

Agenda Item 5

APPENDIX F (Updated)

BUDGET ENGAGEMENT & CONSULTATION FEEDBACK

This Appendix provides details of the budget engagement events which have taken place in January 2022.

Statements on Budget Proposals for 2022/23 from Overview and Scrutiny Committees

The following statements have been received from Scrutiny Committee meetings which have taken place during January 2022:

Environment and Economy Scrutiny Committee – 18 January 2022

The Environment and Economy Scrutiny Committee unanimously supports the Revenue and Capital Budget Proposals 2022/23 for the Council's Environment and Economy Services.

The Committee acknowledged the importance of efforts made to roll out efficient waste collection services, including the separate paper and cardboard collection trial and the food waste collection trial that took place in South Holland District and South Kesteven District respectively. The Committee welcomed future plans for wider roll out of the food waste collection appreciating that these were affected and shaped by the implementation of the Environment Act 2021.

The Committee expressed a concern over the apparent removal of the development management budget and the anticipated impact on services and were pleased to hear that this was a budget that received income from development contributions from developers, and as the income received exceeds the cost of providing that service, it results in a negative budget and does not reflect a reduction in budget year-on-year.

Adults and Community Wellbeing Scrutiny Committee – 12 January 2022

The Adults and Community Wellbeing Scrutiny Committee unanimously supports the budget proposals for Adult Care and Community Wellbeing. The Committee also supported the proposed increase of 3% in the social care precept for 2022/23.

The Committee recorded its appreciation to all the officers who had managed the cost pressures on the service over recent years. The Committee also acknowledges the future costs pressures on Adult Care and Community Wellbeing, as a result of the proposed reforms of adult social care, will be substantial, as well as cost pressures on other council services. The Committee noted that all these pressures would be reflected in the Council's medium term financial strategy.

The Committee recognises the importance of innovation as one way of addressing the budget pressures, and will be including items on its agenda in the coming year, which reflect this

innovative approach. This includes the Improvement Programme for working practices, including initial contact, signposting, assessment and wellbeing services; reviewing the process for financial assessments, including the proposed cap on individual costs and changes to the assessment process; the use of digital technology; and the opportunities arising from

Children and Young People Scrutiny Committee – 14 January 2022

The Children and Young People Scrutiny Committee unanimously supports the budget proposals for Children's Services for 2022/23, including the funding of the cost pressures for Children's Social Care Services.

The Committee congratulated officers on an excellent report despite the difficult financial challenges facing Children's Services and the Council.

The Committee was disappointed to learn of the removal of the funding for Local Authorities School Improvement Monitoring and Brokering Grant for school improvement activities supporting maintained schools, which would be managed by the Council from April 2022 while a review was undertaken. It was recognised that this could have a detrimental impact on small schools in Lincolnshire. The Committee requested a report back to a future meeting outlining some options and recommendations for responding to the removal of this funding.

The following points were clarified in relation to the Revenue and Capital Budget Proposals for 2022/23:

- The Home to School Transport budget had been moved to the Place Directorate as the commissioning of home to school transport was undertaken by Place due to the connections with the public transport network. As a result, this budget would now be reported to the Highways and Transport Scrutiny Committee. A new transport management system had recently been implemented to support the delivery of operations but also to allow better tracking of the budget and the impact of the cost of each contract which would enable the budget to be better predicted. Children's Services would continue to have oversight of the budget and delivery of home to school transport to ensure some consistency of expertise in this complex area. A cost pressure of around £6.5m had been identified for the Home to School Transport budget. Through transformation work, overall costs were planned to reduce by about £1.2m, leaving a net cost pressure of approximately £5.3m. The current transformation work was aimed at bringing these cost pressures down and to try to stabilise and galvanise the market to increase competition. The Committee requested a report back in six months' time to consider how the transition has worked and the transformational changes which have been made in relation to Home to School Transport.
- The Special Educational Needs and Disabilities (SEND) delegated funding to schools and services to the sector were funded from the High Needs Block of the Dedicated Schools Grant which was under increasing pressure and was a significant financial risk for the Council. SEND spending levels was a national concern. The Children's Education

budget was for funding the SEND team, school improvement, safeguarding and other education support services.

- The lower average cost per child in care in Lincolnshire was due to the internal fostering service and the large number of foster carers working for the Council which made it more cost effective and better for the individual. A number of other councils were more reliant on independent foster carers or the residential market which were more costly.

Highways and Transport Scrutiny Committee – 24 January 2022

The Highways and Transport Scrutiny Committee supports the Revenue and Capital Budget Proposals 2022/23 for the Council's Highways and Transport Services.

The Committee was satisfied that the Major Schemes Programme remained affordable on the back of other schemes being deferred into the future. The Committee acknowledged impacts of the £12 million gap in funding and were pleased to hear that there was ongoing work of Leading Officers and Executive portfolio holders towards a future funding strategy as part of the Highways Infrastructure Asset Management Plan. Members welcomed plans for the allocation of the remainder of £7 million out of the £10 million funds in 2022 – 2023 in line with the Highways Asset Management Strategy.

The Committee expressed a view that the transfer of the transport to school services, that was now brought into the Highways budget, offered a potential for a thorough examination of that service and the cost pressures that were on the rise, to ensure that challenges were mapped, and funds were used in the most effective way. Members were assured that there was a structure and governance model around a fundamental review of educational travel and that home to school transport was one of the major transformation activities for Lincolnshire County Council.

Public Protection and Communities Scrutiny Committee – 25 January 2022

The Public Protection and Communities Scrutiny Committee supports the Revenue and Capital Budget Proposals 2022/23 for the Council's Public Protection and Communities Services.

