

CABINET

10.00 A.M.

23RD JUNE 2009

PRESENT:- Councillors Stuart Langhorn (Chairman), Evelyn Archer, June Ashworth, Jon Barry, Eileen Blamire, Abbott Bryning, Jane Fletcher, David Kerr, Roger Mace and Malcolm Thomas

Officers in attendance:-

Mark Cullinan	Chief Executive
Peter Loker	Corporate Director (Community Services)
Heather McManus	Corporate Director (Regeneration)
Roger Muckle	Corporate Director (Finance and Performance)
Nadine Muschamp	Head of Financial Services and Section 151 Officer
Kate Smith	Project Development Officer
Debbie Chambers	Principal Democratic Support Officer

16 MINUTES

The minutes of the meeting held on Tuesday 2nd June 2009 were approved as a correct record subject to clarification of the status of all Cabinet Liaison Groups, as requested at Council on 17th June 2009.

17 ITEMS OF URGENT BUSINESS AUTHORISED BY THE LEADER

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

18 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

No declarations were made at this point.

19 PUBLIC SPEAKING

Members were advised that there had been no requests to speak at the meeting in accordance with the Cabinet's agreed procedure.

20 CABINET APPOINTMENTS TO OUTSIDE BODIES, PARTNERSHIPS AND BOARDS

(Cabinet Member with Special Responsibility Councillor Langhorn)

The Chief Executive submitted a report asking Members to consider issues arising from the decisions made at Cabinet on 2nd June 2009, regarding the appointment to the Lancaster and District Vision Board and named substitutes on the North Lancashire Local Action Group Executive Group and the Lancaster District Local Strategic Partnership (LDLSP) Thematic Groups.

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

The options regarding the Vision Board are:

- (a) To appoint the Leader of the Council to the Lancaster and District Vision Board, in line with the Vision Board Constitution.
- (b) To consider and approve, where appropriate, any other proposals from Cabinet Members, requesting a change to the Vision Board Constitution, if necessary.

The options regarding appointing substitutes are:

- (a) To name a substitute for the North Lancashire Local Action Group Executive Group and substitutes for any or all of the LDLSP Thematic Groups
- (b) Not to name substitutes for any or all of the above Groups. If this were the case, the Council would not be represented should the representative be unable to attend, as unappointed substitutes are not permitted.

The Officer preferred option was that the Leader be appointed to the Lancaster and District Vision Board, in line with the Board's Constitution, and that substitutes be named for the North Lancashire Local Action Group, as requested, and for the LDLSP Thematic Groups, in line with the LDLSP Constitution.

It was moved by Councillor Langhorn and seconded by Councillor Barry:-

"That Cabinet appoint the Leader of the Council to the Lancaster and District Vision Board, in line with the Vision Board Constitution and that Councillor Mace be appointed to the Vision Board's Connectivity Steering Group".

Councillor Langhorn then proposed Councillor Mace as substitute member on the North Lancashire Local Action Group Executive Group. Councillor Fletcher seconded the proposal.

The Chairman then asked for Members to put themselves forward as substitute members on the LDLSP Thematic Groups.

Councillor Archer volunteered for Children and Young People, moved by Councillor Langhorn, seconded by Councillor Kerr.

Councillors Bryning and Ashworth volunteered for Economy. A vote was taken with 6 Members voting for Councillor Bryning and 4 Members voting for Councillor Ashworth.

Councillor Kerr volunteered for Environment, moved by Councillor Barry and seconded by Councillor Archer.

Councillor Fletcher volunteered for Safety, seconded by Councillor Kerr.

Councillor Ashworth volunteered for Health and Wellbeing, seconded by Councillor Kerr.

Councillor Mace volunteered for Education, Skills and Opportunities, seconded by Councillor Bryning.

Councillor Blamire volunteered for Valuing People, seconded by Councillor Barry.

Members then voted as follows:-

Resolved:

(7 Members (Councillors Barry, Blamire, Bryning, Fletcher, Langhorn, Mace and Thomas) voted in favour and 3 Members (Councillors Archer, Ashworth and Kerr) abstained)

- (1) That Cabinet appoint the Leader of the Council to the Lancaster and District Vision Board, in line with the Vision Board Constitution and that Councillor Mace be appointed to the Vision Board's Connectivity Steering Group.

Resolved unanimously:

- (2) That Councillor Mace be named substitute member on the North Lancashire Local Action Group Executive Group.
- (3) That Councillor Archer be named substitute member on Children and Young People LDLSP Thematic Group.

