

# BOSTON BOROUGH COUNCIL

**NOTICE OF DECISIONS TAKEN BY CABINET ON 4 JULY 2022**

**DATE OF PUBLICATION: WEDNESDAY, 6 JULY 2022**

**DEADLINE FOR CALL-IN: WEDNESDAY, 13 JULY 2022**

**NOTES:**

**MINUTE NUMBER 11 HAS BEEN GRANTED EXEMPTION FROM CALL IN ON THE GROUNDS OF URGENCY**

**A COPY OF THE CABINET AGENDA HAS BEEN PREVIOUSLY CIRCULATED TO ALL MEMBERS OF THE COUNCIL. IF YOU REQUIRE ANY FURTHER INFORMATION ON ANY ISSUE PLEASE CONTACT, IN THE FIRST INSTANCE, THE PORTFOLIO HOLDER OR OFFICER NAMED IN THE RIGHT HAND COLUMN.**

**MEETING OF THE CABINET**

4 July 2022

Present:

Councillor Paul Skinner, in the Chair

Councillors Tracey Abbott, Richard Austin BEM, Deborah Evans, Martin Griggs, Jonathan Noble and Nigel Welton

Officers –

Deputy Chief Executive - Communities, Assistant Director - Planning and Strategic Infrastructure, Assistant Director - Regulatory, Assistant Director - Wellbeing and Community Leadership, Insights and Transformation Manager, Climate Change and Environment Manager, Senior Licensing Officer, Transformation Officer, Democratic Services Officer

**1 MINUTES**

The minutes of the Cabinet meeting held on 4 May 2022 were agreed and signed by the Chairman.

**2 APOLOGIES**

None.

**3 DECLARATIONS OF INTERESTS**

Councillor Richard Austin declared an interest in the report relating to the S&ELCP Crowdfunding Scheme as he was a member of the Boston Woods Trust.

**4 QUESTIONS FROM MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC**

A question had been submitted by Mr. Darron Abbott.

Question to the Leader:

“Just in case you have forgotten Boston Borough Council submitted a Bid to gain City Status last December which I believe was unsuccessful. At the time I raised the question of how much this project had cost the rate payers of Boston in officers time, at the time the answer was the "costs were insignificant" and "the officers had done a considerable amount in their own time."

The fact that officers felt they had to complete the project in their own time seems totally unfair and along with the fact that it is obvious that no one has a scooby do of what time is ever taken to complete any project, suggests very poor management of resources and time management.

As we are now in the 21st Century do you not think it is about time that Boston Borough Council joined the outside world and operated some kind of Job card system in order to ensure officers time is used in the most efficient and cost effective manner?"

Response by the Leader:

“The efforts of our staff are frequently recognised and appreciated by Councillors. I would not support a job card system.”

Supplementary question asked by Mr. Abbott:

“I think at this point I should thank the Leader for his answer, but I am not sure whether I should laugh or cry.

I have a copy of a face book posting where one of your Deputy Chief Executives has a stab at the cost of the city bid, this being £393.90, but proves how your senior officers have no idea of how to run a business and is quite embarrassing.

Your response does surprise me, with your track record of running so many successful businesses even PLCs you must have some system of controlling costs, one of those being staff, but I suppose with those businesses the money had to be earned not given to you on a plate by local residents.

Is your answer what you really think or is it the fact that you do not want to upset the officers of this Council by asking them what they do in exchange for their salaries?"

Response by the Leader:

“I have recently spent the afternoon at the S&ELCP Employee Awards event where staff efforts were recognised. People who won awards were nominated by their peers. I have no fear that all staff are dedicated to their jobs.

The city bid is layered like an onion, there are many different layers that need to be set out. The city bid wasn't a failure, it raised the profile of Boston which was the main point

of the exercise. The LGA Conference in Harrogate were aware of Boston and the work that officers have been doing recently. We are starting to gain traction.”

## 5 RECOMMENDATIONS FROM OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY (STANDING ITEM) \*

Reports had been considered by the relevant Overview and Scrutiny Committee and comments were included as appropriate.

## 6 RECOMMENDATIONS FROM THE BOSTON TOWN AREA COMMITTEE (BTAC) (STANDING ITEM)

There were no recommendations from the Boston Town Area Committee.