The Committee was satisfied that on the Capital Programme 2021 – 2022 and beyond, where zero expenditure was marked against target areas, these were runoffs of existing projects, running this current year and therefore that there was no further expenditure expected in future years derived from these. Members were informed that the substantial increases in annual spend proposed in the budget reflected continuity of existing programmes some of which suffered delays due to the Covid Pandemic and were affected by EU Transition (e.g., replacement of fire appliances and equipment associated with the Fire and Rescue Service).

The Committee requested information on grants anticipated and received assurance that the amounts would become known in the final settlement announcement in mid-February 2022; following this the Committee will be informed at Full Council.

The Committee also asked for further information on the Fire and Rescue Service capital expenditure and was satisfied with the elaborate detail provided.

Overview and Scrutiny Management Board – 27 January 2022

On 27 January 2022, the Overview and Scrutiny Management Board supported the budget proposals for 2022/23 for the Council's Commercial, Resources and Corporate services, with the exception of Councillor R B Parker who abstained.

In relation to the 2022/23 details, the following points were clarified for the Board in relation to questions raised by members:

- There were very few employees of the Council on the national living wage. Any increase to the national living wage was however likely to impact on the Council's contractors, such as those in the care worker sector which had a bigger proportion of staff on the national living wage. The contract rates were fixed in October 2021 so if the national living wage was increased, there would be a need to look at the contractual arrangements for the particular staff affected. This would result in ongoing recurring costs either following the implementation of an increase or when the contract rates were fixed the following October. Any rise in national living wages would also have an impact on the pay scales for staff as it would raise the pay for the lowest grades resulting in smaller pay differentials for the grades above, which could lead to other grades needing to be re-evaluated.
- The Council was still waiting for confirmation of the Highways Maintenance settlement from the Department for Transport. In addition to the Council, the County Council Network and Lincolnshire MPs have been lobbying the government for the reinstatement of the Highways Maintenance funding, which was a national issue, but the current indications were not hopeful. If the government's response was not positive, then there would be a need to look at proposals to address the shortfall.
- The financial settlement included new burdens funding which could be used for cyber security but it was only for one year and it was unknown when it would become available.
- The focus for the savings strategy for the 2022/23 budget was through the smarter working programme. Savings varied for each area depending on the activity undertaken, the amount of travel and the size of the team. Therefore, smaller areas of the Council such as Corporate services were proposing smaller savings compared to some other areas due to having fewer staff and less staff travelling for meetings.
- The Transformation Programme saving was in relation to the specific team set up to deliver projects for delivering savings across the Council and related to the smarter working programme and reduced travelling costs.
- The underlying theme for the budget was to ensure that the Council continued to deliver services at a sufficient level and at a standard the public would like to receive. Within this, there were wider themes such as the smarter working programme, the green agenda, improved communications with the public, and the broader ambitions of the Council in terms of the Greater Lincolnshire devolution agenda.

- The Council had received a better settlement than expected, but there were still concerns with the highways maintenance funding. A lot of the savings in the budget had been previously agreed, and there would be further savings in terms of efficiencies. The smarter working agenda would release larger efficiencies, but there was a need for investment such as in IT to generate those efficiencies.
- The planned reduction in Executive and Management support posts was due to the greater use of technology such as Teams, and a change of model from 1:1 or 1:2 support to a hub model for supporting senior management. This would not have a significant impact on the operation of the Council.

The Overview and Scrutiny Management Board also considered the Council Budget 2022/23 proposals as set out in the report to the Executive on 5 January 2022.

The Board supported the Budget proposals put forward by the Executive for 2022/23, with the exception of Councillor R B Parker who abstained, and agreed to provide comments to the Executive.

In relation to the 2022/23 details, the following points were clarified for the Board:

- It was unknown what the Fairer Funding review would involve and whether it would be a fundamental review including reviewing the localised business rates system, or just a reset of the data and formula used. There was a debate around the weighting of factors such as for deprivation and sparsity which still needed to be resolved.
- In relation to the rising energy costs, the Council used the ESPO framework for purchasing energy. The ESPO contract provided the Council with some certainty around the rates the Council was paying as the prices were fixed for a period of time.
- As a result of the review of the Executive and Management Support arrangements, 30 staff would be leaving the Council on voluntary terms. The remodelling might lead to a change in the delivery of certain services by utilising the technology now available. In addition, the smarter working programme meant that there was reduced mileage and overheads from less staff travelling to meetings.
- The financial volatility reserve was kept between £40million - £50million to enable the Council to continue delivering services. If the Fairer Funding review did not go in favour of the Council, then the Council could be looking at £5million - £10million of savings per year. The financial volatility reserve provided a buffer to enable the Council to transition from the current spending base to the future spending base over a three to four year period.
- The latest staff survey had recently been completed and the key headlines coming out of the data was that the employee wellbeing rating remained strong. There continued to be a lot of support for the smarter working agenda as it gave people the flexibility to deliver their job in the best possible way. The Council had heavily invested in supporting the wellbeing of staff and those support measures would mitigate the lone working issues which had been raised in the last staff survey. Staff were also now able to go into the office when they wanted to.
- The smarter working savings from reduced mileage costs were already included in the budget proposals. Some frontline staff, such as social workers, were still having to

- travel, plus some service areas did not need to travel as part of their roles, which would impact on the level of savings available.
- The smarter working programme would enable staff to come into service hubs which have been set up to bring staff together to share ideas and work collaboratively. Hybrid working would provide several benefits to staff while delivering savings through reduced travel and a reduced building estate.
 - Predicting the business rates collection fund was difficult as each district council varied between having surpluses and deficits. As a result, the budget included an assumption that there would be no surplus or deficit.

