

BOSTON BOROUGH COUNCIL

At the meeting of Boston Borough Council held remotely via Zoom, on Monday, 1st March, 2021 at 6.30 pm

Present:

The Mayor (Councillor Anton Dani), in the Chair

Councillors Tracey Abbott, Tom Ashton, Alison Austin, Richard Austin BEM, Alan Bell, Peter Bedford, David Brown, Michael Cooper, George Cornah, Anne Dorrian, Deborah Evans, Paul Goodale, Martin Griggs, Neill Hastie, Jonathan Noble, Frank Pickett, Brian Rush, Judith Skinner, Paul Skinner, Yvonne Stevens, Peter Watson, Judith Welbourn, Nigel Welton and Stephen Woodliffe

Officers –

Chief Executive, Deputy Chief Executive (Place) & Monitoring Officer, Deputy Chief Executive (Strategy), Section 151 Officer, Accountancy Manager - Revenues and Systems, Democratic Services Manager, Senior Democratic Services Officer and Democratic Services Apprentice

132 APOLOGIES

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Viven Edge, Martin Howard and Chelcei Trafford.

133 COMMUNICATIONS

The Chief Executive reminded Members that, in accordance with the Local Authorities (Standing Orders) (England) (Amendment) Regulations 2014, all votes on the council tax and budget setting report would be taken as recorded votes.

134 QUESTIONS FROM ELECTED MEMBERS

The Chief Executive reported there were questions from Councillors Anne Dorrian and Brian Rush.

Question asked by Councillor Anne Dorrian pursuant to paragraph 10 of the Rules of Procedure as set out in the Constitution.

“You recently reported that you visited the COVID testing stations to say ‘thank you’ to volunteers. Given the current restrictions, isn’t that something which could have been done in writing or by hosting a virtual meeting?”

Response by Councillor Paul Skinner

“Cllr Dorrian, once again you seem confused, I visited the Tollfied Road facility as a customer and thanked them in my brief and via the bulletin.

“I, as Leader of the Council, was invited by the NHS to visit the Vaccination Centre. A number of other Leaders from across the County were also invited to attend their local sites. I took the opportunity to say thank you to those working there on behalf of the Council to show our collective appreciation for their hard work.”

Supplemental question asked by Councillor Dorrian pursuant to paragraph 10.6 of the Rules of Procedure as set out in the Constitution:-

“Thank you for that, Councillor Skinner. I appreciate your answer. Currently we’re under COVID restrictions and, just watching the presentation on TV this evening, we’re still under “Stay At Home, Protect the NHS and Save Lives”. So, my question’s in two parts if you will, Councillor Skinner.

Part A is, local residents have complained to me that people are getting cabin fever and one local resident complained to me that her neighbour leaves home upwards of 12 times a day – what advice would you give that member of our local community?

Part B is that numerous local residents have contacted me, wishing to express their gratitude to Jonathan Van Tam, especially as he seems to have single-handedly painted this town in a very favourable light. Would you commit, Councillor Skinner, to participating in a cross-party working group within our Council so that we could find a way to honour his contribution to the public health of our community and the public health of the UK in general?”

Response by Councillor Paul Skinner

“Thank you, Councillor Dorrian, for your question.

When people are abiding by the restrictions and see other people not complying it’s extremely frustrating and not everybody wants to be the nosy neighbour and dob them in, but obviously you’ve got the opportunity to use 101, or e-mail 101, and that would be the correct route.

As regards JVT, as he’s known in the trade, absolutely fantastic gentleman, an absolute asset to this town and, yes, I would be quite, quite willing to take part in anything to actually honour him because he honours the town every time he stands up. Thank you very much.”

Question asked by Councillor Brian Rush pursuant to paragraph 10 of the Rules of Procedure as set out in the Constitution.

“Can the residents and ratepayers of Boston Borough Council, be provided with a clear and concise explanation as to why and when this Administration has unilaterally curtailed the ‘democratic rights’ of the Public to engage personally in delivering questions to their Elected Representatives, and instead obliged the Worshipful Mayor, to present their questions on their behalf, what was the reasoning behind this?”

Response by Councillor Paul Skinner

“The introduction of The Local Authorities and Police and Crime Panels (Coronavirus) (Flexibility of Local Authority and Police and Crime Panel Meetings) England & Wales Regulations 2020, provided local authorities the ability to hold meetings remotely to avoid having to meet face to face and risk the further spread of covid-19. In response to those Regulations the Chief Executive, in consultation with all Group Leaders, used emergency powers to implement the Remote Meetings Procedure Rules

which, to aid the management of remote meetings, suspended the requirement for members of the public to attend meetings in person to ask their questions and instead are directed via the Mayor or Chairman of the meeting.”

