

## CABINET

10.00 A.M.

6TH OCTOBER 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

Also in attendance:-

Councillor Keran Farrow (for Minute 58)  
Councillor Emily Heath (for Minute 65)

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)
Richard Tulej	Head of Corporate Strategy (part)
Derek Whiteway	Internal Audit Manager and Deputy Section 151 Officer (part)
Debbie Chambers	Principal Democratic Support Officer

### 54 MINUTES

Councillor Mace queried the wording of exempt minute number 53, Land at Scotforth Road, Lancaster.

Members took a vote to approve the minutes of the meeting held on Tuesday 1 September 2009, as follows:-

***Resolved:***

***(8 Members (Councillors Archer, Ashworth, Barry, Blamire, Bryning, Fletcher, Kerr and Langhorn) voted in favour, 1 Member (Councillor Mace) voted against and 1 Member (Councillor Thomas) abstained)***

(1) That the minutes of the meeting held on Tuesday 1 September 2009 be approved as a correct record.

### 55 ITEMS OF URGENT BUSINESS AUTHORISED BY THE LEADER

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

### 56 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Councillor Barry declared a personal interest with regard to the report on Allotments in view of his involvement as an allotment holder. (Minute 65 refers).

Councillor Langhorn declared a personal and prejudicial interest with regard to the report on the Fair Pay Package (Incorporating the Pay and Grading Structure) in view of his wife's employment with Lancaster City Council. (Minute 58 refers).

The Corporate Director (Finance and Performance) declared an interest with regard to the report on Land at Mossgate/Douglas Park, Heysham in view of his Council appointed role as Secretary to Heysham Mossgate Community Facilities Company Ltd (Minute 68 refers).

## 57 PUBLIC SPEAKING

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

## 58 APPROVAL OF THE FAIR PAY PACKAGE (INCORPORATING THE PAY AND GRADING STRUCTURE)

**(Cabinet Members with Special Responsibility Councillors Mace and Thomas)**

***(It was noted that Councillor Langhorn had previously declared a personal and prejudicial interest in the following item in view of his wife's employment with Lancaster City Council. He left the meeting prior to consideration of the item).***

The Chief Executive called for nominations to chair the meeting for the item. Councillor Archer nominated Councillor Thomas and Councillor Ashworth seconded the nomination. There were no further nominations and Councillor Thomas took the chair.

The Chief Executive submitted a report to enable the Cabinet to consider the updated financial information in respect of the preferred pay and grading structure and to consider recommending to Council to approve the financial implications of the proposed fair pay package.

Councillor Farrow tabled and presented a detailed summary of the Joint Consultative Committee's (JCC) involvement in this issue to assist Cabinet Members. The JCC is a Committee made up of the seven elected members of the Personnel Committee and seven Trade Union representatives.

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

### Option 1

To recommend the Fair Pay package in total to Council including the preferred Pay and Grading structure.

### Option 2

Whilst Officers would not recommend removing any elements of the Fair Pay package there are one or two elements that are not integral to the Pay and Grading Structure such as the proposals around Annual Leave (see paragraph 11 of Appendix One of the report) and those in respect of Pay Protection (see paragraph 4 of Appendix One of the report).

Option 1 is the preferred option .

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

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

By way of addendum, which was accepted as a friendly addendum by the mover and seconder of the original proposition, it was moved by Councillor Barry and seconded by Councillor Blamire:-

“and that officers consider reviewing and amending the structure within the next two years.”

Members then voted:-

***Resolved:***

***(8 Members (Councillors Archer, Ashworth, Barry, Blamire, Bryning, Fletcher, Mace and Thomas) voted in favour and 1 Member (Councillor Kerr) voted against)***

- (1) That the financial implications of implementing the proposed Fair Package, incorporating the Pay and Grading structure 9.5.4.5 be recommended to Council and that officers consider reviewing and amending the structure within the next two years.

**Officer responsible for effecting the decision:**

Chief Executive

**Reasons for making the decision:**

The decision reflects previous considerations by the Personnel Committee, Cabinet and Council and is in line with the agreed process and revised timetable for implementing Fair Pay. The preferred grading structure is still considered to be the best structure to assimilate employees following the Fair Pay review. However, the financial implications in the medium to longer term of this structure are unsustainable. Therefore it will be necessary to review and amend the grading structure within two years of implementation.