Meeting with businesses, trade unions and other public bodies – 28 January 2022

Councillor M A Whittington, Executive Support Councillor for Resources, Communications and Commissioning welcomed everyone to the meeting. Attendees were informed that this meeting was part of the normal consultation process which the authority undertook when setting its budget and provided the opportunity for partners and other organisations to take part in the consultation. It was reported that the proposed budget was also examined by each of the County Council's scrutiny committees who would look in more detail at the budgets for individual service areas. Recommendations would then be made to the full Council at its meeting on 18 February 2022, where the budget would be formally approved.

Dave Simpson, Head of Technical and Development Finance, gave a presentation on "Budget Consultation Meeting with Key Stakeholders, 28 January 2022", which was a consultation exercise led by the County Council to highlight the Council's current budget and financial outlook for public services over the coming year. The presentation highlighted the following main points:

- A Government Spending Review had recently taken place resulting in an increase of £4.8b, over three years, in funding to all local authorities nationally for social care and other services. A Council tax referendum limit of 3% had been agreed, 2% for general council tax and a further 1% for those authorities with social care responsibilities. In addition, there was the ability to carry over the adult social care precept from 2021/22, which was 3% for Lincolnshire County Council. The government announced that core spending power would rise for all councils by at least 6.9% which included council tax. Adult Social Care funding reform was confirmed, resulting in care contributions being capped but national insurance contributions seeing an increase of 1%. While the fairer funding review wasn't specifically addressed, it was confirmed that Councils' needs and resources were going to be considered during the next financial year. As a rural authority, the Council were optimistic that such considerations would be to its advantage. The National Living Wage (NLW) was to be increased by 6.6% and the local government pay freeze was to be lifted. Business rates multiplier was to be frozen, however councils would be compensated for any

loss. No further grants or supported in relation to the Covid-19 pandemic were to be provided.

- A one-year budget would be set in accordance with a one year set of figures. A new tranche of Social Care Support grant of £9.342m was expected to continue into upcoming years and was incorporated into the Council's future budget. For 2022/23 only, the Council would receive £7.684m Service Grant from the government to support with local authority cost pressures. No restrictions on were imposed on spending. The Improved Better Care Fund (iBCF) increased by an additional £1.006m to meet continued accelerated discharge activity. Furthermore, the Council would receive a grant of £2.273m to support reforms to Adult Social Care funding, called the Market Sustainability and Fair Cost of Care Fund. Related cost pressures had been identified and costed into the budget setting process.
- The first graph outlined the Council's Net Expenditure Sources of Finance 2022/23, identifying 62.0% (£333.146m) from Council Tax, 23.1% (£124.265m) from Business Rates, 10.9% (£58.559m) from other sources and finally 4.0% (£21.220m) from Revenue Support Grants totalling £537.190m.
- The second graph outlined the Council's Net Expenditure on Services 2022/23, identifying 32.3% (£173.259m) on Adult Social Care and Community Wellbeing, 21.0% (£112.630m) on Place, 15.3% (£82.675m) on Children's Services, 10.8% (£57.809m) on other services, 8.0% (£47.989m) on Capital Financing Charges, 7.4% (£39.595m) on Commercial and finally 5.2% (£28.231m) on Resources totalling £537.190m.
- Delayed Local Government finance reforms created uncertainty when future planning, however the Council had a good record of operating within its budget through savings and prudent use of reserves. Underspends were typically allocated to support reserves to reinforce the Council's financial resilience. As a result of this, the Council maintained its position as being in the lower quartile of Council Tax levels nationally.
- The third graph detailed financial trends over the previous 10 years, identifying a significant reduction of £118.000m in total government grants from 2011 to 2021. The Council hadn't been required to use its reserves over the past two years.
- The Medium-Term Financial Plan for 2022/22 achieved a balanced budget, however 2023/24, 2024/25 and 2025/26 saw deficits of £9.335m, £6.480m and £6.909m respectively.
- Cost pressures for the Council for 2022/23 totalled £41.249m, £13.501 of which came from Adult Social Care and Community Wellbeing, as a result of increase in contract costs to reflect inflation and National Living Wage increases, increased demand, new burdens arising from Accelerated Discharge Pathway and Market Sustainability and Fair Cost of Care, increases in the numbers and complexity of children in care and increases in the cost of Home to School Transport. Other budget cost pressures, which accounted for £14.703m, included pay awards, National Insurance, pension increases, contingency increase for inflation on major contracts and Increased cost of financing the capital programme.

During the course of discussion, the following points were noted:

- The cost of the £364m of borrowing over the upcoming 10 years would begin to be paid in the year following the planned spend's completion. The annual budget for capital financing currently sat at approximately £42m, however, over the upcoming

10 years, it would gradually increase until it peaked at £50m before decreasing again. The earmarked reserves allowed for cyclical refinance and repayment of loans. All borrowing was facilitated through the Public Works Loan Board.

- The £61m allocated for schools’ improvement ensured that the Council could guarantee sufficiency of places across the County Schools including both academy’s and maintained schools.
- As part of the Council’s financial strategy, it sought to maintain its position within the lower quartile of Council Tax nationally. Currently, Lincolnshire County Council sat as the second lowest Council of its cohort and its payments were £300 per annum lower than that of the highest rate. Moreover, the Council continued to deliver quality services while making savings where appropriate.
- The anticipated Levelling Up White Paper would detail several opportunities for the Council including Fairer Funding, exploration of devolution and levelling up.

