

CABINET

10.00 A.M.

18TH JANUARY 2011

PRESENT:- Councillors Stuart Langhorn (Chairman), June Ashworth, Jon Barry, Eileen Blamire, Abbott Bryning, Jane Fletcher, David Kerr and Peter Robinson

Officers in attendance:-

Mark Cullinan	Chief Executive
Heather McManus	Deputy Chief Executive
Nadine Muschamp	Head of Financial Services and Section 151 Officer
Graham Cox	Head of Property Services (Minute 92)
Suzanne Lodge	Head of Health and Housing (Minute 93 & 95)
Liz Bateson	Principal Democratic Support Officer

87 MINUTES

The minutes of the meeting held on Tuesday 7 December (and reconvened on 14 December 2010) were approved as a correct record.

88 ITEMS OF URGENT BUSINESS AUTHORISED BY THE LEADER

The Chairman advised that there were no items of urgent business.

89 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

No declarations were made at this point.

90 PUBLIC SPEAKING

Members were advised that there had been two requests to speak at the meeting from members of the public in accordance with Cabinet's agreed procedure, as set out in Cabinet Procedure Rule 2.7, with regard to the Canal Corridor Redevelopment (Minute 91 refers.)

The Chairman advised that he had also agreed to a Ward Member speaking at the meeting upon the report regarding the Canal Corridor Redevelopment (Minute 91 refers.)

91 CANAL CORRIDOR REDEVELOPMENT

(Cabinet Member with Special Responsibility Councillor Langhorn)

(Jon Price, President of Lancaster and Morecambe Chamber of Commerce and Tim Hamilton- Cox who had registered to speak on this item in accordance with the City Council's agreed procedure and Cabinet Procedure Rule 2.7, spoke to this item.)

(Councillor John Whitelegg, who had requested to address Cabinet as a Bulk Ward Councillor, spoke to this item.)

Cabinet received a report from the Deputy Chief Executive to consider the Development Agreement for the development of the City Council's land for the proposals contained within the Lancaster Canal Corridor Development Brief.

The options, options analysis, including risk assessment and officer preferred option, were set out in the report as follows:

	Option 1: Terminate the Development Agreement with Centros (due to there being insufficient time to process an acceptable planning application by October 2011) and seek to carry out a community based masterplanning process	Option 2: Extend/Revise the Development Agreement with Centros, subject to revised terms and conditions being negotiated by the District Valuer (or their appointed professional) to comply with S123 of the Local Government Act 1972 due to the special purchaser arrangements that are in place	Option 3: Terminate the Development Agreement and retain all existing uses on the Council owned land	Option 4: Terminate the Development Agreement and dispose of the Council owned land on the open market
Advantages	Such a process will engage with all the communities who have an interest in the process, including the residents associated with "Its Our City". The outcome could also inform the Local Development Framework Land Allocations process for Members to consider.	As detailed in Appendix B, the adjoining land owner has agreed to enter into a land sale agreement with Centros to dispose of their interests in the land. Considering this, the Council would not need to consider acquiring the land, nor would it need to consider the cost of submitting a planning application as these would all be covered in the Development Agreement with the adjoining land owner, Centros. It would not be	None	The Council would obtain a capital receipt, but this would be lower than that received if planning approval is sought first.

		<p>considered to be economically value for money to consider acquiring land from a developer where that developer is willing to undertake development themselves. Such an option of “special purchaser” is considered acceptable on the proviso that the disposing authority ensure it receives market value for the asset and to facilitate this, it is proposed that the District Valuer will be appointed to agree suitable terms and conditions of the proposed Development Agreement.</p> <p>The Council would retain ownership of the site, up until the point when the site is developed, thus maintaining control over the development process.</p> <p>Should members approve working with Centros, this would allow an early start on the planning process, maximising on the positive progress made to date.</p>		
--	--	--	--	--

<p>Disadvantages</p>	<p>Although a community based process would result in a masterplan being produced, there would be no developer on board to implement the scheme.</p> <p>Because the scheme in question is strategic and will affect the total population of the district (over 140,000) and communities from South Lakes and Wyre, it is difficult to identify how a community based process would comprehensively capture and balance all views of the community. Because of the strategic nature of the project, it would probably be best to leave such engagement with the community to the developer and have a robust engagement strategy through the planning process.</p>	<p>None</p>	<p>Such an option would be contrary to the current Development Brief for the site and the principles of the Council's approved Local Development Framework.</p>	<p>The Council would have no trustee land owner control over the form that the planning process would take as a development partner. It would only have control through its regulatory function. And hence could be overridden by the Secretary of State.</p>
<p>Risks</p>	<p>There can be no</p>	<p>There is a risk that</p>	<p>None</p>	<p>None</p>