***(Councillor Langhorn returned to the meeting and took the Chair.)***

**59 UPDATE ON THE MANAGEMENT OF COASTAL DEFENCES AND FLOODING**

**(Cabinet Member with Special Responsibility Councillor Barry)**

The Corporate Director (Regeneration) submitted a report to update Members on the current coastal and flood defence issues and arrangements for grant funding by central government; to endorse that the City Council continues to work with all agencies to sustain and improve our coastal and flood defences; to consider the offer of funding for the investigation of flooding at Hest Bank Lane, Slyne and to update Members on the

revision of the Shoreline Management Plan and the important opportunity to influence the plan during its public consultation.

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

Revised arrangements for coastal and flood defence grants

Option 1: The Council note the Environment Agency's revised arrangements for the application for coastal and flood defence grant funding and endorse that the Council continues to work with all relevant agencies to sustain and improve our current defences in line with the Council's existing budgetary framework and approvals processes. The grant available is for 100% of approved costs and requires no match funding, although there may be costs to the Council relating to staff time, as advised previously in the report.

Option 2: Not to continue with grant applications for flood and coastal defences. This will diminish the ability for the Council to meet the predicted increasing risk from these events.

Grant offer of £45,000 from the EA for the investigation of flooding at Hest Bank Lane, Slyne.

Option 1: That the grant offer be accepted to investigate a possible solution to the flooding risk.

Option 2: That the grant offer be rejected which would mean no immediate progress, at minimal cost to the Council, will be made on this matter and there could be a loss of confidence in the Council's ability to address these issues. In addition, the flooding problems at Hest Bank Lane would still need to be resolved and it is likely that the Council would have to provide some financial input.

Shoreline Management Plan

Option 1: That Members note the opportunity to participate in the consultation on the revised shoreline management plan and officers of the Council continue to work with the North West coastal groups to finalise the proposals for SMP2 and report back on the outcomes of the public consultation relative to the Lancaster coastline.

Option 2: That the opportunity for Members to participate is not taken up and the chance to comment on or influence the final plan would be missed.

Officer Preferred Option (and comments)

Revised arrangements for coastal and flood defence grants

The officers preferred option is Option 1, to continue working with all agencies to enhance our coastal and flood defences to the benefits our residents.

Grant of £45,000 from the EA for the investigation of flooding at Hest Bank Lane

The officer's recommendation is Option 1, to take this opportunity to investigate a possible solution to the flooding risk for residents in the vicinity of Hest Bank Lane.

Shoreline Management Plan

The officer's recommendation is Option 1, as this is an important step in the future management of our coastline and will be an important factor in the determination of support that the council will receive from central government on coastal defence issues.

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

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

***Resolved unanimously:***

- (1) That the revised funding arrangements for coastal and flood defences be noted and that officers continue to work with all agencies to sustain and improve our current defences in line with the councils existing budgetary framework and approvals processes be endorsed.
- (2) That the funding of £45,000 from the Environment Agency (EA) for the investigation of flooding at Hest Bank Lane, Slyne be accepted, and that the General Fund Capital Programme be updated accordingly, subject to there being a nil impact on the Council's resources.
- (3) That the public consultation phase of the revision of the Shoreline Management Plan (SMP2) be noted, giving Members the opportunity to participate in the consultation and the chance to influence the outcome of this important plan which will shape the future management of Lancaster's coastline.

**Note:** Councillor Ashworth was not present for the vote.

**Officers responsible for effecting the decision:**

Corporate Director (Regeneration)  
Head of Planning Services  
Head of Financial Services

**Reasons for making the decision:**

The decisions taken will allow positive management of the risks from coastal erosion and flooding to continue.

**60 APPOINTMENTS TO OUTSIDE BODIES - VISION BOARD WORKING GROUPS****(Cabinet Member with Special Responsibility Councillor Langhorn)**

The Chief Executive submitted a report to enable the relevant Cabinet Members to be appointed to the Lancaster and Morecambe Vision Board Working Groups.