Present	Representing
Councillor M A Whittington	Lincolnshire County Council
Councillor M J Overton MBE	Lincolnshire County Council
Councillor A M Austin	Lincolnshire County Council
Ken Rustidge	Lincolnshire Secretary – National Education Union
Andrew Crookham	Lincolnshire County Council
Dave Simpson	Lincolnshire County Council
Michelle Grady	Lincolnshire County Council
Robert Close	Lincolnshire County Council

Public Engagement via the Council website

Following consideration of the budget proposals 2022/23 by the Executive on 5 January 2022, a public engagement was published on the Council website, and closed on 26 January 2022. The following seventeen responses were received by email:

Response 1 by email

Dear Sir/Madam,

I am grateful that Lincolnshire Council has taken the current and expected cost of living increases into account when deciding on a necessary but fair 3.00% council tax increase (which is entirely for Adult Social Care) for 2022-2023.

As you have stated maintaining the existing council tax would necessitate a reduction in the services that the council could provide and I am sure this would unacceptable to the residents of Lincolnshire.

Kind Regards

JS (*name redacted*)

Response 2 by email

Simply - needs must 3%

Regards

AA (*name redacted*)

Response 3 by email

I totally agree with the proposal for a 3% rise if dedicated entirely to adult social care, which has fallen way behind other areas of care and the staff in particular do a great job but need more resources to recruit, pay more and train.

JC (*name redacted*)

Response 4 by email

As a retired couple living in Horncastle we will be pleased to pay an extra 3% on our council tax bill knowing that most of the money will be well spent.

IS (*name redacted*)

Response 5 by email

I am writing this email with regards to your proposed asc tax increase I feel this can't go ahead for so many reasons.

1, we already have to pay 2% over and above any increase on council tax bills.

2, we are being hit with a 1.25% tax rise in April with this going to pay for the NHS and ASC so we are being hit with a double whammy national and local tax not sustainable and fair for the hard working people of Lincolnshire.

3, Families across Lincolnshire are facing massive increases on fuel bills Food prices, petrol diesel prices water bills just about everything is going up and wages are not keeping up with all these rises so something at the end of the day has to give!

While I do sympathise with your predicament at the end of the day you can't keep coming to the hard working people and the older generations of Lincolnshire to keep putting up council tax by the maximum and over and above increases every year it's just not on you should be campaigning to central government for proper funding and making sure they give you the proper funds you need to run essential public services you provide.

Please bear this In mind when setting your budget for the next financial year!!!

I personally don't think anybody at the top table will take any notice of any bodies views including my own but they will steam roller the increases proposed at the end of the day.
Yours living in hope.

RA (*name redacted*)

Response 6 by email

I consider the 3% previously deferred should be charged for adult social care, for the coming year until the national social care premium from national insurance will start going to what it is designed for instead of supplementing an already enlarged NHS. I also think you should charge a further 2% for this year general funds, otherwise you will be cutting services yet further.

I believe you should push back to central government to give a greater grant to Lincolnshire as it is rural but is growing its residents each year.

NB (*name redacted*)

Response 7 by email

Referring to the above would be inappropriate use of public funding. LCC needs to manage and square up that department as it is poorly managed as I have had first hand knowledge.

Supervision not in communication with its employees, lack of social workers in the field not acting responsibly are just some items that require addressing. Have the money directed to that department but ensure it is used correctly.

JF (*name redacted*)

Response 8 by email

Following a discussion at the Swayfield Parish Council meeting held on the 11th January 2022, the Parish Council agreed to support your budget proposal for 2022.

Swayfield Parish Council

Response 9 by email

I have been asked to respond on behalf of Market Rasen Town Council in relation to the recent request for the council's views on the proposed council tax increase of 3.00% for 2022/23.

The Council are broadly in support of the proposal and recognise that the funding of Adult Social Care is a vital issue that must be addressed. However, the council would ask that consideration/ support be given to those within the community who are unable to afford increased payments

Market Rasen Town Council

Response 10 by email

This email is to confirm Swinstead Parish Council support your budget proposal.
Swinstead Parish Council

Response 11 by email

It is my opinion that if and only 3% rise for social care only would be except able. Anyone at anytime may need care and this must be a priority.

ES (*name redacted*)

Response 12 by email

First of all thank you for allowing us to reply to your current budget proposals which, having regard to the reasons listed below: our group feels that the 3% increase, for Adult Social Care should, on this occasion, be absorbed from reserves. Wherever this money comes from, it should be ring fenced for the purposes of Adult Social Care.

1. Cost of living crisis: some economists have predicted that households could be hit with an increase in costs of an additional £3,000 taking the increase in national Insurance, due this year, into account.
2. Salary increases have not kept up with inflation
3. Not only the poorest in our society will be the hardest hit but also many households with small families.
4. Confidence in the government is at a very low level.
5. With successive increases in Council Taxes and falling services, confidence at local levels are also reaching crisis point.

In respect of item '5' the ONS have reported for some time that the 'raw premium' in favour of the public sector is 7.5% rising to 10% during the pandemic (meaning that the public sector are better off by a margin of 7.5% than those working in the private sector). With this in mind and as far as local authorities are concerned, significant structural changes are required to bring them more in line with the private sector. And these are: replace incremental pay, where it still exists with performance related pay. And with possibly the exception of the highest echelons in public service (MP level and above) replace the defined benefit pension schemes with defined contribution schemes. This, in our opinion, will bring back control of service delivery costs.

We hope our views will be taken into account and acted on where necessary.

Councillors C, W, O, L, A (*names redacted*)

Response 13 by email

Grainthorpe Parish Council support these budget tax proposals for 2022/23 provided that the increase is used in its entirety, as proposed, ie for adult social care.

Grainthorpe Parish Council

Response 14 by email

The proposed 3% council tax increase relating to social care was discussed at our recent Parish Council meeting and the Councillors agreed that they had no objection to this proposal.