## 7 REVIEW OF MAXIMUM HACKNEY CARRIAGE FARE STRUCTURE

<b>DECISION</b>  <b>That a variation to the maximum hackney carriage fares, as recommended by the Regulatory and Appeals Committee and outlined at option 2 in the report, be approved, with the addition of continual review by officers. The variation to be subject to the necessary statutory notices being advertised and no objections being received.</b>	<b>Portfolio Holders and Officer</b>  <b>PS / AMcD</b>
--	--

### REASON FOR DECISION

The Leader introduced a report by the Senior Licensing Officer setting out proposals for variations to be made to the maximum hackney carriage fares, at the request of the Boston Hackney Carriage Association (BHCA).

Under the provisions of section 65(1) of the Local Government (Miscellaneous Provisions) Act 1976 a council may fix fares for time and distance and other charges, in respect of the hire of hackney carriages. For the purpose of setting fares the ‘council’ meant the executive by virtue of the Local Authorities (Functions and Responsibilities) (England) Regulations 2000 (as amended).

The current hackney carriage tariffs were set out in the report, together with a proposal for an increase in the maximum fare submitted by the BHCA and an option formulated by Officers.

The proposed options had been considered by the Regulatory and Appeals Committee on 7 June 2022, and Option 2, the Officers suggested alternative, was recommend to Cabinet for approval.

In recognition of the increasing cost of fuel, the Regulatory and Appeals Committee agreed a further recommendation that an additional discretionary fee of 20 pence to be paid for each journey when the cost of diesel exceeded £1.80 per litre with a further 20 pence

increase for every respective 10 pence per litre in the cost of diesel thereafter. At the time of publication of the Regulatory and Appeals Committee report the cost of diesel per litre was £1.78; at the time of publication of the Cabinet report the cost had risen to £1.94 per litre.

Taxi proprietors and drivers had been consulted on the proposed fare increases. Once Cabinet had made a decision a public notice would be published in the local press and made available to view at the Council offices for the public to inspect, any representations would be required to be received within 14 days of the notice being published.

Cabinet proposed that the fares should be kept under regular review by officers.

#### OTHER OPTIONS OR ALTERNATIVES CONSIDERED

As set out in the report.

#### RECORD OF ANY CONFLICT OF INTEREST

None.

#### RECORD OF ANY DISPENSATION GRANTED

None.

### **8 TREE STRATEGY**

#### **DECISION**

**That the Tree and Hedgerow Strategy be approved.**

**Portfolio Holders and Officer**

**PS / SB**

#### REASON FOR DECISION

The Leader introduced a report by the Climate Change and Environment Manager seeking approval for the adoption of a Tree and Hedgerow Strategy for the South and East Lincolnshire Councils Partnership (SELCP), which set out the ambition and high level commitment of the three councils.

The report stated that the development of a Tree and Hedgerow Strategy for the SELCP was detailed in the Annual Delivery Plan for 2022-23. The proposed strategy set out the vision: 'our communities are richer in greener spaces to live, visit and invest through the

sustainable presence of trees and hedgerows which helped people and wildlife adapt to the future challenges of the changing environment.’ This was underpinned by a set of aims and objectives to provide the foundations for developing the work programme across the sub region. A copy of the proposed strategy was appended to the report.

The three core objectives of the strategy were to Protect, Plant and Participate; recognising the need to manage and enhance existing resources, to ensure a carefully considered approach to new planting and to engage local communities and wider stakeholders in the delivery of the strategy going forward.

#### OTHER OPTIONS OR ALTERNATIVES CONSIDERED

To not take forward a Tree and Hedgerow Strategy and continue to develop projects, policies and procedures in a piecemeal fashion across the sub-region.

#### RECORD OF ANY CONFLICT OF INTEREST

None.

#### RECORD OF ANY DISPENSATION GRANTED

None.

### **9 QUARTER 4 REPORT - PERFORMANCE, PROJECTS, RISK AND FINANCE**

<b>DECISION</b>  <b>That the quarterly monitoring information for Q4 2021/22 be noted.</b>	<b>Portfolio Holders and Officer</b>  <b>PS / SR</b>
--	--

#### REASON FOR DECISION

Councillor Paul Skinner and Councillor Jonathan Noble jointly introduced a report by the Insights and Transformation Manager setting out the performance, projects and risk monitoring information for Quarter 4 of 2021/22, as at March 2022).