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

Option 1: That Cabinet appoint the most appropriate portfolio holder to each Steering Group.

Option 2: That no appointments be made by Cabinet and the issue of City Council representation on the Vision Board steering groups be referred back to Council.

The officer preferred option is Option 1.

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

“That Councillor Ashworth be appointed to the Place, Culture and Identity Steering Group”

By way of amendment, it was moved by Councillor Bryning:-

“That Councillor Blamire be appointed to the Place, Culture and Identity Steering Group”.

However, it was noted that there was no seconder for the nomination and so the nomination fell.

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

“That Councillor Bryning be appointed to the Business and Knowledge Innovation Steering Group.”

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

“That Councillor Mace be appointed to the Connectivity Steering Group.”

Members then voted:-

***Resolved unanimously:***

- (1) That Councillor Ashworth be appointed to the Place, Culture and Identity Steering Group
- (2) That Councillor Bryning be appointed to the Business and Knowledge Innovation Steering Group
- (3) That Councillor Mace be appointed to the Connectivity Steering Group.

**Officers responsible for effecting the decision:**

Chief Executive  
Head of Democratic Services

**Reasons for making the decision:**

The decision will provide Cabinet Member representation for the City Council on the three Vision Board steering groups.

**61 INTERNATIONAL YOUTH GAMES 2010****(Cabinet Members with Special Responsibility Councillors Ashworth and Mace)**

The Head of Democratic Services submitted a report asking Members to consider an invitation from the Council's Associate Town, Almere, to participate in the 2010 International Youth Games.

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

Option 1 – To accept the invitation to attend the International Youth Games 2010 in Almere in full (as set out in paragraph 2.4 of the report) and give a commitment to the Council's future participation in the Youth Games, subject to a budget being established.

Option 2 – To accept the invitation to attend the International Youth Games 2010 in Almere in part (varying the numbers as set out in paragraph 2.5 of the report) and give a commitment to the Council's future participation in the Youth Games, subject to a budget being established.

Option 3 – to decline the invitation to attend the International Youth Games 2010 in Almere.

**Officer Preferred Option (and comments)**

In light of the Council's resolution at its meeting in April 2009, officers' preferred option is Option 2 above, although it is for Members to determine the level of participation and the size of the civic delegation. This is governed for the most part by cost.

Of the potential sports listed by Almere for inclusion in the Games, 8 of those proposed have been supported in the past by groups operating in this district and volunteer leaders may be available to accompany the young people. It is suggested therefore that having accepted the invitation, the final make-up of the group be determined by the willingness of local sports clubs to participate and the availability of volunteer leaders.

Dance, music and theatre styles can vary and the inclusion of any representatives to take part in these programmes will again be determined by the availability of any suitable groups in the district and a willing volunteer leader.

The cost of travel to and from Almere is difficult to quantify at this stage. Indications at this stage are that flights could be anything from £50 to £250 per person. Buses will also be required to and from the airport at each end, adding approximately £1-2,000 subject to numbers. Ferry crossings are approximately £100 per person. Costs of a coach for a week will need to be added to the ferry cost, including accommodation in Almere for the driver.

In past years a contribution has been sought from each child taking part in the Games towards their travel and other costs of taking part. This was set at £200 in 2007 and 2008 and the suggestion is that this be continued for 2010.

There are also incidental costs of providing a suitable tracksuits with logo, insurance and CRB checking for accompanying adults.

Officers would also advise that an invitation to Almere in 2010 should only be accepted if the Council is prepared to commit (as far as possible) to funding for the future, in particular the hosting of a Games in 2013.

Should Members wish to accept the invitation but keep costs to a minimum, the numbers participating could be reduced and/or the contribution requested from participants could be increased.