North Scarle Parish Council

Response 15 by email

It is a difficult time for many people and to increase Council Tax by more than 3% would not be palatable to many. However, continuing pressure on budgets and on services needs to be addressed. My reading is that we are talking about a real cut in budgets for non-Adult Social Care services unless the council uses reserves and that over time this is not sustainable. I would be supportive this year but with the proviso that the council reports back on the impact of a 3% increase for all services.

Baston Parish Council Clerk on behalf of a resident

Response 16 by email

We are supportive of your proposed rate increase of 3% for your Adult Social Care budget. We are also pleasantly surprised by your proposal not to increase the balance of your budget; we assume some Central Government help has been forthcoming with issues such as Pot Holes to enable you to hold the rate; it can sometimes be tempting to have a small increase and you are to be congratulated for not falling for this temptation – it sometimes means you have to set a higher rate at some time in the future!

Ewerby and Evedon Parish Council

Response 17 by email

Please note that Friskney Parish Council support the proposed increase of 3% on Council Tax.

Friskney Parish Council

Responses posted on Council Website

Response 1 on website

After the pandemic anyone who doesn't expect tax rises hasn't been paying attention. You should raise the tax by as much as possible and then use some of the money to improve services. Fix the roads, look after people, improve public transport, invest in leisure facilities, etc.. Why is this even up for debate? You should be raising taxes and improving services.

Response 2 on website

3% is acceptable.

Response 3 on website

Whilst I doubt that I will ever be able to benefit from any Adult Social care I think, if all the increase is to be used to balance the books for this provision, then the increase is necessary.

Response 4 on website

I am happy for LCC to increase by 3% - you can't do more for less.

Response 5 on website

I'd say go for it, but then I can afford it. With escalating fuel costs for residents, you need to think very carefully about the risk of financial hardship to families on average earnings and below.

Response 6 on website

I think in the present economic climate it is unfair to increase council tax this much. Along with rising fuel and food prices enough is enough.

Response 7 on website

I do not think the Council should raise Council tax for citizens. I thoroughly support an increase in budget for Adult Social Care which is very underfunded, but think the Council should use its current budget provision to do so. For example: prioritise Adult Social Care over roads; use financial reserves; improve productivity and efficiency by reducing lengthy and expensive decision making processes; minimise the use of consultants, agency, hotels etc. and ensure lean and efficient systems.

Response 8 on website

There is no doubt that Adult Social Care services are underfunded. The Local Plan for the next 40 years includes increased housing development which will result in greater for Adult Social Care. To provide for the present needs and for the future funds need to be available. Hence I support the 3% proposed increase.

Response 9 on website

Whilst agree that social care requires additional funding we are concerned about the proposals not to increase the precept in relation to LCC. Obviously costs are increasing and as such as a Parish Council we are concerned that services are going to be reduced and that the lower levels of local government will have to cover the difference, As Parish Councils have already submitted their precept requirements this will effect services that they can deliver.

Response 10 on website

3% rise is too much. Between 1.5 & 2.0% is the level which would be more bearable.

Response 11 on website

Adequate funding for Social Care and the NHS are essential if the health and well-being of our communities are to be preserved at an acceptable level. It is clear that current funding is not adequate therefore on a personal level I agree to the extra 3% levy provided that sufficient safeguards exist to help those who are not in a position to afford this extra payment.

LCC should do all it can to use other methods to address the issue; lobbying Central Government, reviewing practices etc.

Response 12 on website

Any increase above 2.0% is far too much.

Savings must be found. Perhaps a special tax for HOMO?

Tax on empty homes of not less than 2% of the sale value in the condition it is on 1st April.....

Increase fines for illegal dumping of waste...starting point would be the cost of the clear-up plus a fine of not less than the cost of the clear-up. Ex £3k to clear the site plus a further £3k fine as a starting point . 2nd offenders would have the same system put on them plus any vehicle used crushed.

Response 13 on website

Savings must be found. Reduce the council support for people who have their council tax reduced because of low income caused by not working. Reduction to be 5% of the support. This would not apply to disabled people.

Response 14 on website

Whilst I believe that central government has largely passed the buck on this issue and should be much more supportive, in this situation the LA must be able to provide the care that is needed - and this has to be funded some way so I don't think there is any option. It is good that there will be no rise in general tax as well.

Response 15 on website

While the current pressures on ASC are horrendous, the solution should not be to tax local people further. Funding for ASC should come from central government, funded through a wealth tax. Putting more funding into local ASC does not fix the issue. This was attempted through the Better Care Fund which didn't work, and was used to fill gaps rather than innovate. LCC's ASC is not effective or efficient in terms of contracting or service design. Fix these issues before increasing council tax

Response 16 on website

There seems no alternative in the short term - but national government needs to take over and fund ASC (and children's services) through general taxation. The increase will only add to the financial pressure on the less well off. The idea of increasing council tax on 2nd homes seems sensible but won't raise much

Response 17 on website

I think any council tax rise at this moment is pure bad judgment. Households are battling increasing energy costs, food and transport costs, just to live and commute to work. Wages are not increasing by that much. It would be better if LCC looked at saving money. You've already turned our street lights off, roads are in a poor condition and you're shoving loads of cash to a PCC, who doesn't seem to be of any benefit to anyone. How about the senior management taking look at how top heavy LCC is?

Response 18 on website

Needs must. 3% acceptable only if contracts outsourced wisely and don't end up lining the pockets of private business.