Supplemental question asked by Councillor Rush pursuant to paragraph 10.6 of the Rules of Procedure as set out in the Constitution:-

“I want to thank Councillor Skinner for his answer. However, I would like to say, are we really so dependent on Big Brother that our peers consider us incapable of participating in a virtual reality exercise or is this yet another surrender by our ruling Conservative Group who have forgotten how to lobby our own MP?”

Response by Councillor Skinner

“Thank you, Councillor Rush. We have had quite a national pandemic. It has not allowed people to meet face to face unless you’ve got the space round them. And, quite frankly, until the four tests that the Government have set, all the early restrictions, the earliest date is 21st June. And, basically, it is a way the questions can still be asked, but I, like you, would prefer to see people face to face and let’s hope people will value our freedoms and, therefore, actually follow the rules so we can get out this crisis quite quick because I, like you, I prefer face to face, thank you.”

Question asked by Councillor Brian Rush pursuant to paragraph 10 of the Rules of Procedure as set out in the Constitution.

“Can You tell me, when it was, that this Council passed a directive to begin allowing vehicles to park overnight in Boston Market Place, and what charge is levied to the owners for doing so?”

Response by Councillor Tracey Abbott

“The Council has not passed a directive to allow vehicles to park overnight in Boston Market Place.

The Markets team have allowed the butchers van to park in the events space the night before Markets on a trial period, if this is causing an obstruction, issues or complaints we will happily review this process. No charge is currently levied for this van.”

Supplemental question asked by Councillor Rush pursuant to paragraph 10.6 of the Rules of Procedure as set out in the Constitution:-

“Thank you Councillor Abbott. So is this overnight accommodation being provided free of charge to this particular vendor? If so, maybe we can begin to allow all our stallholders to pull up and stay overnight before the market. I have many photographs of bad practice being allowed to take place in the market place. I thought we already had a stopover site at the stock entrance, but they are maybe charging for that. So, Councillor Abbott, tell me, how much do we charge him for stopover electric? Whose responsibility is it if his truck gets broken into in the dead of night and his stock gets stolen or infected? What if a resident trips over one of his unprotected cables that are left out in the market place? Does our liability really cover such events? Don’t you think

it's time our Markets Manager started properly applying all the regulations within our markets policies before someone gets injured or killed?"

Response by Councillor Abbott

"Thank you for your supplementary. As I have just stated, there is no charge being levied for the van. As for the electric, I do not know, I can find that out for you. As I believe, anybody who would approach us who, especially during COVID, needs this requirement, I'm sure our staff and team will listen to every effort to make it possible. I shall get back to you about your second part of your supplementary. Thank you Councillor Rush."

135 QUESTIONS FROM MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC

The Chief Executive reported there were two questions from members of the public.

Question asked by Mr Darron Abbott pursuant to paragraph 11 of the Rules of Procedure as set out in the Constitution.

"A couple of year ago the Council invested around £20 million pound in property funds. Please could you give the current valuations of these funds and the income received by the council from these funds in the current financial years."

Response by Councillor Jonathan Noble

"Thank you for your question Mr Abbott. I would point out that there is a typographical error in the response provided to Mr. Abbott and the year quoted should be 2020/21 not 2021/22. The current valuation of our Property Funds' investments is £19,152,000. We budget to receive £977,000 per annum as a return on our Property Funds' investments and the latest projection for this financial year, 2020-21, is that the return will be £897,000.

The Council has received £2 million in dividends from our property fund investments in the last 4 years.

This information is in the public domain. It is presented to the Audit and Governance Committee. The last meeting of this Committee was on 25th January and details are to be found in the Treasury Management and Capital Strategy."

Supplemental question asked by Mr. Abbott pursuant to paragraph 11.8 of the Rules of Procedure as set out in the Constitution:-

"I thank Councillor Noble for his answer.

You seem to have misunderstood part of my question. I asked for the investment income for the current financial year which I believe to be 2020/2021 but you have supplied the figure for 2021/22. Please could you let me have this figure as I am sure you will have it at hand considering how easily you answered my supplementary question at cabinet last week .

Now on to my supplementary question. I have concerns about the budget you are laying before the Council this evening you state that for the year 2021/22 you will expect to receive £897,000 but on page 16 of the report does state a return of £977,000 so your budgeted income for next year is already £90,000 short so how can you be confident that next year you can deliver a balanced budget.”