Resolved:

(6 Members voted for Councillor Bryning (Councillors Barry, Blamire, Bryning, Langhorn, Mace and Thomas) and 4 Members voted for Councillor Ashworth (Councillors Archer, Ashworth, Fletcher and Kerr).

- (4) That Councillor Bryning be named substitute member on the Economy LDLSP Thematic Group.

Resolved unanimously:

- (5) That Councillor Kerr be named substitute member on the Environment LDLSP Thematic Group.
- (6) That Councillor Fletcher be named substitute member on the Safety LDLSP Thematic Group.
- (7) That Councillor Ashworth be named substitute member on the Health and Wellbeing LDLSP Thematic Group.
- (8) That Councillor Mace be named substitute member on the Education, Skills and Opportunities LDLSP Thematic Group.
- (9) That Councillor Blamire be named substitute member on the Valuing People LDLSP Thematic Group.

Officers responsible for effecting the decision:

Chief Executive.

Reasons for making the decision:

The decision allows the City Council to be represented appropriately at meetings including by a substitute Member, in the event that a named Member is unable to attend for any reason.

21 PERFORMANCE MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK**(Cabinet Member with Special Responsibility Councillor Langhorn)**

The Corporate Director (Finance and Performance) submitted a report to present for Cabinet's approval a refresh of the Performance Management arrangements for 2009/10 that reflected the new cabinet portfolios.

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

Option 1

To agree the revised arrangements to the Performance Management framework and PRTs as set out in the report, focusing on the strategic aspects of performance managing corporate priorities.

Option 2

To agree alternative arrangements to option 1 to ensure the effective performance management of corporate priorities.

The officer preferred option was Option 1 as it would deliver effective arrangements for performance managing the delivery of the council's corporate priorities.

It was moved by Councillor Langhorn and seconded by Councillor Thomas:-

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

Members then voted:-

Resolved unanimously:

- (1) That Cabinet notes the continuing work that is on-going in respect of finalising Corporate Plan targets and the need to acquaint themselves with all Corporate Plan priorities and associated targets.
- (2) That Cabinet endorses the revised arrangements for Performance Review Team meetings set out in the report and also the need to arrange other meetings to monitor the non-strategic aspects of service business plans.

Officers responsible for effecting the decision:

Corporate Director (Finance and Performance)

Reasons for making the decision:

The decision will deliver effective arrangements for performance managing the delivery of the council's corporate priorities.

22 REVENUE BUDGET STRATEGY 2010/11**(Cabinet Members with Special Responsibility Councillors Langhorn and Thomas)**

The Corporate Director (Finance and Performance) submitted a report presenting an issues paper of financial matters that will need to be addressed in delivering the 2010/11 revenue budget targets set out in the Medium Term Financial Strategy.

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

Option 1

Is for Cabinet members to progress the issues set out above by arranging regular meetings between themselves, Directors and Service Heads to identify and bring forward options for achieving savings and efficiencies by early September.

Option 2

As Option 1 but with each Cabinet member set a savings/efficiency target to meet.

The officer preferred option was Option 2 as it would enable a set of provisional budget savings/efficiencies options to be prepared in good time and provide the focus for each Cabinet Member to contribute to the process. It was noted that there would need to be some agreement by Cabinet regarding how the targets should be set, however.

It was moved by Councillor Langhorn and seconded by Councillor Thomas:-

“(1) That Cabinet agree the approach outlined in the report and undertake the actions set out in Section 3 of the report with immediate effect.”

By way of addendum, which was accepted as a friendly addendum by the proposer and seconder of the original motion, Councillor Mace proposed, and Councillor Thomas seconded:-

“In doing so, it is noted that this is essentially an information gathering exercise to enable the July Cabinet meeting to identify which initiatives should proceed further.”

Members then voted as follows:-

Resolved unanimously:

- (1) That Cabinet agree the approach outlined in the report and undertake the actions set out in Section 3 of the report with immediate effect. In doing so, it is noted that this is essentially an information gathering exercise to enable the July Cabinet meeting to identify which initiatives should proceed further.

Officers responsible for effecting the decision:

Corporate Director (Finance and Performance)
Head of Financial Services

Reasons for making the decision:

The decision allows actions to be undertaken to inform the next Cabinet meeting in July.

23 LANCASTER SQUARE ROUTES**(Cabinet Member with Special Responsibility Councillor Archer)**

The Head of Planning Services report informed Members of outline designs for the improvement of public spaces and routes within the city centre and on the outcome of public consultation and asked Cabinet to decide on how the project should be taken forward.