Response 19 on website

A National Care Service, as proposed by Jeremy Corbyn's Labour Manifesto, would be the ideal solution to Adult Social Care. https://labour.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2019/09/12703_19-Towards-the-National-Care-Service.pdf

In some way, carers need to be paid a wage for care work, which is why I am the only carer campaigning for #wagesnotclaps for carers. Carers simply cannot rely on charities that wrongly define us as "unpaid", while care workers are paid to do the same job.

Response 20 on website

Do not put up the council tax for adult social care. I do not wish to pay for this.

Response 21 on website

I honestly don't know why you are bothering to ask for our opinion on this matter. I feel you will carry on ,regardless, and do whatever you want to do

Response 22 on website

At this time I am sure that any rise will cause many families hardship and so I believe it should be kept as low as possible, particularly since things like the police section of council tax will also be increased.

Response 23 on website

I would not object to an increase of 3%

With a rising cost of living I think that your proposal is very responsible and would thank you for it being not more as, being on a pension, was quite worried that the charge increase would be higher.

Response 24 on website

The MAXIMUM increase at the foot of the tax bill should be no more than 2%. This to include ALL increases by County and local councils and the Police and Fire authorities.

Response25 on website

I would not object to an increase of 3%. This seems to be reasonable and responsible in the current situation.

Response 26 on website

As long as the total council tax increase is no more than 3% this is just about acceptable.

With regard to Adult Social Care as someone who has had to sell their mother in laws house to pay £150,000 care home fees in the last 4 years I think we have paid enough.

Response 27 on website

Please dont increase any more taxes and take even more of the money we work for. If you need more spend then I will be very happy to come along and identify savings you can make in your department. This is a service I will offer to you free of charge and I can guarantee I

will find wasteful spend. If our taxing paying household budgets have to be squeezed until the pips squeak then your departments should also be placed under the same tension.

Response 28 on website

I agree with your proposed tax increase of 3%
No one likes price increases but social care is very important.

Response 29 on website

I find it absolutely unbelievable and irresponsible to have deferred a social care increase when we have so many elderly in the county. While none of us like tax increases they are necessary to maintain and improve services with the burden shared by most people. The failure of this council to criticise the shortfall of grant by central government is another irresponsible act, this should have happened years ago and that is why the roads are so bad. Represent us, not your party.

Response 30 on website

No need for any increase in acc social we are already have a government tax increase coming in April as well a 2% increase already on tax bills the working person can't keep bailing out the local and county councils it isn't sustainable every year you need to go central government
Any savings need to made in house I don't like paying max increases and getting nothing in return take note mark jones !
My pay rise if any won't cover all increases in cost of living so lcc please take note!!!

Response 31 on website

The increase should be the maximum permitted (6% = £5 a month?) as services in the County are at the lowest level imaginable and some regard for the future is needed. I hold no truck with your dispensing largesse. Get on the doorstep of number 10 and drill it into your masters that we cannot continue in this manner. It is time this antiquated system of Government was disbanded and something suitable for the 21st century was introduced. 6% is the way to show us you really care.

Response 32 on website

The increase for social care should not have been deferred by the Council, leading to a problematic situation this year. Local services need to improve not be retrenched or held steady after a decade of cuts. 3% should be the minimum increase.

Response 33 on website

It is necessary to provide ongoing increases in Council Tax if only to be able to provide an adequate service. Such can be tempered by indicated economies wherever possible.

Response 34 on website

I think 3% increase is very fair

Response 35 on website

We feel under the current circumstances within the ASC system it would be fair to support by 1% even though the Government should be held to account for the under funding that has been allowed.

Response 36 on website

Needs must as several people have stated. Don't like it but it has to be done but PLEASE, sort out the general repairs to the roads in and around Market Rasen and Lincolnshire, the POT holes are getting larger and more dangerous by the day.

Response 37 on website

A lot more work needs to be done by LA's and their representatives in securing money from central Government, a lot more. Cap in hand no longer appears to work, more direct and out of the box opposition is required.

On the subject of Adult Social Care ; all cases need to be reviewed or audited as a matter of urgency. There are some poor souls, the old and infirm who get little help if any. Equate a cases of £30k pa for a taxi, and £900 on a phone to 15 min visits in Adult Social Care
Insulting!

Response 38 on website

Because HM Government has decided not to fund pothole repairs this winter, the County Council as Highways Authority should fund that cost. I realise that we are discussing the next financial year, but I doubt that the grant will be reinstated next winter. The general precept should be raised by 3% to cover that expense. Pothole repairs are a stitch in time, that will save greater expense in the long run. Potholes also damage vehicles and tyres, cause injuries to cyclists, who could well sue LCC

Response39 on website

I have been on the receiving end of LCC's Adult Care Programme. My late wife was let down by it. We received an apology, but if spending is to be increased via a council tax increase, I would stress the importance of directing additional funds to meet the needs of recipients, as opposed to spending it on 'management' and pen-pushing.

Response 40 on website

I support the increase if it is specifically for adult social care. This is a badly neglected service and it is about time we recognised how much help it needs.

Response 41 on website

I do not support a large increase in council tax as I do not believe it will be ring fenced for care considering the large pay increases for senior staff in particular just announced. Most staff seem to be working from home still and service to residents is not good. However regardless of what residents say you will no doubt continue to do as you like whilst increasing your own salaries.

Response 42 on website

This would be good if it was to improve adult social care but it is intended just to balance your budget suggesting that the increase is more for your purposes than the users of the service. With adequate management the budget could be balanced from within current

allocation - start by reviewing all salaries over £50k per annum (plus on costs) or do away with the PCC office and save £1m per annum. use funds for direct client support not admin and backroom staff and officer pay increments.