The report stated that of the 22 KPIs set 8 were on or better than target; 3 were within tolerance and 9 were worse than target. Full details of the performance information was set out in Appendix A of the report.

A joint project management framework was in place across Boston and East Lindsey Councils which included monthly reporting to the Senior Leadership Team and quarterly reporting to Cabinet and relevant scrutiny committees. The end of year update for projects was attached at Appendix B of the report. Additional Annual Delivery Plan items and progress rating that was not part of the project reporting, was also included in Appendix B for completeness.

The Strategic Risk Register had been reviewed and signed off by the Senior Leadership Team in May 2022, and was attached at Appendix C of the report.

OTHER OPTIONS OR ALTERNATIVES CONSIDERED

None.

RECORD OF ANY CONFLICT OF INTEREST

None.

RECORD OF ANY DISPENSATION GRANTED

None.

**10 APPOINTMENT TO EXTERNAL ORGANISATIONS 2022/23**

<b>DECISION</b>  <b>That the appointments to the external organisations, as listed in Appendix A and below, be approved; such appointments to hold good only whilst the appointees remain Members of the Borough Council, until the next Annual Meeting of the Council, or until the appointment of their successors.</b>	<b>Portfolio Holders and Officer</b>  <b>PS / LB</b>
---	--

REASON FOR DECISION

Under the Constitution, those appointments to outside bodies connected with functions that were the responsibility of the executive (Cabinet) were to be determined by Cabinet rather than full Council.

The Leader presented a report, which sought approval for to make appointments to the external organisations as indicated in Appendix A as follows:

Organisation	Period of Appointment	Previous Appointees	Nominees
Local Community Framework Investment Panel (Empower Community Foundation/Lincolnshire housing Partnership)	Civic Year	P. Skinner	P. Skinner
Local Government Association Coastal Special Interest Group	Civic Year	-	P. Skinner Welton (sub)
PATROL (Parking and Traffic Regulations outside London)	Civic Year	Noble	Noble
Tritton Knoll Local Liaison Committee	Civic Year	Cooper	Cooper

**OTHER OPTIONS OR ALTERNATIVES CONSIDERED**

Not to make appointments to the external organisations.

**RECORD OF ANY CONFLICT OF INTEREST**

None.

**RECORD OF ANY DISPENSATION GRANTED**

None.

**11      LEVELLING UP WAVE 2**

<p><b>DECISION</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1.      That the purpose of the Levelling Up Fund and its requirements be noted;</li> <li>2.      That the engagement with Members in relation to the Levelling Up bid - including briefings, Scrutiny (Environment and Performance) and Full Council be noted and note comments raised as outcomes from that engagement;</li> </ol>	<p><b>Portfolio Holders and Officer</b></p> <p><b>NW / MS</b></p>
--	---

<p><b>3. That the round 2 Levelling Up Fund bid and its general direction of travel be supported and Officers authorised to finalise and submit the bid to Government by 6<sup>th</sup> July deadline;</b></p> <p><b>4. That the set aside of provision for 10% match funding (through in kind land contribution to the scheme) plus additional funding required to be allocated from the Capital Investment Reserve to a total combined value of £2m, be approved, subject to an offer of Levelling Up Funding being made from Government.</b></p> <p><b>5. That delegated authority be granted to the Deputy Chief Executive – Growth, in consultation with the Deputy Leader, to make any necessary amendments to the Council’s proposed bid to enable the best possible submission to be made.</b></p>	
--	--

**The above decision has been granted exemption from call-in on the grounds of urgency.**

**REASON FOR DECISION**

Councillor Nigel Welton introduced a report by the Assistant Director – Planning and Strategic Infrastructure providing an overview of the direction of travel for the Council’s proposed Levelling Up Fund (LUF) round 2 submission which focused on the re-development of ‘PE21’.

The report stated that the Levelling Up Fund was part of the government’s wider Levelling Up agenda. It was a capital fund designed to invest in infrastructure that improved everyday life across the UK. The £4.8 billion fund would support town centre and high street regeneration, local transport projects, and cultural and heritage assets. It was a competitive bid-process where authorities could seek to secure up to £20m from the fund.

The report contained the background to the Council’s round 1 submission, which had been unsuccessful, and the feedback received from Government which had been positive with minor suggestions being made in respect of narrowing down the focus of the bid to PE21 only; revisiting values and costs; revisiting engagement with the community and seeking support from more partners and the MP.