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

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

Members then voted:-

***Resolved:***

***(6 Members (Councillors Ashworth, Blamire, Bryning, Kerr, Mace and Thomas) voted in favour, 3 Members (Councillors Barry, Fletcher and Langhorn) voted against and 1 Member (Councillor Archer) abstained)***

- (1) That the invitation to participate in the 2010 International Youth Games in Almere be accepted, on the basis of:
  - (a) A civic delegation comprising the Mayor and Mayoress (or consort), a Member chosen by ballot (and contributing £200 to costs to match the contribution requested of participating athletes) and an officer; and
  - (b) A sporting and cultural delegation to be led by the Head of Cultural Services, or his representative in conjunction with local volunteer individual sports leaders, the size of the party to be determined to a maximum of 68 subject to the net cost of travel being contained within a 2010/11 budget allocation of £7,000 and taking into account availability of volunteer leaders and suitable transport.
  - (c) A long term commitment to the Council's participation in the International Youth Games, in particular the hosting of the Games in 2013.
- (2) That this decision be subject to the outcome of the budget for 2010/11, and the associated revenue growth bids for 2010/11 and beyond be taken forward for consideration as part of the Cabinet's budget proposals.

**Officers responsible for effecting the decision:**

Corporate Director (Regeneration)  
Head of Cultural Services  
Head of Democratic Services  
Head of Financial Services

**Reasons for making the decision:**

The decision subject to budget considerations is in line with Members wish to continue



to support twinning connections and encourage young people's interest in sport by maintaining participation in the International Youth Games.

## 62 COMMUNITY FOUNDATION FOR LANCASHIRE

### **(Cabinet Member with Special Responsibility Councillor Mace)**

The Head of Democratic Services submitted a report updating Cabinet on the Community Foundation for Lancashire and work in progress to implement the Cabinet's previous decision to bring back into use existing charity funds which currently lie dormant.

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

Option 1 – to note the work of the Community Foundation of Lancashire in this district but to continue with the proposed amalgamations and transfer of funds as agreed by Cabinet in January 2009.

It should be noted that this work is not a priority and although included in Democratic Services Business Plan is unlikely to progress quickly. There also remains a concern as to the staffing capacity to manage the new Trusts once established.

Option 2 – to note the work of the Community Foundation of Lancashire in this district and invite a representative to a future meeting of Cabinet to outline the work they are doing and ways in which they can assist in ensuring that funds are put to a better use in this district.

#### Officer Preferred Option

Option 2 is the officer preferred option, as this has the potential to take advantage of the expertise of a specialist grant making organisation to bring back into use funds which have lain dormant for many years and on which slow progress is being made using Council resources.

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

“(1) That Cabinet note the work of the Community Foundation of Lancashire in this district and invite a representative to meet the Head of Democratic Services and the relevant portfolio holders (Councillors Fletcher and Mace) to outline the work they are doing and ways in which they can assist in ensuring that funds are put to a better use in this district.”

Members then voted:-

#### ***Resolved unanimously:***

(1) That Cabinet note the work of the Community Foundation of Lancashire in this district and invite a representative to meet the Head of Democratic Services and the relevant portfolio holders (Councillors Fletcher and Mace) to outline the work they are doing and ways in which they can assist in ensuring that funds are put to a better use in this district.

**Officers responsible for effecting the decision:**

Chief Executive  
Head of Democratic Services

**Reasons for making the decision:**

The decision provides the potential to take advantage of the expertise of a specialist grant making organisation to bring back into use funds which have lain dormant for many years and on which slow progress is being made using Council resources.

**63 LAND AT AALBORG SQUARE, LANCASTER****(Cabinet Member with Special Responsibility Councillor Thomas)**

It was noted that the item Land at Aalborg Square, Lancaster, had been withdrawn.

**64 REVENUE BUDGET UPDATE****(Cabinet Member with Special Responsibility Councillor Thomas)**

The Corporate Director (Finance and Performance) submitted a report updating Members on the Revenue Budget.

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

The following options are available to Cabinet.

Savings and Efficiency Options

- 1 Consider the savings and efficiency options included at Appendix A of the report for inclusion in the Cabinet's draft list of recommendations, highlighting those that can be supported and those that may need further work.
- 2 Consider the savings and efficiency options included at Appendix A of the report but offer no view at this stage on those for inclusion in the Cabinet's draft list of recommendations.

Preferred Option

The preferred option is option 1. This will ensure that officers are clear which options are to be considered further and those that require further work. This will also provide an on-going position summary of the savings and efficiencies position.