Response 43 on website

When considering the proposed increase perhaps The Council could look at the cost of street lighting. There is the obvious increase in energy costs and the environmental cost of carbon emissions, light pollution and the effects on wildlife. Cut light, save money, save carbon. Members' allowances could be looked at along with other attendance expenses; some of these allowances and final totals are far in excess of the average wage. Any increase in Council Tax needs to be ring fenced/targeted.

Response 44 on website

Would like the hike to go to actual social care, I'm really fed up with the council's telling us "they're struggling to balance the books" yet has a ridiculous amount of managers on too high wages, Lincolnshire is one of the poorest paid counties, yet council managers and councillors have very high wages and benefits, which should be cut. Get rid of the PCC and let Chief Constable fulfil the role like it used to be, you'd save the wages of Jones and assistant, no tax rise then needed.

Response 45 on website

I understand the need to raise more money for the adult social care sector but feel that the government should be providing this and not the tax payer. At the end of the day we pay additional taxes now and then when we need social care pay another massive lump sum to care homes, I feel there should be more balance and subsidised by the government so I would not be happy to increase my taxes

Response 46 on website

I sincerely doubt that I can afford any increase in council tax, let alone one of 3%. While I understand that tax increases have been frozen, and that the 3% is for the increasing costs of social care, please be aware that residents have also been hit with many other cost increases (fuel costs etc) while receiving no increases in wages.

Response 47 on website

I would welcome the increase in Adult Social Care expenditure but will the 3% increase be used in this way? I am concerned about the statement that says the increase is required to balance the books, so will Adult Social Care really benefit by 3%?

Response 48 on website

I am in complete agreement that the 3% increase should be used for Adult Social Care as the money will include anyone of 18 and over who qualifies, not solely older people. If I was confident that my personal finances would allow, I would approve of the extra 3% being used for general tax purposes e.g. public transport and provision of pavements and cycle paths in rural areas, plus road maintenance.

Response 49 on website

I am not in favour of this increase this things should be sorted at national lvl we get so little value from our rate payment poor policing poor road maintaince poor local health care

Response 50 on website

I am in total agreement with the 3% increase, which is solely for Ault Social Care, taking into account the current tight budget and the increasing older population.

Thank you.

Response 51 on website

Council tax is already too high for very little service in return. Instead of raising taxes, maybe think of services that the rate payer should not be paying for.

As others have said, you end up paying taxes all your life, then if you need social care will end up selling your house to pay for it.

Please be honest with people, there's no money to pay for things, at least stop taking it off us if we won't have anything to show for our contributions.

Response 52 on website

I have to say across the board where services are contracted out they are putting the prices up because they can, bringing essential services back in under direct council operation removes the ability for a company to make profits and give those to share holders.

Invest our money directly in Our own facility and preference them, then you'll force private to compete rather than extort. Shareholders are promised a return and every year to get that return needs a rise.

Response 53 on website

The proposed increase at this time when considering rising energy prices by large percentages will put a large squeeze on the lower earners. For this reason such a proposed increase should be a phased approach over 3 years. The proposal is not acceptable in this form at this time.

Response 54 on website

I am content to see you implement the allowed increase for adult social care, which should have been enacted last year. I agree that this is the time to go with no increase in the general allowance and as a member of Burgh le Marsh council I am supporting a similar policy.

Response 55 on website

I support the proposed council tax increase of 3% for 2022/23 for adult social care. I would appeal to the council to spend more wisely on the works involving pot hole fixing in Spalding and Surfleet. Nothing seems to have been done since last year's budget!

Response 56 on website

I fully support the 3% for Adult Social Care.

I would like an extra 1% to be levied to pay towards road maintenance.

Response 57 on website

All bills and taxes are rising far too quickly for people to afford them. I would not recommend this increase at the moment.

Response 58 on website

We are about to undergo one of the biggest tax rises in years, energy prices are about to skyrocket and all other living costs are rising. This is not the time to be increasing council tax for any reason, especially as we get so little for what we already pay. Work out how you can create internal efficiencies before adding to the cost of living crisis for us all.

Response 59 on website

I am strongly in favour of raising council tax to pay for services. I would also like to see restoration of a greater contribution to council budgets from the national budget.

Response 60 on website

Bills are unaffordable as it is, and as for council tax we seem to be paying more and more every year for you to do less and less. Bins for example- I'm taking more than half of my household waste to the recycling centre myself because the bins aren't nearly big enough and you don't collect them often enough and won't take side waste. Street lights are turned off at night on residential streets turning them into a criminal's paradise. The money doesn't seem to be going to where you say it is.

Response 61 on website

The rise seems reasonable in the light of a CPI of between 5-6%. Having said that it's easy to say that Central Government should contribute more to local authorities, Central Government gets its money from the same source as the Local Government, those who pay their taxes. Government, both Central and Local must continue to strive for increased efficiency not least as higher taxes affect business growth, reduced business activity (such as closed high street shops) doesn't help anyone.

Response 62 on website

Any increase is difficult to cope with when living on a pension; but if the rise is specifically for adult social care it will be worth it.

Response 63 on website

I'm happy to pay a little more to ensure people receive decent services. However central government must take responsibility for supporting civil society, of which local government services are a part. Over the last 12 years central government policy has been to whittle down public services to the bone for ideological reasons. There are no more "efficiencies" to be had in public services. We are exhausted, cut to the bone and facing yet another pay cut this year. There IS an alternative to this

Response 64 on website

I am in favour of an increase so long as it is ringfenced and can be accounted for on an open book basis. I would also like to see local government challenging central government about the decision to delay the funding of ASC out of the NI increases for 18 months.

Response 65 on website

I agree with this increase for adult social care. In fact I would agree with the increase for children's social care. We need to protect and support the vulnerable in society rather than responding to the loudest voices. (Potholes comes to mind) keep up the great work in social care.