	<p>assurances that a private sector developer would accept a community led development and the City Council would then need to fund the cost of carrying out the masterplanning process which could run into hundreds of thousands of pounds.</p> <p>A community led approach could also raise the expectations of the community and may create a plan which is undeliverable in commercial terms. A formal land allocation in the LDF could not be made if practical delivery were questionable.</p>	<p>the Developer will not carry out community consultation to a satisfactory level. However, this can be mitigated through phrasing within the revised Development Agreement.</p>		
--	---	---	--	--

The Officer preferred option is Option 2; to discuss with Centros the extension and amendment of the Development Agreement and to bring back the proposed terms and conditions to Cabinet. Officers also recommended that the Head of Property Services obtained independent valuation advice from the District Valuer (or their appointed professional), funded through the Development Agreement, to ensure that it could be seen to be acting properly and prudently throughout all its dealings.

Councillor Langhorn proposed, seconded by Councillor Bryning:-

“That the recommendations, as set out in the report, be approved.”

By way of amendment, Councillor Barry proposed and Councillor Fletcher seconded:-

“That the Development Agreement with Centros be terminated and that consideration be given to holding a participatory design competition to allow teams of architects/developers to present their ideas for the site.”

Councillors then voted on the amendment:-

2 Members voted in favour (Councillors Barry and Fletcher), 5 Members against (Councillors Ashworth, Bryning, Kerr, Langhorn and Robinson) and 1 Member abstained (Councillor Blamire) whereupon the Chairman declared the amendment to be lost.

Members then voted on the original proposition.

Resolved:

(5 Members (Councillors Ashworth, Bryning, Kerr, Langhorn and Robinson) voted in favour, 2 Members (Councillors Barry and Fletcher) voted against and 1 Member (Councillor Blamire) abstained.)

- (1) To discuss with Centros the extension and amendment of the Development Agreement and to bring back the proposed terms and conditions to Cabinet.
- (2) That the Head of Property Services obtains independent valuation advice from the District Valuer (or their appointed professional), funded through the Development Agreement, to ensure that it can be seen to be acting properly and prudently throughout all its dealings.
- (3) That, in negotiating the Development Agreement, specific reference is made to Centros carrying out comprehensive consultation with communities as part of the planning process. The development agreement should also make reference to how the economic growth of Lancaster District can be implemented through the visitor economy, particularly cultural and heritage aspects.
- (4) That the Canal Corridor Cabinet Liaison Group be re-established.

Officers responsible for effecting the decision:

Deputy Chief Executive
Head of Property Services
Head of Governance

Reasons for making the decision:

The decision will enable negotiations to take place to extend and amend the Development Agreement, and prepare terms and conditions for the Council's consideration which would maximise the financial return in connection with the land and ensure that any subsequent development of the site is carried out in a manner which delivers to its corporate priorities at the minimum of risk and cost to the Council.

92 REVIEW OF PARKING FEES AND CHARGES 2011/12

(Cabinet Member with Special Responsibility Councillor Langhorn)

Cabinet received a report from the Head of Property Services to enable consideration of the Annual Review of Parking Fees and Charges for 2011/12.

The options, options analysis, including risk assessment and officer preferred option, were set out in the report as follows:

	Option 1: This option is to approve increases that meet the financial target of £110,300	Option 2: This option is to approve the majority of the recommendations including in this report and to exceed the financial target of £110,300	Option 3: This option is to do nothing, retain the existing fees and charges and the likelihood of not contributing to the financial target
Advantages	<p>This option meets the financial target for parking fees and charges taking into account inflation and the implications of the increase in VAT.</p> <p>This option is likely to provide less price increases and limits the impact on usage and the potential for adverse variances in the 2011/12 budget.</p>	<p>This option allows parking fees and charges to meet the financial target and to also make an additional contribution to the 2011/12 budget process.</p> <p>A further contribution could be made depending on the level of charge introduced for partner permits.</p>	<p>This option limits the impact on parking usage and town centre vitality and trading.</p> <p>This option is likely to receive the greatest support through the consultation process</p>
Disadvantages	<p>This option does not maximise the contribution that parking fees and charges could make to the 2011/12 budget preparation process.</p>	<p>Depending on the range of increases approved this option could have a negative impact on short stay parking and town centre trading.</p> <p>This option is likely to receive the most objections through the consultation process.</p>	<p>Apart from the possibility of increased income arising from no fee increases this option will result in a significant budget problem requiring additional income or savings to be generated from other activities / services undertaken by the council.</p>
Risks	<p>This option still has inherent risks associated with price increases as</p>	<p>This option will have a significant risk of customer resistance to additional fee</p>	<p>This option increases the budget preparation difficulties at a time</p>

	customers may choose other modes of transport or use other car parks in the district.	increases with a corresponding substantially increased risk of adverse variances with the 2011/12 budget.	when additional income or major savings are required.
--	---	---	---

The preferred option is Option 2 which is summarised below:

- (1) That Cabinet approves 0.20p increases on the pay and display tariffs highlighted in the table at paragraph 3.1 for 2011/12 to generate additional income of £186,600 (exceeding the financial target of £110,300 by £76,300).
- (2) That Cabinet approves a 5% reduction in the level of public permit charges for 2011/12 generating additional income of £2,400.
- (3) That Cabinet approves the conversion of Lucy Street Car Park to a short stay pay and display car park generating additional income of £10,000.
- (4) That Cabinet approves the conversion of Bulk Street Car Park to a specific permit holders' car park generating a nil impact on the total income.
- (5) That Cabinet approves a 6% increase to Staff and Members permit charges for 2011/12 generating additional income of £3,100.
- (6) That Cabinet approves extending the existing Staff and Member permit arrangements to partnering organisations employing staff that are based in City Council buildings and the Head of Property be authorised to determine the level of parking charges for 2011/12 after further discussions with the partnering organisations and to implement the permit charges for 2011/12.

Councillor Langhorn proposed, seconded by Councillor Kerr:-

"That the recommendations, as set out in the report, be approved."

It was proposed by Councillor Robinson and accepted as a friendly amendment by the proposer and seconder of the original proposition:

"That there be no increase to the car parking charges at the Festival Market car park at the present time."

By way of a further amendment it was proposed by Councillor Robinson:

"That there be a 5% reduction in permit charges for existing staff in line with the reduction in the level of public permit charges."

However, it was noted that there was no seconder to the amendment and, therefore, it was deemed to have fallen.

It was then proposed by Councillor Barry and seconded by Councillor Fletcher:

"That the majority of Member and Officer permits be weekday only; with Members who need to park at weekends for Council business able to claim charges and only Officers

required to work at weekends able to apply for a 7 day permit.”

Members then voted on the amendment.

2 Members (Councillors Barry and Fletcher) voted in favour of the amendment and 6 Members (Councilors Ashworth, Blamire, Bryning, Kerr, Langhorn and Robinson) voted against whereupon the Chairman declared the amendment to be lost.

Councillors then voted on the original proposition, as amended.

Resolved:

(6 Members (Councillors Councilors Ashworth, Blamire, Bryning, Kerr, Langhorn and Robinson) voted in favour, and 2 Members (Councillors Barry and Fletcher) abstained.)

- (1) That Cabinet approves 0.20p increases on the pay and display tariffs highlighted in the table at paragraph 3.1 for 2011/12 to generate additional income of £186,600 (exceeding the financial target of £110,300 by £76,300).
- (2) That Cabinet approves a 5% reduction in the level of public permit charges for 2011/12 generating additional income of £2,400.
- (3) That Cabinet approves the conversion of Lucy Street Car Park to a short stay pay and display car park generating additional income of £10,000.
- (4) That Cabinet approves the conversion of Bulk Street Car Park to a specific permit holders' car park generating a nil impact on the total income.
- (5) That Cabinet approves a 6% increase to Staff and Members permit charges for 2011/12 generating additional income of £3,100.
- (6) That Cabinet approves extending the existing Staff and Member permit arrangements to partnering organisations employing staff that are based in City Council buildings and the Head of Property be authorised to determine the level of parking charges for 2011/12 after further discussions with the partnering organisations and to implement the permit charges for 2011/12.
- (7) That there be no increase to the car parking charges at the Festival Market car park at the present time.