Shared Services

- 1 Approve the creation of a shared, senior management structure as outlined in Appendix B of the report, and authorise officers to consult with vulnerable postholders and to liaise with Preston City Council to implement the arrangements as soon as practicable.

- 2 To agree an alternative approach.

#### Preferred Option

The preferred option is option 1. This will ensure that a shared service can be developed in a phased approach and affected staff consulted. It will enable a shared senior management structure to be established prior to further options being developed. This option will generate immediate savings for both councils.

#### Consultation Exercise

##### City Council Exercise

1. Endorse the planned programme of events as set out in Appendix C of the report for undertaking the consultation exercise on the 2010/11 budget proposals.
2. Not to endorse the proposals and request officers to prepare other options for the consultation programme.

#### Preferred Option

The preferred option is option 1. This will ensure that officers can prepare for the consultation exercise in good time and maximise community engagement by organising the exhibitions and forums after the Christmas and New Year period.

#### County Council Exercise

1. to consider the request from the County Council attached as Appendix D of the report on Cabinet's preferred method for involvement in their budget consultation exercise and respond accordingly
2. to consider the request from the County Council on Cabinet's preferred method for involvement in their budget consultation exercise but to offer no view at this stage

#### Preferred Option

The preferred option is option 1. This will ensure that the Council can engage positively with the County Council in their budget exercise.

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

- “(1) That Cabinet note the latest position in respect of identifying savings and efficiencies as set out in Appendix A to the report and that at this stage all options be retained for further consideration as the budget process progresses.
- (2) That Cabinet Members continue to meet with officers to review spending variances from outturn and Performance Review Team meetings and to identify further options for savings and efficiencies that could be considered at the November Cabinet meeting.

- (3) That Cabinet meet again informally to consider the messages from the Place Survey data presentation and to further review current spending allocations regarding Corporate Plan priorities and non-priorities.”

Councillor Mace then proposed and Councillor Langhorn seconded:-

- “(4) That Cabinet approve the first phase of the establishment of a Revenues and Benefits Shared Services with Preston City Council on the basis highlighted in the report and Appendix B which would create a joint senior management structure as the first phase of the agreement.”

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

- “(5) That Cabinet endorse the schedule for the budget consultation exercise as set out in Appendix C of the report (as amended on 7th January to start the Morecambe Town Centre exhibition at 10.30am) and authorise officers to proceed accordingly.”

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

- “(6) That the Leader of the Council liaises further with the Leader of the County Council on options for engaging further with the County Council in respect of their budget consultation proposals.
- (7) That, in respect of 6 above, Cabinet request the Budget and Performance Panel to invite the County Council to present their budget proposals to a future meeting of the Panel.”

Members voted as follows:-

***Resolved unanimously:***

- (1) That Cabinet note the latest position in respect of identifying savings and efficiencies as set out in Appendix A to the report and that at this stage all options be retained for further consideration as the budget process progresses.
- (2) That Cabinet Members continue to meet with officers to review spending variances from outturn and Performance Review Team meetings and to identify further options for savings and efficiencies that could be considered at the November Cabinet meeting.
- (3) That Cabinet meet again informally to consider the messages from the Place Survey data presentation and to further review current spending allocations regarding Corporate Plan priorities and non-priorities.
- (4) That Cabinet approve the first phase of the establishment of a Revenues and Benefits Shared Services with Preston City Council on the basis highlighted in the report and Appendix B which would create a joint senior management structure as the first phase of the agreement.
- (5) That Cabinet endorse the schedule for the budget consultation exercise as set out in Appendix C of the report (as amended on 7th January to start the

Morecambe Town Centre exhibition at 10.30am) and authorise officers to proceed accordingly.

- (6) That the Leader of the Council liaises further with the Leader of the County Council on options for engaging further with the County Council in respect of their budget consultation proposals.
- (7) That, in respect of 6 above, Cabinet request the Budget and Performance Panel to invite the County Council to present their budget proposals to a future meeting of the Panel.

