

CABINET

10.00 A.M.

29TH MAY 2012

PRESENT:- Councillors Eileen Blamire (Chairman), Janice Hanson (Vice-Chairman), Jon Barry, Abbott Bryning, Tim Hamilton-Cox, Karen Leytham, Ron Sands and David Smith

Officers in attendance:-

Mark Cullinan	Chief Executive
Graham Cox	Head of Property Services (Minute 4)
Mark Davies	Head of Environmental Services (Minute 10)
Andrew Dobson	Head of Regeneration and Planning Service (Minutes 11 &12)
Nadine Muschamp	Head of Financial Services and Section 151 Officer
Anne Marie Harrison	Assistant Head (Partnerships), Community Engagement Service (Minute 8)
Gary Watson	Senior Property Officer
Liz Bateson	Principal Democratic Support Officer, Democratic Services

1 MINUTES

The minutes of the meeting held on Tuesday 17 April 2012 were approved as a correct record.

2 ITEMS OF URGENT BUSINESS AUTHORISED BY THE LEADER

The Chairman advised that there was one item of urgent business. This related to the Disposal of Land at Wellington Terrace, Morecambe (Minute 4 refers).

Councillor Blamire declared a personal interest with regard to this item as her son-in-law worked in the same office as the agent referred to in the report. Councillor Blamire vacated the chair and left the meeting at this point and did not vote on this item. Councillor Hanson took the chair.

3 EXCLUSION OF THE PRESS AND PUBLIC

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

“That, in accordance with Section 100A(4) of the Local Government Act 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:-

(6 Members (Councillors Barry, Bryning, Hanson, Leytham, Sands and Smith) voted in favour, and 1 Member (Councillor Hamilton-Cox) voted against).

Resolved

- (1) That, in accordance with Section 100A(4) of the Local Government Act 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.

4 DISPOSAL OF LAND AT WELLINGTON TERRACE, MORECAMBE - ITEM OF URGENT BUSINESS (Pages 1 - 2)**(Cabinet Member with Special Responsibility Councillor Hamilton-Cox)**

Cabinet received a report from the Head of Property Services which was exempt from publication by virtue of paragraph 3 of Schedule 12A of the Local Government Act 1972.

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

Councillor Hamilton-Cox proposed, seconded by Councillor Leytham:-

- “(1) That approval be given to the selling of 0.344 acres of land at Wellington Terrace, Morecambe as shown on the plan attached to the exempt report, on the terms and conditions set out in the exempt report.
- (2) That the shortfall in capital receipts be taken into account in re-assessing the 2012/13 Capital Programme, for reporting to Cabinet in due course.”

Councillors then voted:-

Resolved unanimously:

- (1) That approval be given to the selling of 0.344 acres of land at Wellington Terrace, Morecambe as shown on the plan attached to the exempt report, on the terms and conditions set out in the exempt report.
- (2) That the shortfall in capital receipts be taken into account in re-assessing the 2012/13 Capital Programme, for reporting to Cabinet in due course.

Officers responsible for effecting the decision:

Head of Property Services
Head of Financial Services

Reasons for making the decision:

The decision supports the objective of the Morecambe Action Plan to address housing related issues in the central area of Morecambe and the Housing Strategy and is consistent with the Corporate Plan and coalition priorities to implement housing renewal and neighbourhood management in the Poulton Ward.

The Corporate Property Strategy requires that the Council review its asset base and only retain those assets required to meet its agreed objectives and priorities. Where

assets are not required for this purpose they should be disposed of at best value. This is an opportunity sale and removes a liability from the City Council's property portfolio and is an opportunity for the Council to improve the management of its assets.

Councillor Blamire returned to the meeting at this point and took the chair. The press and public were re-admitted to the meeting.

5 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

No further declarations were made at this point.