Officers responsible for effecting the decision:

Head of Property Services
Head of Financial Services

Reasons for making the decision:

The decision made meets the budgetary requirement and allows for an additional contribution to the 2011/12 draft budget, will enable effective transport management and is consistent with the aims and objectives of the Parking Strategy.

The meeting adjourned at 11.45am and reconvened at 12.00pm.

93 HEALTH AND HOUSING FEES AND CHARGES 2011/12

(Cabinet Member with Special Responsibility Councillor Kerr)

Cabinet received a report from the Head of Health and Housing Services which had been prepared as part of the 2011/12 estimate procedure and set out the options for increasing the level of fees and charges.

The options, options analysis, including risk assessment and officer preferred option, were set out in the report as follows:

	Option 1 To approve the increase in fees as recommended in the report	Option 2 To approve a different percentage increase.	Option 3 To do nothing and retain the existing fees and charges.
Advantages	This option allows for increased fee revenue whilst retaining fees at competitive levels. The increase in pest control fees reduces the council's subsidy of this service by a substantial amount whilst retaining pest control fees affordable compared to some private sector providers.	This option potentially allows for a greater increase in revenue if an increase of greater than 2.4% is approved.	This option would mean no price increases for customers.
Disadvantages	Any increase in fees is likely to be unpopular with customers.	An increase in fees above the recommended amount is likely to prove unpopular with customers.	No opportunity to raise additional revenue through fees and charges.
Risks	There is always a risk that customers will choose not to access services if fees are too high. However, evidence gathered shows core fees and charges are comparable to other nearby local authorities.	There is always a risk that customers will choose not to access services if fees are too high. There is a risk that even current income levels will fail to be achieved if fees are perceived to be too high.	This option increases the difficulties of securing a viable budget at a time when additional income and savings are required.

The officer preferred option is Option 1. This option allows for increased revenue whilst retaining fees at affordable and competitive levels.

Councillor Kerr proposed, seconded by Councillor Ashworth:-

“That the recommendations, as set out in the report, be approved.”

Councillors then voted:-

Resolved unanimously:

- (1) That the Health & Strategic Housing fees in Appendix 1 of the report be increased by 2.40% (inflation) subject to deciding pest control fees as per recommendations 2, 3 and 4.
- (2) That the current fees for rodent and insect treatments and hourly pest control rates be increased by 10% as set out in Appendix 1, retaining 50% discounts in qualifying cases (fleas, rats) for those in receipt of Council Tax and/or Housing Benefit.
- (3) That charges are introduced at the standard rodent/insect treatment rate for advisory visits together with chargeable cases where, upon visiting, pest control officers are not in a position to provide or complete treatments.
- (4) That a charge is introduced for bed bug treatments at the standard insect treatment rate plus a new domestic hourly rate for every subsequent complete or part hour required to finish a treatment, with 50% discounts in qualifying cases for those in receipt of Council Tax and/or Housing Benefit.
- (5) That the fees and charges for the Neptune Baby and Young Child Memorial Garden are not increased for 2011/12 and that the cost of a purchased grave includes the Exclusive Right of Burial.
- (6) That the current costs of memorial plaques in the Neptune Baby area are reduced by 50%.
- (7) That a new fee of £175.00 plus VAT be introduced for woodland burial plaques.
- (8) That a new fee of £200.00 plus VAT be introduced for tower memorial plaques.
- (9) That a new fee of £40.00 plus VAT be introduced for the cleaning and re-gilding of existing old style garden of remembrance plaques when a second inscription is required.
- (10) That new fees be introduced for private water supplies risk assessment, investigation, sampling, analysis and granting of authorisations as detailed in Appendix 1 of the report.

Officers responsible for effecting the decision:

Head of Health and Housing Services

Reasons for making the decision:

The decision will maintain income whilst retaining fees at affordable and competitive levels.

94 POLICY FRAMEWORK, GENERAL FUND REVENUE BUDGET AND CAPITAL PROGRAMME UPDATE

(Cabinet Member with Special Responsibility Councillor Langhorn)

Cabinet received a report from the Deputy Chief Executive and Head of Financial Services to provide information on the policy framework and latest budget position for current and future years, to inform Cabinet's budget proposals and to allow it to make final recommendations on to Council regarding Council Tax levels for 2011/12.