Taking into account the response from Government to the round 1 bid, the submission had been reviewed by external advisors and discussions held with the Scarborough Group to consider working up a private/public sector proposal for the entire PE21 area to be delivered through a Joint Venture arrangement.

A re-working of the PE21 masterplan for the western end of the site had been commissioned, jointly with NHS colleagues and LCC (transport) to look at opportunities for a new health centre and how this could be brought forward as a deliverable proposal, working alongside neighbouring parcels. The work was being led by Wilmott Dixon in order to provide information to feed into a LUF 2 bid as well as future funding opportunities / scheme development.

As work was progressing on the LUF 2 bid it was not possible to provide Members with a



precise picture of what would be included in the bid and what the financial model and 'ask' would be, but it was likely to be in the region of £15m. However, in all eventualities the 'match funding' (10%) requirement would not exceed the £2m previously indicated as being acceptable (within LUF 1 to come from land value and a top up if necessary from reserves) owing to the maximum £20m bid allowance that could be made.

The likely direction and key elements of the bid were set out in the report under the headings of:

- Delivery of a significant enhancement of the public realm (spanning the area between the river and the Len Medlock Centre);
- Crown House – as per round 1;
- B&M redevelopment – evolution of round 1

Those interventions would use the LUF funding as a catalyst to unlock the remainder of the PE21 area, including adjacent sites. Collectively this would then leverage the ability to bring forward other potential interventions in the future which could include:

- New health facilities with linkages to third sector organisations including those hosted by the Boston Volunteer Centre Charity;
- Housing, community / public sector and commercial uses;
- Improvements to the bus station;
- Improvements to the wider area including West Street.

It was noted that a number of key stakeholders had offered letters of support for the bid and support was also being sought from the MP (a bid gateway criterion). This was in addition to wider community engagement that had been undertaken through a range of social media activities.

The bid had been the subject of Member Briefings and consideration by the Environment and Performance committee at its meeting held on 21<sup>st</sup> June 2022. A supplementary paper setting out the comments from Members had been circulated for information.

Council considered the proposals for consultation purposes at the meeting held on 27 June 2022 and unanimously affirmed support for the bid to be submitted.

#### OTHER OPTIONS OR ALTERNATIVES CONSIDERED

Do nothing – This would involve the Council not making a bid, and therefore not being able to access the up to £20m available.

Amend proposals – There was potential for other alternative proposals to be considered, however, this had been discounted owing to the time pressures for the submissions as set out in the report. The proposals had been developed in partnership with external advisors to enable the Council to put forward a robust bid, significant changes / deviations to the approach were not possible whilst allowing for the bid deadline to be met. Alternatives could however be considered for future LUF rounds.

RECORD OF ANY CONFLICT OF INTEREST

None.

RECORD OF ANY DISPENSATION GRANTED

None.

**12 SELCP CROWD FUND SCHEME**

<p><b>DECISION</b></p> <p><b>That:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"><li><b>1. Working with East Lindsey District Council and South Holland District Council as partners in the South and East Lincolnshire Councils Partnership (S&amp;ELCP), a Crowdfunding scheme be established with one or both partners.</b></li><li><b>2. Boston Borough Council contract with ‘Spacehive’ to provide external management of the scheme on behalf of the Councils.</b></li><li><b>3. Delegated authority be given to the Deputy Chief Executive – Communities and the Assistant Director for Wellbeing and Community Leadership, in consultation with the relevant Portfolio Holders across the Partnership, to agree final arrangements for the Crowdfund Scheme, including process, criteria, final cost of scheme, and the awarding of grants.</b></li><li><b>4. A review of the benefits of the scheme be undertaken after an initial period of two years.</b></li></ol>	<p><b>Portfolio Holders and Officer</b></p> <p><b>MG / ES</b></p>
---	---

REASON FOR DECISION

Councillor Martin Griggs introduced a report by the Deputy Chief Executive – Communities setting out a proposal to procure a crowdfunding partner to develop a South and East Lincolnshire Councils Partnership Crowdfunding Scheme which would enable funds to be raised for community based initiatives.

The report stated that civic crowdfunding was becoming increasingly popular due to the numerous economic and social benefits it could deliver. Many local authorities across England had successfully used crowdfunding platforms to engage with local residents and businesses to develop projects and seek financial support group online pledges to match

local authority contributions.