Response by Councilor Noble

“I thank Mr. Abbott for his question. I answered the point in the prequel to the original question, there was a typographical error and the correct date is 2020/21.

I take exception to being accused of lying to Council or to anyone. Looking at appendix 1 financial figures, the projected income for property funds in 2020/21, 2021/22 and 2022/23 is the same figure.

Now Mr. Abbott alleges a £90k shortfall, the answer is simple, we have actually exceeded expectations on returns on property funds. The estimate was an under estimate, and performance was better than expected. I have been assured by the Section 151 Officer, who has been in consultation with the Property Fund Managers, that the same will happen the following year. Mr. Abbott should be pleased we are exceeding expectations and doing better than first thought.”

Question asked by Mr Paul Blackburn pursuant to paragraph 11 of the Rules of Procedure as set out in the Constitution.

“Are there any legal implications if council officers give wrong information so Councillors can vote at any meetings.”

Response by Councillor Paul Skinner

“Thank you for your question Mr Blackburn.

Our officers always ensure that councillors have all the relevant information before them to enable decisions to be made that are lawful.”

Supplemental question asked by Mr. Blackburn pursuant to paragraph 11.8 of the Rules of Procedure as set out in the Constitution:-

“I accept your response but totally do not agree with it. So would you begin a full open legal investigation to the whereabouts of all the monies this council has spent and lost in the setting up of the Bargate Green cooperative market which never got off the ground, yet the councillors voted on its implementation, and would give a verbal and written response?”

Response by Councillor Skinner

“This happened before my time as a Councillor. I will provide a written response.”

136 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

No declarations of interest were received.

137 AUDIT AND GOVERNANCE COMMITTEE MINUTES

It was moved by Councillor Tom Ashton, seconded by Councillor George Cornah and

RESOLVED that the confirmed minutes of the meeting of the Audit and Governance Committee held on 9 November 2020 be received.

138 PUBLIC SPEAKING - PLANNING COMMITTEE

Councillor Tom Ashton, Chairman of the Planning Committee, introduced a report on a proposal to amend the Council's Remote Meetings Protocol and Procedure Rules to introduce public speaking at remote meetings of the Planning Committee and adopt the revised procedures as the Public Speaking Scheme for physical meetings of the Planning Committee when resumed for the purposes of consistency.

The report stated that in response to the Covid-19 pandemic the Government had introduced legislation that permitted local authority meetings to take place by remote means until 7 May 2021.

At the time of introducing remote meetings, concerns had been raised regarding the effective application of public speaking rules at meetings of the Planning Committee. In response, it had been agreed to suspend the public speaking procedures and replace them with the submission of written representations.

Having gained experience and knowledge of operating remote meetings and having had the opportunity to learn from authorities that operated public speaking, the Council was now in a stronger position to effectively implement public speaking at meetings of the Planning Committee. It was therefore proposed to introduce public speaking from 9 March 2021 based on the protocol attached as an appendix to the report.

To provide consistency with public speaking at both remote and physical meetings of the Planning Committee, it was also recommended that the Public Speaking Protocol for physical meetings of the Planning Committee be revised to adopt the procedures as set out in the protocol for remote meetings. The key revisions were:

- Registration for speaking deadline changed from 12 noon on the day before the day of the meeting to 12 noon 2 clear working days before the day of the meeting.
- Speaking time for all categories, with the exception of Ward Member, to be limited to 3 minutes, currently 5 minutes was allowed.
- Ward Member speaking time to be limited to 5 minutes, currently unlimited time was allowed.
- Only one person to speak in each category of objector, supporter, applicant/agent. Should more than one person wish to speak in any of those categories it would be for those persons to agree between themselves who would speak. If this was not possible, the first registered

speaker would be allocated the speaking time. The current protocol allowed speaking time to be shared up to the time limit.

- Committee Members would be given the opportunity to ask questions of speakers for a maximum of 10 minutes. Direct questioning of speakers was not currently permitted.

Should unforeseen issues arise or further best practice be identified it was important that public speaking rules were able to be amended in a timely fashion to facilitate the effective operation of the Committee. In those circumstances it was considered appropriate and was recommended that the Council delegated to the Assistant Director of Planning, in consultation with the Chairman of the Planning Committee and Portfolio Holder for Planning, the power to amend public speaking rules for remote and physical Planning Committee meetings.