6 PUBLIC SPEAKING

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

7 CABINET LIAISON GROUPS AND APPOINTMENTS TO OUTSIDE BODIES, PARTNERSHIPS AND BOARDS (Pages 3 - 4)

(Cabinet Member with Special Responsibility Councillor Blamire)

Cabinet received a report from the Chief Executive to consider the Cabinet Liaison Groups currently constituted and Cabinet appointments to Outside Bodies, Partnerships and Boards.

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

The options regarding Cabinet Liaison Groups were:

- To note existing arrangements and make no amendments.
- To consider and approve, where appropriate, any proposals from Cabinet Members.

With regard to Outside Bodies, Partnerships and Boards, Cabinet was requested to make appointments, as set out in Appendix C to the report.

It was recommended that appointments be aligned as closely as possible to individual Cabinet Members' portfolios.

Councillor Bryning proposed, seconded by Councillor Hanson:-

- “(1) That the Cabinet Liaison Groups previously constituted, as set out in Appendix B to the report, be re-constituted for the 2012/13 municipal year with the following exception:
 - That the Lancaster Market Cabinet Liaison Group be stood down.
- (2) That the Lead Cabinet Member of each Cabinet Liaison Group be requested to inform the Chief Executive of the participants he/she wishes to invite to such meetings.
- (3) That appointments be made to Outside Bodies, Partnerships and Boards as set

out in the appendix to these minutes with the exception of British Resorts Association.”

Councillors then voted:-

Resolved unanimously:

- (1) That the Cabinet Liaison Groups previously constituted, as set out in Appendix B to the report, be re-constituted for the 2012/13 municipal year with the following exception:
 - That the Lancaster Market Cabinet Liaison Group be stood down.
- (2) That the Lead Cabinet Member of each Cabinet Liaison Group be requested to inform the Chief Executive of the participants he/she wishes to invite to such meetings.
- (3) That appointments be made to Outside Bodies, Partnerships and Boards as set out in the appendix to these minutes with the exception of British Resorts Association.

Officers responsible for effecting the decision:

Chief Executive
Head of Governance

Reasons for making the decision:

The establishment of Cabinet Liaison Groups assists the Cabinet in the discharge of executive functions. Representation on Outside Bodies is part of the City Council’s community leadership role.

8 SECOND HOMES FUNDING 2012 - 2013

(Cabinet Member with Special Responsibility Councillor Blamire)

Cabinet received a report from the Head of Community Engagement to seek members’ views on the use of Second Homes funding for 2012 – 2013.

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

	Advantages	Disadvantages	Risks
<p>Option 1</p> <p>Funding to secure support core services and facilities for wider group of organisations</p>	<p>A significant multiplier effect with benefits for many organisations</p> <p>Efficiencies achieved by providing some support services centrally</p>	<p>Infrastructure costs are ongoing and SH funds are limited to the amounts available in the current year</p>	<p>Current infrastructure arrangements significantly at risk following funding cuts</p>

(Infrastructure)	Reduces reliance on other external funds for a period of time		
Option 2 Investment in premises and accommodation	<p>Potential to reduce management costs of small organisations</p> <p>Supports more collaboration between organisations</p> <p>Achieves a one off investment for a longer term return</p>	Match funding may be required for a capital scheme	Need has been identified in the district but other potential solutions also need to be considered and these are still emerging
Option 3 Investment in volunteering co-ordination arrangements	<p>Economic contribution of volunteering is significant</p> <p>Protection of important services by increasing levels and quality of volunteering in the district</p> <p>Opportunities for skills development for volunteers</p> <p>Supports better engagement of communities in their local areas</p>	Sustainability model needs to be developed but potentially there may be some costs that are unrecoverable	Volunteer bureau now closed and no current co-ordination arrangement of this type – likely to have a negative impact on levels and services supported by volunteering
Option 4 Investment in small grants via existing schemes	<p>Positive impact from existing schemes suggest these grants are useful</p> <p>Low administration costs</p>	Current schemes funded for 2012 -13 and any further investment would roll into 2013 -14 but requires county council agreement	Expectations around the future of schemes need to be managed
Option 5 Investment in limited number of larger grants to achieve long term benefits	<p>Potential to achieve impacts that may not occur otherwise</p> <p>Longer term legacy achieved and improved sustainability of operations and services</p>	Management arrangements required within the council	Innovative projects may carry some risk but appraisal processes should identify this.