The options, options analysis, including risk assessment and officer preferred option, were set out in the report as follows:

Options were dependent very much on Members' views on spending priorities balanced against Council Tax levels. As such, a full options analysis could only be undertaken once any alternative proposals were known and it should be noted that Officers may require more time in order to do this. Outline options were highlighted below, however.

- Regarding Council Tax, various options were set out at section 8 of the report. In considering these, Members should have regard to the impact on service delivery, the need to make savings or provide for growth, the impact on future years and the likelihood of capping.
- With regard to considering or developing savings and growth options to produce a budget in line with preferred Council Tax levels, any proposals put forward by Cabinet should be considered alongside the development of priorities and in light of the public consultation. Emphasis should be very much on the medium to longer term position, given that further reductions in revenue funding are expected in future, in line with Government's Spending Review.
- With regard to items for noting, no options were presented.

Under the Constitution, Cabinet is required to put forward budget proposals for Council's consideration, in time for them to be referred back as appropriate. This is why recommendations are required to feed into the Council meeting in February, prior to the actual Budget Council in March.

Officer preferred options were reflected in the recommendations, where appropriate.

The provisional Settlement was much better than expected, albeit that the Council still faced significant year on year funding reductions; this highlights how much expectations have shifted in recent months. The Council had been successful in achieving major budget reductions and therefore in the short-term, the Council's revenue prospects may be easily managed but the medium to longer term must not be overlooked; the challenge of balancing the Council's budget beyond 2011/12 to deliver its corporate priorities still remained. With regard to capital, the key risks still centred on completing land sales and reaching decisions on stalled regeneration schemes.

Councillor Langhorn proposed, seconded by Councillor Barry:-

“That the recommendations, as set out in the report, be approved.”

By way of amendment which was accepted as a friendly amendment by the mover and seconder of the original proposition, Councillor Ashworth proposed:

“That recommendation 3 be revised and the words ‘partnership working with Lancashire County Council and’ be inserted between ‘with the costs being funded from’ and ‘ongoing savings already approved in developing the budget.’

By way of an amendment to recommendation 7, Councillor Robinson proposed:

“That recommendation 7 be amended to include that there be an indicative limit to fund grants to outside bodies and the limit set at £500K.

However, it was noted that there was no seconder to the proposal and it was therefore declared lost.

By way of an amendment to recommendation 9, which was accepted as a friendly amendment by the mover and seconder of the original proposition, Councillor Blamire proposed:

“That contributing towards any shortfall in funding of PCSO’s be added to the growth options and proposals in Appendix F.”

By way of a further amendment to recommendation 9, which was accepted as a friendly amendment by the mover and seconder of the original proposition, Councillor Fletcher proposed:

“That spend to save options be added to options in Appendix F.”

By way of a further amendment to recommendation 9, Councillor Robinson proposed:

“That £60K be added to the growth options and proposals in Appendix F for developing a car park in Parliament Street, Morecambe.”

However, it was noted that there was no seconder to the proposal and it was therefore declared lost.

By way of a further amendment to recommendation 9, Councillor Robinson proposed:

“That the need for the Regeneration Team be questioned in view of partnership working and any savings from removing the Regeneration Team as a growth option and proposal be used to fund additional environmental enforcement officers.”

However, it was noted that there was no seconder to the proposal and it was therefore declared lost.

Members then voted on the original motion, as amended.

Resolved unanimously:

- (1) That Cabinet notes the provisional priorities as agreed at the Cabinet meeting in November 2010 and that these are now recommended to full Council to develop the policy framework for the three year period from 2011 to 2014, as follows:
 - Economic Regeneration – Energy Coast and Visitor Economy
 - Climate Change – Prioritising reducing the council's energy costs and increasing income
 - Statutory responsibilities – fulfilling at least our minimum statutory duties - focus on keeping the streets clean and safe
 - Partnership working and Community Leadership – working with partners to reduce costs, make efficiencies and create resilience within the district
 - That Cabinet notes the intension to protect the most vulnerable in our society should also be a thread that runs through all our priorities
- (2) That the Council bring together all partnership working, including work relating to the Lancaster District Local Strategic Partnership, in order to protect key services and provide a single corporate approach to partnership working.
- (3) That the decision to withdraw from the agreement with Lancashire County Council to manage the community pools on their behalf be rescinded and that Lancaster City Council continues to manage the pools on behalf of Lancashire County Council with the costs being funded from partnership working with Lancashire County Council and ongoing savings already approved in developing the budget.
- (4) That Cabinet approves the draft 2010/11 Revised Budget of £23.616M for referral on to Council, with the net under spending of £1.124M being transferred into Balances.
- (5) That Cabinet approves the reassessment of other earmarked reserves and provisions as set out in section 4 of the report and that in principle, future surplus Balances be used to support invest to save schemes, subject to this being considered by Council in due course as part of the Medium Term Financial Strategy.
- (6) That Cabinet notes the position regarding the Local Government Finance Settlement and capping, together with prospects for future years.
- (7) That subject to all the above, Cabinet notes the resulting draft 2011/12 General Fund Revenue Budget of £21.331M, and the indicative spending projections of £21.315M for 2012/13 and £22.047M for 2013/14, excluding savings and growth options.
- (8) That Cabinet notes the draft capital investment position from 2010/11 onwards.
- (9) That Cabinet considers the draft budget information and options as set out in the report in context of its proposed draft priorities and:
 - recommends to Council that City Council Tax rates be frozen for 2011/12, subject to Government confirming Council Tax Freeze Grant entitlement (equivalent to a 2.5% tax increase);

- recommends that spend to save options and contributing towards any shortfall in funding of PCSO's be added to the preferred savings and growth options, with any surplus resources in 2011/12 being transferred into Revenue Balances, and
- refers the updated budget information on for Council's initial consideration.

Officers responsible for effecting the decision:

Deputy Chief Executive
Head of Financial Services

Reasons for making the decision:

Under the Constitution Cabinet is required to put forward policy framework and budget proposals for Council's consideration in time for them to be referred back as appropriate. The decision will ensure that the policy and budget proposals are fed into the Council meeting in February, prior to Budget Council in March.

95 2011/12 BUDGET UPDATE - HOUSING REVENUE ACCOUNT AND CAPITAL PROGRAMME**(Cabinet Member with Special Responsibility Councillor Kerr)**

Cabinet received a report from the Head of Health and Housing and the Head of Financial Services which updated the Housing Revenue Account (HRA) revised budget position for the current year and set out the recommended budget for 2011/12 and future years. It also set out the updated Capital Programme for 2010/11 and a proposed programme to 2015/16.

The options, options analysis, including risk assessment and officer preferred option, were set out in the report as follows:

With regard to the Revised Budget, Cabinet could consider other proposals that may influence the Revised Budget for the year and the call on revenue balances.

The most obvious options available in respect of the 2011/12 rent increase are to:

- i) Set the average housing rent at £64.20 i.e. an increase of 6.9% as proposed in paragraph 3.3.1. This is largely in line with the Government's Guideline Rent increase. The benefit of this option would be that the Authority would be in line with the Government's proposals to achieve convergence with no negative financial implications to the HRA. Whilst this increase may appear large, this is only because currently, average council housing rents are below those of other social housing providers.
- ii) Set the rent increase at a minimum level of 5.1% being the RPI inflation of 4.6% +.05%. This would mean an actual average rent of £63.12, which would result in a loss of income of £210K with similar amounts for future years. With no other compensating factors from the Government to offset the loss of income, the shortfall would have to be met from savings within the HRA or funded from Reserves. This option would also considerably delay the Authority in achieving convergence, and does not support sustainability of the

HRA in the longer term.

The options available in respect of the minimum level of HRA balances are to set the level at £350,000 in line with the advice of the Section 151 Officer, or to adopt a different level. Should Members choose not to accept the advice on the level of balances, then this should be recorded formally in the minutes of the meeting, and could have implications for the Council's financial standing, as assessed by its external auditors.

The options available in respect of the revenue budget projections and assumed rent levels for 2012/13 to 2013/14 are to recommend those as set out, or to consider other proposals for incorporation. It should be noted that if Cabinet decides on alternative rent levels for 2011/12 or future years', these would alter the budget projections.

The options available in respect of the Capital Programme are:

- i) To approve the programme in full, with the financing as set out;
- ii) To incorporate other increases or reductions to the programme, with appropriate sources of funding being identified.