It was moved by Councillor Tom Ashton and seconded by Councillor Alison Austin

- 1. That Council approves the introduction of public speaking at remote meetings of Planning Committee from 9 March 2021 and that the Council's Remote Meetings Protocol and Procedure Rules be amended as set out in this report.**
- 2. That the Public Speaking Protocol for physical meetings of the Planning Committee be revised to reflect the registration deadlines, number of speakers and time limit on speaking within the protocol for remote meetings, for purposes of consistency.**
- 3. That any further amendments to the Public Speaking Protocol for both remote and physical meetings of the Planning Committee, be delegated to the Assistant Director of Planning, in consultation with the Chairman of the Planning Committee and the Portfolio Holder for Planning.**

Members welcomed the proposal to introduce public speaking for remote meetings of the Planning Committee, but were concerned that reducing the speaking time to three minutes would create difficulties for members of the public who may not be used to speaking in public.

An amendment was moved by Councillor Anne Dorrian that the allowance of three minutes speaking time, as set out in 1.3 of the protocol, be increased to five minutes.

The proposer and seconder of the substantive motion agreed to accept the amendment.

The substantive motion was put to the vote and it was

RESOLVED

- 1. That Council approves the introduction of public speaking at remote meetings of Planning Committee from 9 March 2021 and that the Council's Remote Meetings Protocol and Procedure Rules be amended as set out in**

the report, with the exception of the allowance for speaking time which should be amended to five minutes.

- 2. That the Public Speaking Protocol for physical meetings of the Planning Committee be revised to reflect the registration deadlines, number of speakers and time limit on speaking within the protocol for remote meetings, for purposes of consistency.**
- 3. That any further amendments to the Public Speaking Protocol for both remote and physical meetings of the Planning Committee, be delegated to the Assistant Director of Planning, in consultation with the Chairman of the Planning Committee and the Portfolio Holder for Planning.**

139 2021/22 BUDGET REPORT, MEDIUM TERM FINANCIAL STRATEGY AND COUNCIL TAX

Councillor Jonathan Noble introduced a report by the Chief Finance Officer which outlined the 2021/2022 revenue and capital position for the General Fund and proposals for the setting of discretionary fees and charges.

The Local Government Act 2003 introduced a requirement for the Chief Financial Officer to report on the robustness of the budget. The estimates had been prepared in a prudent manner, although it was highlighted that there were a number of elements outside of the Council's control. These had been identified within the report and would be mitigated through the budget monitoring and risk management processes of the Council.

The proposed budget showed a balanced position for 2021/22 followed by the need to make approximately £500K of savings in future years in order to maintain a balanced budget position without drawing down on reserves.

The capital programme totalled £4.8m over 5 years which remained affordable and sustainable over that period.

The budget assumed an increase in the Council Tax of £4.95 (2.57%) for 2021/22 and 2% per annum thereafter. This was in line with current known referendum limits of £5 or 2% whichever was the greater. The proposed increase allowed for £36k growth for implementation of the Living Wage Foundation and £60k for Internal Drainage Board Levy increases to be absorbed. There was also a £100k provision for potential sales and fees income shortfalls, following additional risks to income collection levels.

For future years it was expected that the predicted deficit would be approximately £500k per annum. This had been reduced by around £200k per annum following the Council's decision to enter into a shared arrangement for back office functions with PPSL. It was expected that the required savings could at least partially be offset by further Strategic Alliance savings, and other service reviews that would be undertaken during the following year.

It was noted that the Council was expected to hold around £13m in reserves at the end of 2021/22.

When introducing the report, the Portfolio Holder referred to the funds received from central government to compensate for losses incurred as a result of the Covid-19 pandemic lockdowns. A prudent approach had been adopted to recognise reductions in funding from government in future years and the proposal under consideration was a balanced recovery budget.

The draft budget had been published on the Council's website for consultation with all stakeholders, including the local business community and responses were set out in Appendix 9 of the report. In addition Members had been consulted through various forums including the Corporate and Community Committee, and Audit and Governance Committee on the governance aspects of the budget preparation and comments were set out in Appendices 10 and 11 respectively.

Cabinet had considered the report at its meeting on 24 February and recommended the budget and medium term financial strategy 2021/22 to 2025/26 to Council for approval.