	Promotes collaboration between partners		
Option 6 A combination of the above options	Could present an opportunity to provide benefit widely across VCF and arts sectors	May dilute the impact of funding and make it more difficult to achieve higher impact from a limited number of investments	Risk would be relevant to the preferred options

A preferred option was not recommended as officers were aware that whilst any of the identified options were helpful, there were significant issues and opportunities facing these sectors and the Second Homes funding available was insufficient to address all of these concerns. Cabinet's views were sought on the use of the funds available.

The availability of Second Homes funding had now been informally confirmed by Lancashire County Council and as a result of early discussions it had been agreed that these funds could be used to support the council's investment in the VCF and arts sectors. Cabinet members were being asked to determine which option or combination of options was their preferred approach for the use of the current financial year's allocation of Second Homes funding. A further report giving detailed proposals in line with members suggested approach would be brought back to Cabinet for approval.

Councillor Barry proposed, seconded by Councillor Leytham:-

- “(1) That Cabinet notes the availability of Second Homes funding of approximately £290,000 for 2012 -13.
- (2) That Cabinet supports Option 6, a combination of options 1-5 in the report, to address issues and develop opportunities for the Voluntary, Community and Faith and the Arts sector.
- (3) That a further report be brought back to Cabinet setting out detailed proposals for the use of this fund.”

Councillors then voted:-

Resolved unanimously:

- “(1) That Cabinet notes the availability of Second Homes funding of approximately £290,000 for 2012 -13.
- (2) That Cabinet supports Option 6, a combination of options 1-5 in the report, to address issues and develop opportunities for the Voluntary, Community and Faith and the Arts sector.
- (3) That a further report be brought back to Cabinet setting out detailed proposals for the use of this fund.”

Officers responsible for effecting the decision:

Head of Community Engagement
Head of Financial Services

Reasons for making the decision:

The decision is consistent with the Priorities, Outcomes, success Measures and Actions identified in the Corporate Plan 2012-15 with regard to the use of the available Second Homes Funding and enables detailed proposals to be brought back to Cabinet in due course.

9 SILVERDALE HOARD**(Cabinet Member with Special Responsibility Councillor Sands)**

Cabinet received a report from the Head of Community Engagement to seek members support for the ambition to secure the Silverdale Hoard for the district.

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

Members had the option to either support or not support the ambition to secure the Silverdale Hoard for the district. There was no risk at this stage as the decision to support securing the Hoard was an in principle one and this would need to be appreciated by all parties and communicated clearly.

The Silverdale Hoard was a significant find for both the district and Lancashire. Acquiring the necessary funding to both secure the Hoard and conserve, research and interpret it within the City Museum would be costly and access to external funding would be required.

Councillor Sands proposed, seconded by Councillor Hanson:-

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

Councillors then voted:-

Resolved unanimously:

- (1) That Cabinet supports, in principle, the ambition to secure the Silverdale Hoard for the district.
- (2) That a further report be brought back to Cabinet setting out the financial implications of securing the Hoard once a valuation has been made and the longer term strategy for the conservation, research and interpretation of the Hoard.

Officers responsible for effecting the decision:

Head of Community Engagement

Reasons for making the decision:

The district’s museums and their collections are an important element of the Council’s priorities of Economic Regeneration. The Silverdale Hoard is a significant find for both the district and Lancashire as the collection would have significant visitor appeal and the in principle decision is consistent with the following extract from the Corporate Plan: ‘An improved future for the district’s museums is secured’. The decision enables a further report to be brought back to Cabinet once a valuation has been made.

