all of our friends in the Commonwealth Countries.

These actions have stopped local Cantonese and Indian restaurants recruiting suitable chefs and local people legitimately, bringing in their spouses from non EU countries.

Zero hour contracts might suit students at University, but are no good for people trying to live and enjoy life in our country, it only helps fat cats to get richer whilst taking workers' rights back into the dark ages.

We have the further issue that both David Cameron and the EU are pushing for both Turkey and Bosnia to enter the EU. This will mean that a further 80 million of their population will be entitled to come to the UK.

Once outside of the EU, we can install a full Australian Visa style points entry system into our country, but I feel that as the local County Council, we have to send this message to David Cameron, so that it will help inform him of the need to secure full UK border control. Whilst I feel his insistence of the UK being within the unelected control of the EU, with its associated consequences, it is against the will of the British public.

I have forwarded to councillors a range of information provided by Nottingham University and Professor Tim Congdon. Tim has worked hard over the years deploying in his own analysis the monetarist approach to macroeconomic policy. He has considerable experience working in the City of London and was the founder of the macroeconomic forecasting consultancy Lombard Street Research. Between 1993 and 1997, he was a member of the Treasury Panel that advised the Conservative government on economic policy.

I move that this Council urges the UK Government to adopt a Migration System so that EU Migrants are treated equally to non EU Migrants entering the UK, meaning that they need a work visa / work permits, allocated on a skill Points Based System (PBS) - Tier 1(high value); Tier 2 (skilled workers with a job offer); Tier 4 (students " who will pay the same amount as non EU students"). Tier 1 (unskilled) entry routes will no longer be open. This will involve re instilling full UK border control.

Upon being put to the vote, the amendment (i) was lost.

Upon being put to the vote, the motion (2) by Councillor A Bridges was carried.

Upon being put to the vote, the motion (3) by Councillor C Pain was lost.

RESOLVED

That the current UK/EU deal does not offer a good opportunity for Lincolnshire and unless a better arrangement can be negotiated, the United Kingdom would be better placed to grow and develop outside the European Union.

(4) Motion by Councillor S L W Palmer

We believe that this Council is facing unprecedented financial pressure with a perceived background of dissatisfaction with scrutiny and a disconnection of councillors not part of the administration.

It is therefore proposed that this Council establishes a cross party review to investigate all systems of governance available to recommend on best value, inclusion of all councillors in decisions and transparency to the residents of Lincolnshire that we are elected to represent.

Upon being put to the vote, the motion was lost

The meeting closed at 5.20 pm