

## CABINET

10.00 A.M.

9TH OCTOBER 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
Nadine Muschamp	Head of Resources and Section 151 Officer
Mark Davies	Head of Environmental Services
Richard Tulej	Head of Community Engagement Service
Suzanne Lodge	Head of Health and Housing
Nick Howard	Environmental Health Manager
Liz Bateson	Principal Democratic Support Officer

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

The Chairman advised that there was one item of urgent business. This related to the recent incident in a local licensed premises following the alleged consumption of liquid nitrogen with alcohol. (Minute 56 refers).

### 52 PUBLIC SPEAKING

Members were advised that there had been two requests to speak at the meeting from members of the public in accordance with Cabinet's agreed procedure, as set out in Cabinet Procedure Rule 2.7, with regard to the Service Level Agreement Storey Gallery (Minute 53 refers) and Morecambe Festival Market (Minute 54 refers).

*The Chairman informed the meeting of a revision to the order of the agenda in view the two public speaking requests and the item of urgent business.*

### 53 SERVICE LEVEL AGREEMENT STOREY GALLERY

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

***Mr John Angus, Director of the Storey Gallery, who had registered to speak on this item in accordance with the City Council's agreed procedure and Cabinet Procedure Rule 2.7, spoke on behalf of the Storey Gallery and responded to questions from Cabinet Members.***

Cabinet received a report from the Head of Community Engagement to seek members' views as to future arrangements regarding the Council's Service Level Agreement with the Storey Gallery.

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

The options were to:

- 1 No longer have an SLA with the Storey Gallery.
- 2 Reinstate the SLA in full or in part. It was likely that the findings of the consultant would lead to a complete redrafting of the existing agreement if either of these options were selected.

In the light of the findings of the consultants report the officer recommendation was Option 1. The City Council has had in place a long standing SLA with the Storey Gallery company. The current financial and operational difficulty the company was facing had led to the closure of the gallery space and a review of its current operational and financial arrangements.

Councillor Sands proposed, seconded by Councillor Bryning:-

- “(1) That Cabinet recognises that the grant to the Storey Gallery company is in two parts. A £27,100 ring fenced grant for the purpose of rent and £10,700 for artistic activities.
- (2) That the ring fenced grant of £27,100 be no longer allocated to the Storey Gallery company but used to support the future management and operation of the Storey Gallery space as it is essential for the management of this space.
- (3) That the £10,700 grant be held back until detailed proposals regarding any specific project are brought forward by the company for consideration by Cabinet.
- (4) That any proposals brought forward should indicate the likely financial support of the Arts Council, Lancashire County Council and/or other funding bodies as appropriate.”

Councillors then voted:-

***Resolved unanimously:***

- (1) That Cabinet recognises that the grant to the Storey Gallery company is in two parts. A £27,100 ring fenced grant for the purpose of rent and £10,700 for artistic activities.
- (2) That the ring fenced grant of £27,100 be no longer allocated to the Storey Gallery company but used to support the future management and operation of the Storey Gallery space as it is essential for the management of this space.
- (3) That the £10,700 grant be held back until detailed proposals regarding any specific project are brought forward by the company for consideration by Cabinet.
- (4) That any proposals brought forward should indicate the likely financial support of the Arts Council, Lancashire County Council and/or other funding bodies as appropriate.

**Officers responsible for effecting the decision:**

Head of Community Engagement  
Head of Resources

**Reasons for making the decision:**

The decision fits with the Corporate Plan Economic Growth priority: Support arts in the district working with the Arts Partnership.

**54 MORECAMBE FESTIVAL MARKET**

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

*Mrs Karen Kay who had registered to speak on this item in accordance with the City Council's agreed procedure and Cabinet Procedure Rule 2.7, spoke on behalf of Morecambe Festival Market traders and responded to questions from Cabinet Members.*

Cabinet received a report from the Head of Environmental Services to provide information in order for Cabinet to agree a direction for improving market provision in Morecambe and also Lancaster.

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

In terms of strategic options there were in outline basically three-

**STRATEGIC OPTION 1- DO NOTHING (MAINTAIN EXISTING FACILITY)** - the fabric of the facility will still need some investment to maintain it and address any existing problems; the extent will be informed by the conditions survey. This may have some impact on the financial standing of the market and the contribution that the market can make towards the Council's corporate plan. It may mean a lost opportunity to take advantage of the much greater sum of the parts that adopting a strategic view to market provision could offer. This option may also be inconsistent with the MAAP, but it may prove to be the only affordable option. It would still involve appraisal of current rents.

**STRATEGIC OPTION 2- CONSIDER OPTIONS FOR IMPROVING THE EXISTING FACILITY AT MORECAMBE-** based on the condition survey currently being undertaken a range of costed solutions for improving the current facility in Morecambe could be brought forward. These would be combined with realistic plans for ensuring the sustainability of the Council's markets as a whole. It is expected that to implement these considerable investment would be required and market rents would need to increase, so ultimately any options may prove financially unworkable. This option assumed that the best place for a market in Morecambe is the existing location. Development of this option would need to take into account the MAAP.