10 HIGHWAYS MAINTENANCE

(Cabinet Member with Special Responsibility Councillor Smith)

Cabinet received a report from the Head of Environmental Services to seek a decision on the future of the highway maintenance functions currently provided by the City Council on behalf of the County Council, prior to referral on to Council.

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

	Option 1: Continue to provide Highways Maintenance Services on behalf of the County as per the offer outlined in the report	Option 2: Discontinue provision of Highways Maintenance Services on behalf of the County
Advantages	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Local knowledge gained through years of operating in the District is retained. • Services can be used by other Council Services (eg grounds maintenance, council housing, property services). This, in turn, helps improve efficiency and may reduce the net costs for the highways account. • The fixed costs associated with providing a full range of in-house direct services (eg waste collection, cleansing, grounds maintenance, repairs and maintenance, vehicle maintenance) are spread over a wider range of activities. • Consistent with aspects of the Council’s corporate plan, other than reducing 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Removes any financial uncertainty of this service. • In purely financial terms is the cheaper option.

	<p>costs.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Complements other public realm services delivered by the City Council on behalf of the County Council (eg verge grass cutting, highway tree maintenance, weed spraying, pavement gritting) 	
Disadvantages	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Proposal put forward by County only provides a contribution to overheads incurred in delivering the service. Officers will have to look at ways of reducing overall overheads of functional area, service and Council. (Which is work that is already underway in any case.) The highways maintenance account is always subject to uncertainty. This will not improve the situation. The proposal is outside of the Council's agreed budgetary framework (see financial implications below) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Capacity will need to found from HR to deal with TUPE transfer. Highways Maintenance capacity will be lost. This means that internal work that could offset the cost to the highways account can no longer be undertaken. Reinforces split in functional responsibility between City / County which from a resident perspective is a negative. Inconsistent with some aspects of the Corporate Plan (but consistent with reducing costs).
Risks	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> County may in the future decide to operate in a different way and take back the work. Staff will be the subject of a TUPE transfer. Arrangements would need to be made with regard to vehicles / equipment which would no longer be required. As with previous arrangements there are no guarantees as to the volume of work that the City Council will be requested to undertake. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Currently the highways maintenance function is also involved in supporting the delivery of some other public realm functions which are delivered through a separate arrangement with County. Ceasing to deliver highways maintenance would have a negative impact on this arrangement.

The officer preferred option was option 1. That said, it was considered appropriate to seek a formal review clause in any agreement; a term of one year or so would seem

reasonable. The agreement would also need to be flexible enough to deal with any other future fundamental changes in associated service delivery.

Councillor Smith proposed, seconded by Councillor Hamilton-Cox:-

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

Councillors then voted:-

Resolved unanimously:

- (1) That Cabinet agrees to the principle of the City Council continuing to deliver a highways maintenance service on behalf of the County Council, on the terms set out within the report.
- (2) That as the financial implications of delivering the service on the proposed terms fall outside of the existing budgetary framework, the final decision be referred to Council for approval at its meeting on 13 June 2012.
- (3) That subject to Council’s approval of recommendation (1), the agreement of the detail of the terms of the highways maintenance service be delegated to the Head of Environmental Services.

Officer responsible for effecting the decision:

Head of Environmental Services

Reasons for making the decision:

The decision to support in principle the City Council’s continuation to provide Highways Maintenance Services on behalf of the County is consistent with the City Council’s Corporate Plan priorities in particular ‘clean, green and safe places’ and ‘community leadership.’

11 FUNDING FOR WEST END HOUSING PROJECTS

(Cabinet Member with Special Responsibility Councillor Hanson)

Cabinet received a report from the Head of Regeneration and Planning to obtain authority to spend ‘ring-fenced’ receipts on the Bold Street regeneration project.