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

Officers, supported by Gillespies, propose to present and explain the outline design options for each space and route at the meeting. The available options are:

Option 1 - to endorse the thematic approach to the outline design options, noting that in September 2009 Cabinet will be presented for approval with a) an updated brief which will enable the design team to produce more detailed designs based on wider consultation and investigation and b) a recommendation as to what order of priority should be given to each space and route for implementation. Notwithstanding this, to endorse / reject any option or, alternatively, element of an option for more detailed development.

Option 2 not to endorse the thematic approach being taken, nor the detailed development of the outline design options as presented, but, notwithstanding this, to direct how the design work should progress for each space and route drawing on the Gillespies proposals and options as appropriate.

Regarding an Officer preferred option, Officers consider that the Gillespies proposals fit well to the brief given and are innovative and well considered. Option 1 will ensure that the full benefits of the consultation and stakeholder engagement can be taken into account and that officers can investigate potential synergies for the delivery of these proposals both in terms of the physical development and for the longer term management and opportunities for these spaces and routes, including for cultural and social activity and

market trading for example. This will ensure that a holistic approach to the management of the town centre will be captured. On this basis officers prefer option 1.

It was moved by Councillor Archer and seconded by Councillor Kerr:-

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

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

- (1) That Officers be asked to arrange for an alternative version of the City Park plan on Quay Meadow to be produced that does not involve building on the green space of Quay Meadow.
- (2) That, as part of this proposal, the Roman Bath House site be improved so that it becomes an asset to the city.
- (3) That we recognise that the siting of allotments in the Quay Meadow area is a sensitive issue for residents and for potential allotment holders. Thus, full consultation with local residents, users of Quay Meadow, Ward Councillors and other local stakeholders should take place before final plans are put in place.
- (4) That any potential removal of trees around the Castle should be fully consulted on with local residents and stakeholders.
- (5) That some trees are left in Market Street/Market Square and this means that where trees are to be removed that consideration should be given to suitable replacements.

At this point, the Chief Executive declared an interest regarding the Quay Meadow area as a local resident, Councillor Barry declared a personal, non-prejudicial interest as an allotment holder and Councillor Langhorn declared a personal, non-prejudicial interest in view of his son's involvement with the Young Archaeologists' Club in maintaining the Roman Bath House site.

The mover and seconder of the original motion both accepted Councillor Barry's amendments (2)-(5) as friendly amendments.

Members then voted on Councillor Barry's amendment (1). 3 Members (Councillors Barry, Fletcher and Langhorn) voted in favour, 5 Members (Councillors Archer, Ashworth, Bryning, Mace and Thomas) voted against and 2 Members, (Councillors Blamire and Kerr) abstained, whereupon the Chairman declared amendment (1) lost.

Members then voted as follows:-

Resolved unanimously:

- (1) To endorse the thematic approach to improving spaces and routes in the centre focusing on the themes of “Lancaster Lore and Legends”, “Georgian Gem” and “City Park”.
- (2) To endorse the outline concept designs for specific routes and spaces for further development by the design team

- (3) That, as part of this proposal, the Roman Bath House site be improved so that it becomes an asset to the city.
- (4) That we recognise that the siting of allotments in the Quay Meadow area is a sensitive issue for residents and for potential allotment holders. Thus, full consultation with local residents, users of Quay Meadow, Ward Councillors and other local stakeholders should take place before final plans are put in place.
- (5) That any potential removal of trees around the Castle should be fully consulted on with local residents and stakeholders.
- (6) That some trees are left in Market Street/Market Square and this means that where trees are to be removed that consideration should be given to suitable replacements.
- (6) To note that Cabinet will receive a further report prior to the next stage of design development to direct the recommendations for each route or space and their priority for implementation
- (7) To update general fund revenue budgets to reflect the revised expenditure profile and external funding draw down, subject to authorisation by the external funders NWDA and Lancashire County Council

Officers responsible for effecting the decision:

Corporate Director (Regeneration)
Head of Planning Services

Reasons for making the decision:

The decision provides a steer from Cabinet to allow Officers to take the project forward.

24 REORGANISATION OF THE FACILITIES MANAGEMENT FUNCTION

(Cabinet Member with Special Responsibility Councillor Thomas)

(Councillor Fletcher declared a personal, non-prejudicial interest in the following item in view of her work in the field of energy management).

The Corporate Director (Regeneration) submitted a report to provide a new corporate approach to Facilities Management across the Council.