Any risks attached to the above would depend very much on what measures Members proposed, and their impact on the council housing service and its tenants. As such, a full options analysis could only be undertaken once any alternative proposals are known. It should be noted that Officers may require more time in order to do this. The risks attached to the provisional nature of current subsidy determinations will be managed through future reporting arrangements, as set out in the report.

The Officer Preferred options are to:

- approve the 2010/11 revised Revenue Budget as set out;
- approve the provisions, reserves and balances positions as set out;
- set a 6.9% increase in average rents, and to approve the draft revenue and capital budgets as set out in the appendices, for referral on to Council as appropriate.

These are as reflected in the Member recommendations.

Councillor Kerr proposed, seconded by Councillor Ashworth:-

“That the recommendations, as set out in the report, be approved.”

Councillors then voted:-

Resolved:

(4 Members (Councillors Ashworth, Kerr, Langhorn and Robinson) voted in favour, 2 Members (Councillors Barry and Fletcher) voted against and 2 Members (Councillors Blamire and Bryning) abstained.)

- (1) That the Housing Revenue Account Revised Budget for 2010/11, as set out at Appendix A, be recommended to Council for approval.

- (2) That the Housing Revenue Account Budget for 2011/12 also as set out at Appendix A, be recommended to Council for approval.
- (3) That Cabinet recommends to Council that the minimum level of HRA unallocated balances be retained at £350,000 from 01 April 2011, and that the Statement on Reserves and Balances be noted and referred to Council for information.
- (4) That average council housing rents for the year commencing 01 April 2011 be set at £64.20, representing an increase of 6.9%.
- (5) That at present, future year budget projections assume average rent increases of 4.74% for 2012/13 and 4.71% for 2013/14 in line with the current Subsidy Determination, and the resulting budget projections also as set out at Appendix A be referred on to Council for approval.
- (6) That the Capital Programme as set out at Appendix D be referred on to Council for approval.
- (7) That Cabinet notes that the proposed revenue budgets and capital programme had been referred to the District Wide Tenants Forum and that any issues arising had been fed back verbally at the meeting.

Officers responsible for effecting the decision:

Head of Housing and Health Services
Head of Financial Services

Reasons for making the decision:

The Council is required under statutory provisions to maintain a separate ring-fenced account for all transactions relating to the provision of local authority housing, known as the Housing Revenue Account (HRA). This covers the maintenance and management of the Council's housing stock. It is therefore necessary to prepare separate revenue and capital budgets for the HRA each year, and to set the level of housing rents in sufficient time for the statutory notice of rent variations to be issued to tenants by 01 March. The decision ensures the deadline will be met and will enable a balanced budget and fully financed Capital Programme for referral on to Council.

96 SHARED SERVICES PROGRAMME

(Cabinet Member with Special Responsibility Councillor Langhorn)

Cabinet received a report from the Chief Executive with regard to the progress made in developing a shared services programme for the Council as requested as an action from the Corporate Performance Monitoring Report Quarter 1 2010, and further to the last progress report presented to Cabinet on the 5 October 2010.

The options, options analysis, including risk assessment and officer preferred option, were set out in the report as follows:

Option 1

To note the progress being made in respect of the service areas identified in the

Appendix and to receive reports back to Cabinet as appropriate to ensure that any service improvements and efficiencies are considered as part of the budget exercise.

Option 2

To note the progress being made in respect of the service areas identified in the Appendix.

Councillor Langhorn proposed, seconded by Councillor Ashworth:-

“That the recommendations, as set out in the report, be approved.”

Councillors then voted:-

Resolved unanimously:

- (1) That Cabinet note the progress made in developing a Shared Services Programme for the Council, since the last progress report presented to Cabinet on the 5 October 2010.
- (2) That officers continue to develop shared service partnership opportunities for achieving service improvements and efficiencies with a view to reporting back as determined by Cabinet to allow proposals to be considered as part of the budget exercise.

Officers responsible for effecting the decision:

Chief Executive

Reasons for making the decision:

The efficiencies delivered from developing a shared service programme will greatly assist in achieving the outcomes of the Council's savings and efficiency programme and targets included in the Medium Term Financial Strategy including the continued operation of the three community pools. It will also support the Council's Corporate Plan priorities for working closely with other partner organisations to deliver improved benefits for the Lancaster District community.