It was moved by Councillor Jonathan Noble and seconded by Councillor Paul Skinner

- 1. That the Council approves capital and revenue budgets for 2021/22, the 5 years Medium-Term Financial Strategy for 2021/22 to 2025/26 and the associated financial strategies as shown in the attached budget setting report.**
- 2. That the Council agrees the formal Council Tax resolutions as detailed at Appendix 12 and 13 (Parishes, BTAC special expense, the County Council and the Police and Crime Commissioner for Lincolnshire are also dealt with as a part of this resolution). This includes a 2.57% increase in Boston's element of the Council Tax, the Band D Council Tax being £197.91.**

An amendment was moved by Councillor Anne Dorrian and seconded by Councillor Peter Watson:-

That there be a zero increase in the Boston Borough Council element of the council tax for 2021/22.

The Section 151 Officer advised Council that if a zero increase was agreed, there would be a deficit of £100k which would need to be funded from reserves in order to achieve a balanced budget. It would also result in £500k of lost income to the Council in future years. The impact on council tax bills would be a reduction of £3.30 for Band A, £3.80 for Band B and £4.95 for Band D.

Debate ensued on the merits of the substantive motion and the amendment, key points being made of:-

- Boston was one of the poorest areas of the County with lowest incomes and every penny counted to many people.
- It was important to recognise the welfare of people.
- People deserved a break after suffering a year with the Covid-19 pandemic.

- Reserves should be used to balance the budget for 2021/22 and help the community.
- The impact on future years and necessary savings if a zero increase was agreed.
- It was important to provide the services residents needed and could only be maintained by increasing council tax.
- An alternative budget should have been produced to demonstrate the cuts which would be made in future years to compensate for a zero increase.
- Investment was required in services to improve the cleanliness of the town, HMO inspections and enforcement etc.

On being put to the vote the amendment was lost.

For	Against	Abstain
Bedford	Abbott	
Bell	Ashton	
Cooper	A. Austin	
Dorrian	R. Austin	
Hastie	Brown	
Rush	Cornah	
Watson	Dani	
Welbourn	Evans	
Woodliffe	Goodale	
	Griggs	
	Noble	
	Pickett	
	J. Skinner	
	P. Skinner	
	Stevens	
	Welton	

The substantive motion was put to the vote and it was

RESOLVED

- 1. That the Council approves capital and revenue budgets for 2021/22, the 5 years Medium-Term Financial Strategy for 2021/22 to 2025/26 and the associated financial strategies as shown in the attached budget setting report.**
- 2. That the Council agrees the formal Council Tax resolutions as detailed at Appendix 12 and 13 (Parishes, BTAC special expense, the County Council and the Police and Crime Commissioner for Lincolnshire are also dealt with as a part of this resolution). This includes a 2.57% increase in Boston's element of the Council Tax, the Band D Council Tax being £197.91.**

For

Abbott
Ashton
A. Austin
R. Austin
Brown
Cornah
Dani
Evans
Griggs
Noble
Pickett
J. Skinner
P. Skinner
Stevens
Welton

Against

Bedford
Bell
Cooper
Dorrian
Goodale
Hastie
Rush
Watson
Welbourn
Woodliffe

Abstain

COUNCIL TAX RESOLUTIONS

1. it be noted that on 1 March 2021 the Council calculated the Council Tax Base 2021/22.
- (a) for the whole Council area as 19,621.70; and
- (b) for dwellings in those parts of its area to which a Parish precept relates as in the table below:

Parts of the Council's Area: Parishes of	2020/2021			2021/2022			C/Tax Increase/ (Decr) (£)	C/Tax Increase/ (Decr) (%)
	Tax Base	Precepts (£)	Council Tax Band D (£)	Tax Base	Precepts (£)	Council Tax Band D (£)		
Algarkirk	103.50	7,727.40	74.66	102.50	8,837.40	86.22	11.56	15.48
Amber Hill	87.10	3,419.00	39.25	87.60	3,499.00	39.94	0.69	1.76
Benington	160.70	17,500.00	108.90	165.20	17,500.00	105.93	(2.97)	(2.73)
Bicker	280.30	25,000.00	89.19	276.70	25,550.00	92.34	3.15	3.53
Butterwick	404.20	30,000.00	74.22	409.70	30,000.00	73.22	(1.00)	(1.35)
Fishtoft	2,131.60	33,624.30	15.77	2,167.30	32,739.00	15.11	(0.66)	(4.19)
Fosdyke	146.50	12,000.00	81.91	147.60	12,600.00	85.37	3.46	4.22
Frampton	457.90	22,880.10	49.97	459.90	22,880.10	49.75	(0.22)	(0.44)
Freiston	328.80	30,000.00	91.24	329.30	32,500.00	98.69	7.45	8.17
Holland Fen with Brothertoft	201.10	3,250.00	16.16	197.00	3,250.00	16.50	0.34	2.10
Kirton	1,625.70	70,000.00	43.06	1,671.50	75,000.00	44.87	1.81	4.20
Leverton	195.00	15,000.00	76.92	195.60	15,000.00	76.69	(0.23)	(0.30)
Old Leake	644.10	42,096.00	65.36	649.50	42,096.00	64.81	(0.55)	(0.84)
Sutterton	521.50	28,350.00	54.36	528.60	29,767.00	56.31	1.95	3.59
Swineshead	943.20	32,332.00	34.28	979.60	33,756.00	34.46	0.18	0.53
Wigtoft	146.30	9,115.00	62.30	149.20	10,211.00	68.44	6.14	9.86
Wrangle	440.30	21,000.00	47.69	442.10	22,000.00	49.76	2.07	4.34
Wyberton	1,129.10	50,875.00	45.06	1,156.90	50,875.00	43.98	(1.08)	(2.40)
Sub-Total: Parishes	9,946.90	454,168.80	45.66	10,115.80	468,060.50	46.27	0.61	1.34
Boston Special Expense Area	9,306.00	702,696.00	75.51	9,505.90	716,192.00	75.34	(0.17)	(0.20)
Total	19,252.90	1,156,864.80	60.09	19,621.70	1,184,252.50	60.35	0.26	0.43