**Officers responsible for effecting the decision:**

Corporate Director (Finance and Performance)  
Head of Financial Services

**Reasons for making the decision:**

The Savings and Efficiencies Options decision will ensure that officers are clear which options are to be considered further and those that require further work. This will also provide an on-going position summary of the savings and efficiencies position.

The Shared Services decision will ensure that a shared service can be developed in a phased approach and affected staff consulted. It will enable a shared senior management structure to be established prior to further options being developed. This option will generate immediate savings for both councils.

The Budget Consultation decision will ensure that officers can prepare for the consultation exercise in good time and maximise community engagement by organising the exhibitions and forums after the Christmas and New Year period.

The County Council exercise will ensure that the Council can engage positively with the County Council in their budget exercise.

**65 ALLOTMENTS - FUTURE LEASING ARRANGEMENTS**

**(Cabinet Member with Special Responsibility Councillor Thomas)**

Councillor Emily Heath presented the referral report from Overview and Scrutiny seeking Cabinet's support to the recommendations of the Allotments Task Group regarding future allotment management arrangements.

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

To accept the recommendations (Option 3A as set out below) of Overview and Scrutiny:-

Option 3a - Partnership with Council (Peppercorn rent)

Partnership

Council

- Capital to improve basic infrastructure at allotment sites (initially 5 year programme is recommended).
- Strategic oversight of allotments
- Agreement with allotment associations as to priorities for officer time allocated to allotments
- Allotment sites provided at peppercorn rent to allotment associations
- Provides support in practical ways (e.g., insurance, access to compost, grass cutting, waste management etc)
- Review infrastructure needs on an annual basis and feed into capital programme

Allotment associations

- Self manage allotment sites on a day to day basis
- Seek external funding opportunities for their allotment sites
- Continue to contribute to Council priorities

ALMA

- Represent allotment associations when dealing with Council
- Seek external funding for allotment development

	Pro	Con
Allotment associations	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Continue to self manage allotments</li> <li>• Will continue to charge same level of rent to plot holders but will have a far greater amount to spend on day to day management and admin of the allotment site</li> <li>• Site infrastructure will be improved at the sites that need it which will encourage demand</li> <li>• Increased investment will raise morale of allotment association volunteers</li> <li>• Officer time utilised in way that meets agreed needs</li> <li>• Capital investment by Council may help attract some external funding</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No guarantee that this model would encourage the participation of plot holders in wider site management issues</li> </ul>
Council	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Management and administration of</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Need for capital investment in region of</li> </ul>

	<p>allotments is devolved to associations</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Officer time utilised in way that meets agreed needs</li> <li>• Increased capital and revenue requirement is still an invest to save option when compared with costs of directly managing allotments</li> <li>• Capital funding by Council may help attract external capital funding</li> </ul>	<p>£80,000 over next 5 years</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Reduction in revenue income</li> </ul>
--	--	--

To not accept the recommendations of Overview and Scrutiny.

To make alternative proposals to those recommended by Overview and Scrutiny.

The key risk to consider is associated with the allotment associations' stated positions in giving up their leases if changes are not made. This should be considered and balanced against future demand for allotments, and any prospects for potential alternative lessees.

#### Preferred Option (and comments)

To accept the recommendations of Overview and Scrutiny – i.e. the adoption of Option 3A as the Council's future approach to the management of allotments. The principal elements of this option are the future provision of allotments at a peppercorn rent and the provision of an estimated £80,000 of capital investment over a 5 year period in improving the basic infrastructure of allotment sites. In recognition of these points, the Council's financial position and competing needs and priorities, the preferred option is that such growth be considered as part of Cabinet's budget proposals. Whilst this would mean that a final decision is not taken until Budget Council in March, it is felt that this would be manageable.

This option would involve the development of new lease arrangements that reflect the Council's position to view allotments as essential community resources, not simply as property assets.

There is existing staffing capacity to both manage the proposed capital programme, negotiate new lease arrangements and maintain ongoing liaison with both ALMA and the allotment associations. The new lease arrangements will develop the capacity of the allotment associations to manage and maintain their allotment sites thus releasing the Council to redirect resources elsewhere to deliver its priorities.