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

	Option 1: Utilise “ring-fenced” receipts to acquire and demolish Bold Street properties	Option 2: Do not utilise receipts for this proposal
--	--	--

Advantages	Signals progress on West End regeneration Removes eyesores properties Maintains credibility in negotiations to acquire further properties Makes some ongoing revenue savings.	More money available for Chatsworth gardens (or other schemes, though any not related to West End housing would require a change to the MTFS).
Disadvantages	Reduces money available for Chatsworth Gardens or other schemes.	Properties remain empty and deteriorating, with costs and liabilities attached. Reduces confidence in West End Loss of "goodwill" with owners
Risks	Negotiations prove unsuccessful	Spiral of decline

Option 1 was the officer preferred option. There was an immediate and pressing need for action on Bold Street. Whilst the proposal was effectively using funds that could potentially be earmarked for Chatsworth Gardens, it was considered that the proposal made the most appropriate use of some fairly limited resources available to the council. Given the scale of this project, and the expectation that the HCA would take a positive approach going forward, it was not considered that this sum would be critical to finding a solution to the Chatsworth Gardens project.

Councillor Hanson proposed, seconded by Councillor Smith:-

"(1) That the recommendation, as set out in the report, be approved."

Councillors then voted:-

Resolved unanimously:

- (1) That Cabinet agrees to re-use the income from the sale of 9 & 11a Bold St, to fund further property acquisitions, demolitions and temporary re-surfacing elsewhere in Bold Street and that the Capital Programme be updated accordingly.

Officers responsible for effecting the decision:

Head of Regeneration and Planning
Head of Financial Services

Reasons for making the decision:

Regenerating the West End of Morecambe has been a long-standing corporate priority, subject to funding being identified, and was central to the council's health and well being and economic growth aspirations as set out in the Corporate Plan and Local Development Framework. There was an immediate and pressing need for action on Bold Street and the proposal would have local community safety benefits by removing derelict properties which are susceptible to illegal and anti-social activities.

12 LANCASTER SQUARE ROUTES

(Cabinet Member with Special Responsibility Councillor Hanson)

Cabinet received a report from the Head of Regeneration and Planning to propose changes required to better manage access to and traffic within the city centre pedestrian zone, to suggest how to progress these and to update more generally on associated progress with the Square Routes initiative.

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

	Option 1: Make no changes to the traffic management system.	Option 2: Formally request the County Council to consider the traffic management proposals as per Appendix 3 and undertake to implement the associated changes to City Council management practice on an experimental basis.	Option 3: Formally request the County Council to consider the traffic management proposals as per Appendix 3 and undertake to implement the associated changes to City Council management practice on a permanent basis.
Advantages	None.	This option involving an Experimental Traffic Order utilises a regulatory mechanism that builds in requirements to monitor and review and if thought necessary then revise or revoke any changes. This flexibility is needed where changes to traffic management are brought in within a complex environment and not all consequential changes can perhaps be known. Advantages otherwise are as set	This option would involve a revision of the TRO on a permanent basis without any experiment. In principle it might enable changes to be brought forward in one tranche

		out in full in section 2 of the Report.	
Disadvantages	No attempt is made to try to address the deteriorating conditions for pedestrians in the zone that are impairing peoples' experiences as pedestrians, impacting on the trading environment and giving rise to increasing safety concerns. Further, it precludes the ability to take the opportunities arising out of the Square Routes initiative and improvements to make more of Market Square as a meeting place, for a better outdoor market and as an entertainment venue and with all the benefits that these might bring.	The raft of changes put forward in this proposal is quite complicated but inevitably so. Several elements will have some early workload implications for council officers e.g in revising the permit system and informing the public of the changes. Once in effect however the changes should make for better management of the pedestrian zone and less requirement on various city and county council officers and police officers and PCSOs and to deal with traffic management and related problems pedestrian problems in a reactive manner.	This option is not favoured by the county council's highway officers. It would not be a best practice approach. It would be much less flexible in practice than an experimental order and is without the ability to monitor and consult in operation then review and revise and, potentially terminate any changes. Conversely an experimental order provides for this. This option would likely prove much more challenging and take very much longer, involving the highway authority evidencing the need for and considering changes that would be permanent in effect. This would make for significant delay.
Risks	Continuing increasing use of the zone by traffic and consequential reduction in the quality, perceived safety of the pedestrian environment and in time making for conditions more likely to give rise to safety accidents. Indirect further affects on and deterioration in the	Any changes to the management of a public environment as complex as this in how it is used risks adverse consequential effects but the consultations undertaken to date with professional highways officers and others should have teased most of these out. Further, the purpose of an experimental order is	That changes via a permanent revision are not attainable within a short / medium term timescale.