2. Calculate that the Council Tax requirement for the Council's own purposes for 2021/22 (excluding Parish precepts) is £3,883,331.
3. That the following amounts be calculated for the year 2021/22 in accordance with Sections 30 to 36 of the Act:
 - (a) £39,245,269 being the aggregate of the amounts which the Council estimates for the items set out in Section 31A(2) of the Act (including Special Expense and Parish Precepts).
 - (b) (£34,177,686) being the aggregate of the amounts which the Council estimates for the items set out in Section 31A(3) of the Act.
 - (c) £5,067,583 being the amount by which the aggregate at 3(a) above exceeds the aggregate at 3(b) above, calculated by the Council in accordance with Section 31A(4) of the Act as its Council Tax requirement for the year.
 - (d) £258.26 being the amount at 3(c) above, all divided by 1(a) above, calculated by the Council, in accordance with Section 31B of the Act, as the basic amount of its Council Tax for the year (including Parish precepts and Special Expenses).
 - (e) £1,184,252 being the aggregate amount of all special items (Parish precepts and Special Expenses) referred to in Section 34(1) of the Act (as per **1(b) above**).
 - (f) £197.91 being the amount at 3(d) above less the result given by dividing the amount at 3(e) above by 1(a) above, calculated by the Council, in accordance with Section 34(2) of the Act, as the basic amount of its Council Tax for the year for dwellings in those parts of its area to which no Parish precept relates.
4. To note that the County Council and the Police and Crime Commissioner have issued precepts to the Council in accordance with Section 40 of the Local Government Finance Act 1992 for each category of dwellings in the Council's area as indicated in the table below.

5. That the Council, in accordance with Sections 30 and 36 of the Local Government Finance Act 1992, hereby sets the aggregate amounts shown in the tables below as the amounts of Council Tax for 2021/22 for each part of its area and for each of the categories of dwellings.

VALUATION BANDS								
	A £	B £	C £	D £	E £	F £	G £	H £
Lincolnshire County Council	909.44	1,061.01	1,212.59	1,364.16	1,667.31	1,970.45	2,273.60	2,728.32
Lincolnshire Police and Crime Commissioner	177.54	207.13	236.72	266.31	325.49	384.67	443.85	532.62
Boston Borough Council	131.94	153.93	175.92	197.91	241.89	285.87	329.85	395.82
Average Parish Excluding Special Expense Area	15.90	18.55	21.20	23.85	29.15	34.45	39.75	47.70
BTAC Special Expense Area	24.33	28.39	32.44	36.50	44.61	52.72	60.83	73.00
Aggregate of Council Tax Requirements	1,259.15	1,469.01	1,678.87	1,888.73	2,308.45	2,728.16	3,147.88	3,777.46

6. The Council has determined that its relevant basic amount of Council Tax for 2021/22 is **not** excessive in accordance with principles approved under Section 52ZB Local Government Finance Act 1992. As the billing authority, the Council has **not** been notified by a major Precepting authority that its relevant basic amount of Council Tax for 2021/22 is excessive and that the billing authority is not required to hold a referendum in accordance with Section 52ZK Local Government Finance Act 1992.

(The meeting ended at 8.45 pm)