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

Option 1: Officers are instructed to prepare a draft specification for the provision of facilities management functions on behalf of the City Council. This specification should reflect the issues and risks identified in the report. Failure to consider a remodelling of the existing provision leaves the Council at risk of failing to provide the most effective and

efficient maintenance service and not achieving any progress in implementing its carbon management policies.

Option 2: That the existing level of service provision is maintained. This will leave the Council at risk of failing to provide the most effective and efficient maintenance service and not achieving any progress in implementing its carbon management policies.

The officer preferred option is Option 1.

It was moved by Councillor Thomas and seconded by Councillor Langhorn:-

“(1) That officers are instructed to prepare a draft specification for the provision of facilities management functions on behalf of the City Council.”

By way of amendment, which was accepted as a friendly amendment by the mover and seconder of the original motion, Councillor Barry proposed and Councillor Fletcher seconded:

“That energy management is given a high priority in order to facilitate the council’s response to climate change and to reduce costs to the council.”

Members then voted:-

Resolved unanimously:

- (1) That officers are instructed to prepare a draft specification for the provision of facilities management functions on behalf of the City Council.
- (2) That energy management is given a high priority in order to facilitate the council’s response to climate change and to reduce costs to the council.

Officers responsible for effecting the decision:

Corporate Director (Regeneration)

Reasons for making the decision:

The decision will allow a remodelling of the existing provision to make sure the Council provides the most effective and efficient maintenance service, which progresses its carbon management policies and addresses energy management.

25 LAND AT AALBORG SQUARE, LANCASTER

(Cabinet Member with Special Responsibility Councillor Thomas)

The Corporate Director (Regeneration) submitted a report asking Cabinet to consider the potential disposal of land at Aalborg Square, Lancaster, to facilitate an extension of the courts building.

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

Option 1 is to approve the principle of disposal of the land at Aalborg Square to the Courts Service for the extension of the courts building that would facilitate the vacation of that part of Lancaster Castle currently occupied by the court. This would allow the potential to expand the tourism opportunities afforded by the Castle. In this option the powers granted under the General Disposal Consent could be utilised which may not result in the full value of the site being received by the Council but the economic benefits of the Courts Service vacating the Castle are considered to balance this lost. The opportunity exists for the District Valuer to undertake a valuation that would accord with the requirements of the General Disposal Consent and the requirements of the special purchaser provisions in the Council's Disposal Strategy. In disposing of the land there would be a loss of an open space in the Lancaster along with a minimal reduction of maintenance responsibilities.

Option 2 is to consider the disposal of land at Aalborg Square but only at market value. This carries the risk that the Courts Service would take the view that it would not proceed with the development – a point that has been made during negotiations. In such circumstances, the opportunity to obtain the benefits of possession of Lancaster Castle for tourism may be lost. In disposing of the land there would be a loss of an open space in the Lancaster along with a minimal reduction of maintenance responsibilities.

Option 3 is not to consider the disposal of the land at Aalborg Square. This would result in the Council retaining the land which is an open space. However, the opportunity to obtain the benefits of possession of Lancaster Castle for tourism would be lost.

The Officer preferred option is option 1 because this allows the retention of the Courts facilities in Lancaster along with releasing the tourism potential of that part of the Castle currently occupied by the Courts.

It was moved by Councillor Thomas and seconded by Councillor Mace:-

- “(1) That the Council approves the principle of the disposal of land at Aalborg Square, Lancaster, subject to a further report which should clearly show the alternative option of building at the rear of the magistrate's court.
- (2) That the District Valuer be appointed to determine the valuation of the site in accordance with the Council's Disposal Strategy, and the General Disposal Consent.”

Members then voted:-

Resolved unanimously:

- (1) That the Council approves the principle of the disposal of land at Aalborg Square, Lancaster, subject to a further report which should clearly show the alternative option of building at the rear of the magistrate's court.
- (2) That the District Valuer be appointed to determine the valuation of the site in accordance with the Council's Disposal Strategy, and the General Disposal Consent.

Officers responsible for effecting the decision:

Corporate Director (Regeneration)
Head of Property Services

Reasons for making the decision:

The decision has been made 'in principle' to allow Cabinet to receive information which it considers necessary before considering the matter further.

Chairman

(The meeting ended at 12.00pm)

**Any queries regarding these Minutes, please contact
Debbie Chambers, Democratic Services, telephone 01524 582057 or email
dchambers@lancaster.gov.uk**

MINUTES PUBLISHED ON THURSDAY 25th JUNE 2009.

**EFFECTIVE DATE FOR IMPLEMENTING THE DECISIONS CONTAINED IN THESE MINUTES:
FRIDAY 3rd JULY 2009.**