	city centre as a trading environment.	to build in flexibility and monitoring and review.	
--	---------------------------------------	--	--

Option 2 involving making the changes as set out in section 2 of the report and summarised in Appendix 2 was the officer preferred option. Officers advised that current arrangements for traffic management within the pedestrian zone were no longer sustainable, not delivering well for economic, social and environmental benefits. Revised arrangements were considered crucial to achieving on corporate and other ambitions for the city centre and as articulated through the Square Routes initiative. Further, it was felt that supporting changes and wider benefits to the pedestrian zone together with the mitigations proposed should outweigh any adverse impacts.

Councillor Hanson proposed, seconded by Councillor Blamire:-

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

Councillors then voted:-

Resolved unanimously:

- (1) That the City Council request of the County Council as highway authority that as soon as possible it make one experimental traffic regulation order for the whole traffic restricted area (pedestrian zone) as per Option 2, including for the following changes:
- core hours of 10.00am to 17.00pm.
removal of the exemption for postal deliveries and parcel packets within core hours
 - introduction of a revised permit system, with withdrawal of permit A and further adjusted providing for: essential maintenance (suggest Permit E); the dismantling of market stalls within set times (suggest Permit M) and temporary access for events and specific other activities (suggest Permit T)
 - removal of the parking spaces dedicated for use by disabled people in Market Square and to the rear of the Old Town Hall
- (2) That subject to the making of such an order Cabinet authorises the Chief Executive to make the following consequential changes to the Council's services and operations:
- re-designating existing car parking spaces within city council off street car parks and including St Nicholas Arcades to provide new dedicated spaces for disabled people
 - adjustment of the Charter Market Rules
 - re-programming council refuse collection in the zone to outside of the new core hours
- (3) That the Head of Regeneration and Planning lead for the council in working with the highway authority to:

- support the making of such an order, subsequent consultations, monitoring and review.
- where appropriate provide additional on street parking bays dedicated for use by disabled people.

and report to the Planning and Highways Regulatory Committee as required concerning any necessary further approvals required.

Officers responsible for effecting the decision:

Head of Regeneration and Planning

Reasons for making the decision:

The decision is consistent with the Economic Growth priority action to ‘continue to deliver Lancaster Square Routes scheme and is consistent with the Core Strategy (2008) which identified Central Lancaster as a Regeneration Priority Area of local importance (Policy ER2). The City Council Parking Strategy (2008) ‘Improving Access’ – Section 14.13 notes the Council’s ambition to seek to meet the needs of all users and types of transport. Specifically it seeks to set aside 6% of the total off-street car parking space for ‘Blue Badge’ holders in car parks where demand is proven and improve public information. The decision both supports and seeks to improve on these ambitions by seeking at least 6% in on and off street car parks where it is thought that access to the centre can be improved. The Council has a duty under the Equality Act 2010 to make areas open to all and not exclude those with significant mobility impairments. As per the assessment of the Parking Strategy policies, it is suggested that the proposal and the wider changes mitigate the removal of the existing provision for disabled access to the zone.

13 SHARED SERVICES PROGRAMME - ONE CONNECT LIMITED

(Cabinet Member with Special Responsibility Councillor Blamire)

Cabinet received a report from the Chief Executive which provided an update on the outcome of negotiations regarding Customer Services and Information and Communications Technology (ICT) provision with One Connect Limited (OCL).