Response 66 on website

In principle nobody would argue that people who need social care shouldn't be properly looked after and funded accordingly. However I would not be in favour of a further increase as so often happens with budgets dealt with by the public sector the chances of the funds going where needed and not swallowed up in admin/ red tape etc will amount to practically zero and we'll be asked the same question time and time again with I doubt any tangible improvement in the service

Response 67 on website

I understand the pressures facing social care, and it's important that there are plans to improve it and help those who need it. However, I think people will want to see positive results and see the extra money being used for good and improve the service. Otherwise I fear that if the pressures are not eased and grow, and the authority propose another tax rise, then I think there will be backlash and uproar. This proposed increase will have to show that it worked.

Response 68 on website

I support the extra money needed towards social care as long as it goes directly to individuals needing care and not swallowed up by admin fees. More is needed to make the service needs led rather than panels assessing and working towards finance led which is the situation now. As a retired manager I witnessed the panel denying care to individual with dementia, wandering in winter with inappropriate clothing
How is that needs led?

Response 69 by on website

I don't agree with any increase in CT for this year. Energy prices are due to double from Apr '22 plus NI increase from 12% to 13.25% (NB an actual increase of 10.4%). Over the past c.30yrs, provision of adult care in England has shifted from a largely publicly funded/provided service to one largely provided by private companies. My wages are now worth much less. Social care needs to be publicly run, not run by private companies profiteering from funding by the tax payer.

Response 70 on website

Sounds like a fair compromise. The pandemic has highlighted the problems that already existed in the field of adult social care and the need for an injection of cash into the system. The tax increase looks to be under the projected rate of inflation, which makes it more palatable to me.

Response 71 on website

You fail to give details where/how the funds are dispersed in the linked PDF document. What is council managed? What is private business and their profit margin and dividends to shareholders?

As you're hiding details then no rise to the entire council tax (0%).
But as a start, cut all Council Executive(s)/Manager(s) yearly salaries to below £100,000 (and no "package" benefits).
Cut councillor(s) basic allowance by 50%, over £11,000 is unjustified for their few hours weekly.

Response 72 on website

Absolutely no rise to any part of Council Tax - 0%.
The existing Executive squanders our funds by sub-contracting to the private sector and their profit margins, gross financial mismanagement.
Too much already goes into admin and not the front line.
Any increase will be diverted from it's proposed target, just look at the waste into LHP and LRSP, the latter of no public benefit whatsoever.
Get rid of half the Council Executives, have you looked at their pointless job titles?

Response 73 on website

While not 100% financially ok for a lot of people including myself I think we need to pay for services. if there is possibility of further reductions exemptions for those on low incomes as I know a lot of people are struggling . We need to ask for more support from the Government whether in the form of Covid 19 subsidy or other ways.

Response 74 on website

Middle Rasen Parish Council discussed the proposed council tax increase of 3% at the meeting on 18th January 2022. It was decided the parish council were not in agreement with the proposed increase with the high cost of living people are facing with increased energy bills

Response 75 on website

Current level of inflation is 5%+;
In April further tax rises will come into effect from Central Government affecting tax levels and National Insurance.
Cap will be reviewed affecting fuel prices and currently households are being told to expect at least a £600 per year increase.
Green Bin charge already increased by 25% to £50 per annum from £40.
Pension and wage rises are well below level of inflation.
Those not able to access help schemes cannot afford 3%. 2% max

Response 76 on website

Too many increases this year with wages not in line with them . No to any council tax increase.

Response 77 on website

Fotherby Parish Council approve the 3% increase

Response 78 on website

Social care underfunded so if this is hypothecated for front-line care and isn't swallowed in management initiatives then I approve.

Response 79 on website

"Walesby Parish Council consider that the proposal is a very sensible compromise and support the 3% increase in Council Tax. This is with the proviso that safeguards are in place to ensure that the proposed increase is spent wholly on social care."

Response 80 on website

At their Precept meeting held Monday 17th January 2022, Heckington Parish Councillors considered that the proposed increase was generally acceptable, so long as the funds were ringfenced for use in providing Adult Social Care services entirely.

Response 82 on website

As a visitor to multiple adult service users in multiple social care facilities, I have observed the impact of a shortfall in funds. I support the idea of a 3% rise wholly dedicated to adult social care.

Response 83 on website

The provision of adequate funding to sustain an acceptable level of Adult Social Care is likely to become a (if not the) burning issue for Councils over the next 10 years or so.

Nearly everyone will need Adult Social Care at some time during their life and in a civilised society it should be readily available when it is needed.

3% is a modest start and such expenditure needs to be regarded as an investment, not an expense.

Response 84 on website

When will you send RMW packing? It was a huge mistake inviting them to find a suitable site for a Nuclear Dump in Theddlethorpe.

WE DO NOT want a NUCLEAR DUMP for the most TOXIC Nuclear Waste anywhere in East Lindsey, but especially not by a seaside town that relies on holiday makers & tourists as its main income.

There is little time to put this right. As for the 'Test of Public Support' it STINKS of bribery!

Response 85 on website

I fully support an increase of 3% to cover the rising costs of social care.

Response 86 on website

Roads are atrocious. A16 subsidence and uneven surface near Waith, weave round these. Tetney Lock Road edges sliding into the dyke, drive astride the white line to avoid being thrown towards the dyke. Holton Road a multitude of holes about 3 ft by 2 ft and 18in deep which would rip your wheel off so slow and let oncoming traffic pass to avoid them. This situation should not exist, why do we pay road tax???

Response 87 on website

Rauceby Parish Council supports the 3% Council Tax proposals by LCC, all being ear-marked for adult care

This page is intentionally left blank