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

“(1) That a standard lease be developed that reflects the Council's position to view allotments as essential community resources, not simply as property assets, and accordingly allotment sites be provided at peppercorn rent to allotment

associations (as set out in Option 3A of the Overview and Scrutiny Allotments Task Group report).

- (2) That provision be made for capital funding estimated at £80,000 over the next 5 years to improve basic infrastructure at allotment sites and the associated capital and revenue growth bids be taken forward for consideration as part of Cabinet's budget proposals.
- (3) That the Overview and Scrutiny Review and Audit of Parish Council Funding Task Group be requested to include in its report consideration of how non-parished allotments might be funded by special expenses and that any recommendation be included in the budget consultation exercise.
- (4) That Cabinet note that the Allotments Task Group has discussed a draft Allotments Strategy and further consideration of the adoption of this Strategy be given on receipt of the Task Group's final report."

Members then voted:-

***Resolved unanimously:***

- (1) That a standard lease be developed that reflects the Council's position to view allotments as essential community resources, not simply as property assets, and accordingly allotment sites be provided at peppercorn rent to allotment associations (as set out in Option 3A of the Overview and Scrutiny Allotments Task Group report).
- (2) That provision be made for capital funding estimated at £80,000 over the next 5 years to improve basic infrastructure at allotment sites and the associated capital and revenue growth bids be taken forward for consideration as part of Cabinet's budget proposals.
- (3) That the Overview and Scrutiny Review and Audit of Parish Council Funding Task Group be requested to include in its report consideration of how non-parished allotments might be funded by special expenses and that any recommendation be included in the budget consultation exercise.
- (4) That Cabinet note that the Allotments Task Group has discussed a draft Allotments Strategy and further consideration of the adoption of this Strategy be given on receipt of the Task Group's final report.

**Officers responsible for effecting the decision:**

Corporate Director (Finance and Performance)  
Head of Democratic Services  
Head of Corporate Strategy  
Head of Financial Services

**Reasons for making the decision:**

The extension of the current lease arrangements for a further year from April 2009 provides the Council with an opportunity to consider future management of allotments in



line with Council policy which views allotments as essential community resources and not simply as property assets.

## 66 RESTRUCTURE OF SERVICES

### (Cabinet Members with Special Responsibility Councillors Archer, Ashworth, Blamire and Bryning)

The Corporate Director (Regeneration) submitted a report seeking Member approval to the reorganisation of Corporate Strategy, Cultural, Economic Development, Planning, Tourism and Customer Services to effectively and efficiently implement the City Council's priorities set out in the Corporate Plan and the Lancaster District Local Strategic Partnership Community Strategy in line with the revenue budgets estimated to be available to the Council over the next three years.

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

#### Option 1

Members approve the restructuring proposals identified in Appendix B and C of the report.

<b>Advantages</b>	<b>Disadvantages</b>	<b>Risk</b>
<p>A clear strategic direction is given to all staff regarding the future of services.</p> <p>The financial budget savings are achieved within the timescales identified.</p> <p>Strong structures are in place to develop further ideas around shared services and efficiency savings.</p>	<p>Uncertainty to staff may cause initial disruption to Council services in areas where savings are clearly identified.</p>	<p>Services disrupted whilst structures implemented.</p> <p>Reduced level of structures may have negative impact on Council image.</p> <p>Termination costs and therefore net savings are uncertain at this stage.</p> <p>Funds remaining in reserves to support further restructures are also uncertain.</p>

#### Option 2

Members do not approve structures and continue with existing services.

<b>Advantages</b>	<b>Disadvantages</b>	<b>Risk</b>
<p>Service provision continues at existing level.</p>	<p>Council does not meet its financial commitments.</p>	<p>Intervention?</p>

The officer preferred option is Option 1.

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

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

By way of amendment, Councillor Mace proposed and Councillor Bryning seconded:-

“That Cabinet approve the restructuring of services as set out on page 11 of the report.”

2 Members (Councillors Bryning and Mace) voted in favour of the amendment and 8 Members (Councillors Archer, Ashworth, Barry, Blamire, Fletcher, Kerr, Langhorn and Thomas) voted against, whereupon the Chairman declared the amendment to be lost.