97 SAFEGUARDING VULNERABLE ADULTS POLICY

(Cabinet Member with Special Responsibility Councillor Kerr)

Cabinet received a report from the Head of Community Engagement to seek Cabinet's approval of a Safeguarding Adults Policy and Procedure.

The options, options analysis, including risk assessment and officer preferred option, were set out in the report as follows:

There were three options presented:

- (1) To agree the draft Safeguarding Vulnerable Adults policy and procedure.
- (2) To agree the draft Policy and Procedure with amendments.

- (3) To not agree the new policy and procedure and have no policy place in respect of vulnerable adults.

The officer preferred option was Option 1. The draft Safeguarding Adults policy is a new policy developed in line with Lancashire County Council guidance and reporting procedures. It provides guidance to staff who may come into contact with vulnerable adults regarding the identification of different types of abuse and also what to do if they have concerns relating to a vulnerable adult. The revised policy and guidance provides the Council with up to date information and procedures that are necessary to fulfill the council’s responsibilities.

Councillor Kerr proposed, seconded by Councillor Barry:-

“That Cabinet approve the policy and procedure set out in Appendix A of the report and that staff and Members are made aware of the new policy.”

Councillors then voted:-

Resolved unanimously:

That Cabinet approve the policy and procedure set out in Appendix A of the report and that staff and Members are made aware of the new policy.

Officers responsible for effecting the decision:

Head of Community Engagement

Reasons for making the decision:

The decision will provide the Council with up to date information and procedures that are necessary to fulfill the Council’s responsibilities.

98 UNIVERSITIES CABINET LIAISON GROUP

(Cabinet Member with Special Responsibility Councillor)

Cabinet received a report from the Head of Governance to consider the future of the Universities Cabinet Liaison Group.

The options, options analysis, including risk assessment and officer preferred option, were set out in the report as follows:

	Option 1: Stand down the Universities Cabinet Liaison Group	Option 2: To note existing arrangements and make no amendments
Advantages	This would be in accordance with the consultation undertaken with members of the group.	No advantages have been identified for this option.

Disadvantages	None. Cabinet Liaison Groups assist Cabinet in the discharge of executive functions, however they are purely consultative and non-decision making and may be time limited according to purpose. Those consulted feel that there are other mechanisms for considering matters of mutual interest so it would appear that the Group is no longer necessary.	This would not be in accordance with the consultation undertaken with members of the group.
Risks	No risks have been identified with either proposal. Both options provide ways to consider matters of mutual interest.	

There was no officer preferred option.

Councillor Robinson proposed, seconded by Councillor Barry:-

“That the Universities Cabinet Liaison Group be stood down.”

Councillors then voted:-

Resolved:

7 Members (Councillors Ashworth, Barry, Blamire, Fletcher, Kerr, Langhorn and Robinson) voted in favour, and 1 Member (Councillor Bryning) voted against.)

(1) That the Universities Cabinet Liaison Group be stood down.

Officers responsible for effecting the decision:

Head of Governance

Reasons for making the decision:

There appeared to be a consensus among members of the Universities Cabinet Liaison Group that the Group was no longer required, as its function was now covered by other groups and working relationships.

99 LANCASTER MARKET

(Cabinet Member with Special Responsibility Councillor Barry)

Cabinet received an oral update on the work of the Lancaster Market Cabinet Liaison Group.

Councillor Barry informed the meeting that a report with options would be presented to Cabinet in February.

Resolved unanimously:

- (1) That the oral update be noted.

Officers responsible for effecting the decision:

Deputy Chief Executive
Head of Property Services

Reasons for making the decision:

The terms of reference of the Lancaster Market Cabinet Liaison Group stipulate regular reports to Cabinet.

Chairman

(The meeting ended at 1.20 p.m.)

**Any queries regarding these Minutes, please contact
Liz Bateson, Democratic Services - telephone (01524) 582047 or email
ebateson@lancaster.gov.uk**

MINUTES PUBLISHED ON FRIDAY, 21ST JANUARY 2011.

**EFFECTIVE DATE FOR IMPLEMENTING THE DECISIONS CONTAINED IN THESE MINUTES:
MONDAY, 31ST JANUARY 2011.**