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

	Option 1: Accept Officer Recommendations	Option 2: Put forward alternatives
Advantages	<p>Still gives opportunity to join up face to face customer services for county and city.</p> <p>Allows City Council to develop a clear way forward for ICT.</p>	Depends on alternatives.
Disadvantages		Depends on alternatives.

Risks	Specific risks will be considered in developing proposals for reporting through to Cabinet in due course.	Depends on alternatives – likely to require further reports back to Cabinet.

Councillor Barry proposed, seconded by Councillor Hanson:-

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

Councillors then voted:-

Resolved unanimously:

(1) That Cabinet notes the outcome of negotiations and:

- in respect of face to face Customer Services, supports separate discussions to progress the development of shared service delivery by the City Council, on behalf of both it and the County Council; and
- in respect of ICT, supports further development of the City Council’s ICT strategy for subsequent consideration by Cabinet.

Officers responsible for effecting the decision:

Chief Executive
Head of Financial Services

Reasons for making the decision:

One of the actions included in the City Council’s Corporate Plan was to ‘develop a programme with Lancashire County Council and others to reduce costs by sharing more of our services.’ The decision to progress the development of a shared service in respect of face to face Customer Services which may have a more visible positive impact for the community as a whole is consistent with the Corporate Plan. Whilst the basic premise of different tiers of local government joining up to provide better integrated and more cost effective services was recognised and supported any arrangements needed to work for all parties involved. With regard to IT, time and energy would now be put into developing an IT strategy rather than a shared service.

14 HEYSHAM MOSSGATE COMMUNITY AND SPORTS FACILITIES

(Cabinet Member with Special Responsibility Councillor Hamilton-Cox)

It was reported that consideration of this item had been deferred to enable Cabinet Members to undertake a Site Visit.

Chairman

(The meeting ended at 11.30 a.m.)

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

MINUTES PUBLISHED ON THURSDAY 31 MAY, 2012.

**EFFECTIVE DATE FOR IMPLEMENTING THE DECISIONS CONTAINED IN THESE MINUTES:
TUESDAY 12 JUNE, 2012.**

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

Document is Restricted

APPOINTMENTS MADE BY CABINET

ORGANISATION
<i>British Resorts Association</i> (now British Destinations Association)
Children's Trust Partnership Lancaster District (Cabinet Member appointed to Lancaster District Children's Trust Board) Councillor Sands
Historic Towns Forum Councillor Sands
Lancashire Leaders Meeting (Leader) Councillor Blamire
Lancashire Rural Affairs Councillor Hanson
LGA Coastal Issues Special Interest Group Councillor Leytham
LGA Executive (Leader) Councillor Blamire
LGA Rural Commission (Cabinet Member for Rural Affairs +1 Member appointed by Group on rotation) Councillor Hanson
Morecambe Bay Partnership Councillor Sands
Museums Advisory Panel Cabinet Member
North Lancashire Local Action Group executive Group (Member + named substitute) Councillor Hanson
North West Rural Affairs Forum Councillor Hanson
Regional Leaders' Forum (formerly NW Regional Assembly) (Leader) Councillor Blamire
Storey Centre for Creative Industries Councillor Bryning
Lancashire Waste Partnership Councillor Smith

POST LDLSP APPOINTMENTS

Organisation	Basis of appointment
Lancaster District Children's Trust Board	Cabinet Member (+ Cabinet Member substitute) Councillor Sands
Community Safety Partnership	Cabinet Member (+ Cabinet Member substitute) Councillor Smith
Health and Wellbeing Partnership	Cabinet Member (+ Cabinet Member substitute) Councillor Leytham

LANCASTER AND DISTRICT VISION BOARD

ORGANISATION	BASIS OF APPOINTMENT
Lancaster and District Vision Board	Leader Councillor Blamire