Councillor Mace then proposed an addendum to Recommendation 2, accepted as a friendly addendum by the mover and seconder of the original proposition:-

“and to the North West Employers Organisation for its input as part of proposals for top management restructuring.”

Members then voted as follows:-

**Resolved:**

***(9 Members (Councillors Archer, Ashworth, Barry, Blamire, Bryning, Fletcher, Kerr, Langhorn and Thomas) voted in favour and 1 Member (Councillor Mace) voted against.)***

- (1) That Cabinet approve the restructuring of four Services to two Services; Community Engagement and Regeneration and Policy.

**Resolved unanimously:**

- (2) That the proposed structures for the Community Engagement Service and Regeneration and Policy Service be referred to Personnel Committee for approval and to the North West Employers Organisation for its input as part of proposals for top management restructuring.

**Resolved:**

***(9 Members (Councillors Archer, Ashworth, Barry, Blamire, Bryning, Fletcher, Kerr, Langhorn and Thomas) voted in favour and 1 Member (Councillor Mace) abstained.)***

- (3) That Cabinet approve the funding principles for termination costs as outlined in the financial implications of the report, and that the outcome of these and the savings achieved be reported back to Cabinet as part of the 2010/11 budget.
- (4) That the revenue budgets are re-aligned to the new service areas.

**Officers responsible for effecting the decision:**

Chief Executive  
Corporate Director (Finance and Performance)  
Corporate Director (Regeneration)  
Human Resources Manager  
Head of Financial Services

**Reasons for making the decision:**

The decision allows the reorganisation of Corporate Strategy, Cultural, Economic Development, Planning, Tourism and Customer Services to effectively and efficiently implement the City Council's priorities set out in the Corporate Plan and the Lancaster District Local Strategic Partnership Community Strategy in line with the revenue budgets estimated to be available to the Council over the next three years.

**67 EXCLUSION OF THE PRESS AND PUBLIC**

The Chairman asked for any further declarations of interest from Cabinet Members regarding the exempt report.

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

"That, in accordance with Section 100A(4) of the Local Government, 1972, the press and public be excluded from the meeting for the following item of business, on the grounds that it could involve the possible disclosure of exempt information as defined in paragraph 3 of Schedule 12A of that Act."

Members then voted as follows:-

***Resolved unanimously:***

- (1) That, in accordance with Section 100A(4) of the Local Government, 1972, the press and public be excluded from the meeting for the following item of business, on the grounds that it could involve the possible disclosure of exempt information as defined in paragraph 3 of Schedule 12A of that Act.

**68 LAND AT MOSSGATE / DOUGLAS PARK, HEYSHAM (Pages 1 - 3)**

**(Cabinet Member with Special Responsibility Councillor Thomas)**

***(It was noted that the Corporate Director (Finance and Performance) had previously declared an interest in the next item, in view of his Council appointed role as Secretary to Heysham Mossgate Community Facilities Company Ltd. He left the meeting prior to consideration of the item.)***

The Corporate Director (Regeneration) submitted an exempt report regarding land at Mossgate/Douglas Park, Heysham.

The options, options analysis, including risk assessment and officer preferred option and comments, were set out in the exempt report.

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

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

Members then voted:-

***Resolved unanimously:***

- (1) The resolution is set out in a minute exempt from publication by virtue of paragraph 3 of Schedule 12A of the Local Government Act 1972.

**Officers responsible for effecting the decision:**

Corporate Director (Regeneration)  
Head of Property Services

**Reasons for making the decision:**

The reasons for making the decision are set out in a minute exempt from publication by virtue of paragraph 3 of Schedule 12A of the Local Government Act 1972.

---

Chairman

(The meeting ended at 12.49 p.m.)

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

**MINUTES PUBLISHED ON FRIDAY 9 OCTOBER 2009.**

**EFFECTIVE DATE FOR IMPLEMENTING THE DECISIONS CONTAINED IN THESE MINUTES:  
MONDAY 19 OCTOBER 2009.**

By virtue of paragraph(s) 3 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A  
of the Local Government Act 1972.

Document is Restricted