The benefits to exploring civic crowdfunding had been identified as:

- Ability to generate additional funds towards projects
- Improving community capacity and resilience
- Community engagement and involvement
- Improved community cohesion and resilience
- Improved transparency of decision making
- Improving awareness of issues that were important to local communities
- Generating significant match funding by the 'crowd' for the benefit of the whole community, typically three times that pledged by the local authority.

It was proposed that a budget of £41,333 from the externally funded Empowering Healthy Communities Programme would be used to maximize the opportunity to support community projects and initiatives and to develop a civic crowdfunding scheme.

To facilitate a crowdfunding scheme it would be necessary to partner with a company to develop a crowdfunding platform. Spacehive had been identified as the only dedicated civic crowdfunding platform in the UK and was the only provider on the Government's G Cloud procurement framework, which would enable an exemption from a competitive tender process. Detailed information relating to Spacehive was set out in Appendix D to the report. Approval was sought to procure the services of Spacehive on behalf of the sovereign councils within the SELCP.

#### OTHER OPTIONS OR ALTERNATIVES CONSIDERED

Not to establish a partnership Crowdfunding Scheme

Continuation of the existing Empowering Healthy Communities Councillor Grant Scheme for 2022/23.

#### RECORD OF ANY CONFLICT OF INTEREST

None.

#### RECORD OF ANY DISPENSATION GRANTED

None.

<p><b>DECISION</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>1. That the detailed proposals set out in the report, supporting the establishment/intended role of the South and East Lincolnshire Healthy Living Board (Healthy Lives Priority Partnership) and accompanying terms of reference, be approved.</b></li> <li><b>2. The delegated authority be granted to the Deputy Chief Executive (Communities) to finalise a programme for the development of a Healthy Living Action Plan for the sub-region and a programme for the sub-regions Leisure and Culture offer, in consultation with the Portfolio Holders for Town Centre and Housing and Communities through the ‘Healthy Living Board’.</b></li> </ol>	<p><b>Portfolio Holders and Officer</b></p> <p><b>TA / MG / ES</b></p>
--	--

<p><u><b>REASON FOR DECISION</b></u></p> <p>Councillor Martin Griggs introduced a report by the Deputy Chief Executive – Communities seeking approval to the terms by which the South and East Lincolnshire Healthy Living Board is established.</p> <p>Cllr Griggs said following agreement at Full Council on 11<sup>th</sup> April 2022 to establish a ‘Healthy Lives Priority Partnership’, the proposed detail for the partnership in the form of a Healthy Living Board was set out in the report. The intention was to bring partners together each with an equal voice to focus on reducing health inequalities and improve health outcomes across the sub region. The draft terms of reference for the Board, including suggested membership, was set out in Appendix A of the report.</p> <p>A proposed key work-stream would be to support the development of a co-ordinated sub-regional offer for leisure and culture for the benefit of the communities of South and East Lincolnshire and those who visited the area.</p> <p>Many of the conversations that would take place at the proposed Healthy Living Board were already ongoing between Members, Partnership Officers and Partners, however the approach set out in the report provided a more formalised framework to support the work in line with the Partnership’s governance structure.</p> <p>The proposals also recognised the changes which were being introduced through the Health and Care Act 2022, which had received Royal Assent on 28 April 2022, and the opportunities to bring greater strength to local plans in relation to the levelling up agenda, the towns fund Projects and other initiatives by taking forward a sub-regional co-ordination role on matters relating to health and well-being, including leisure and culture.</p>
---

<p><u><b>OTHER OPTIONS OR ALTERNATIVES CONSIDERED</b></u></p> <p>None.</p>
--

RECORD OF ANY CONFLICT OF INTEREST

None.

RECORD OF ANY DISPENSATION GRANTED

None.

The meeting ended at 7.55Time Not Specified

Signed by the Deputy Chief Executive

6 July 2022

**These decisions will come into force (and may then be implemented) on the expiry of five clear working days after the date of this notice UNLESS the decisions are subjected to the Call-In procedure or are starred minutes requiring Full Council approval.**

The Meeting ended at Time Not Specified

Signed by the Chief Executive



**WEDNESDAY, 6 JULY 2022**

**These decisions will come into force (and may then be implemented) on the expiry of five clear working days after the date of this notice UNLESS the decisions are subjected to the Call-In procedure or are starred minutes requiring Full Council approval.**