**STRATEGIC OPTION 3- CONSIDER ALL OPTIONS-** this differs from OPTION 2 in that it does not assume that the only location for a market in Morecambe is where it currently is. In preparing this option consideration would be given not just to how the current Festival Market could be improved (as per OPTION 2) but to what other options there could be for providing a sustainable market in Morecambe. As with OPTION 2 realistic

plans for ensuring the sustainability of the Council's markets as a whole would also be developed. This option was most consistent with the MAAP, but again it may prove unworkable financially.

Both options 2 and 3 would require an officer working group to develop the options. It was expected that in developing the options consultation would take place with a wide range of stakeholders, obviously including traders, Elected Members, Morecambe Town Council, business representatives, shoppers etc. To take forward options 2 and 3 thoroughly and within existing resources, it was expected that reports would be available in order to inform the 2014/15 budget process. Options 2 and 3 would clearly take some time to develop and implement, if approved. Besides the 3 strategic options outlined above Cabinet might wish to consider some short term options for the Market. These included-

**SHORT TERM OPTION 1- Provision of coach drop off point-** this would require the removal of approx 15 car parking spaces and associated revenue and some lining work to be undertaken. Traders felt it would increase the amount of coach parties that visit the market and there was anecdotal evidence to suggest that coach companies also agree this would be advantageous. If Cabinet wished to consider this option it could be appraised more fully and implemented if appropriate, from within existing budgets.

**SHORT TERM OPTION 2- Amendment of car parking charges for the Festival Market car park.** This would have a much more significant budgetary impact than the provision of a coach drop off point. It would also be likely to increase the amount of vehicles in the area, require new car park equipment and create other unintended consequences. If Cabinet wished to consider this option again it could be built in as an option in the car parking fees and charges report that would be considered as part of the budget process.

**SHORT TERM OPTION 3- Look at different ways of marketing the market.** This would require a look at how best to promote the market(s). Consideration would need to be given to the resource required to undertake the work as it couldn't be done from within existing resources. The resource implications would be brought in through the budget process.

**SHORT TERM OPTION 4- Look at some short term practical ways of improving the insulation of the market.** The aim of this would be to reduce the winter extremes of temperature. Additional resource would be required to establish what the option were and further additional resource would be required were any of the options to be implemented. The risk of this though is that adopting a piecemeal approach to the maintenance issues affecting to the market became more costly in the medium / long term.

Overview and Scrutiny Committee formed an informal task group to consider the Festival Market. At its meeting on 10<sup>th</sup> September 2012 Members of the group requested that the following be considered by Cabinet-

(1) *options for insulating the Market's roof particularly with polystyrene materials.*

**OFFICER COMMENT-** See SHORT TERM OPTION 4 and STRATEGIC OPTIONS 2 and 3 above

- (2) *wind protection and draft stopping, particularly around the Market's doors including the possibility of installing barriers in front of each door.*

**OFFICER COMMENT-** See SHORT TERM OPTION 4 and STRATEGIC OPTIONS 3 above

- (3) *installing a coach drop off in the Market car park.*

**OFFICER COMMENT-** See SHORT TERM OPTION 1 above

- (4) *marketing (including coach companies) and the signage of the Market.*

**OFFICER COMMENT-** See SHORT TERM OPTION 3 above

- (5) *the cost of re-wiring introducing 3 phase electric in the Market.*

**OFFICER COMMENT-** See STRATEGIC OPTIONS 2 and 3 above

The officer preferred strategic option was STRATEGIC OPTION 3. The options that came forward were likely to provide the best strategic options for delivery of a market within Morecambe, would take account of the MAAP, and would be designed to complement market provision as a whole, but it must also be recognised that it might still prove financially unworkable. It was also envisioned that in developing this option Officers would bring forward the building issues identified within the commission survey and costed options for resolving them. This option would avoid a piecemeal approach to dealing with the maintenance issues affecting the building. The officer preferred short term options were SHORT TERM OPTION 1 and SHORT TERM Option 3.

Councillor Barry proposed, seconded by Councillor Blamire:-

- “(1) That Cabinet strongly supports the continuation of Morecambe Festival Market.
- (2) That with regard to strategic options, Cabinet approves Strategic Option 3 – to consider all options.
- (3) That with regard to Short Term options, Cabinet supports Options 1, 3 and 4:
- *Option 1 – Provision of coach drop off point – to include considering the use of the lay-by and improving pedestrian access to the market from the lay-by.*
  - *Option 3 – Look at different ways of marketing the market*
  - *Option 4 – Look at some short term practical ways of improving the insulation/heating of the market.”*

Councillors then voted:-

***Resolved unanimously:***

- (1) That Cabinet strongly supports the continuation of Morecambe Festival Market.
- (2) That with regard to strategic options, Cabinet approves Strategic Option 3 – to consider all options.

- (3) That with regard to Short Term options, Cabinet supports Options 1, 3 and 4:
- *Option 1 – Provision of coach drop off point* – to include considering the use of the lay-by and improving pedestrian access to the market from the lay-by.
  - *Option 3 – Look at different ways of marketing the market*
  - *Option 4 – Look at some short term practical ways of improving the insulation/heating of the market.*

**Officers responsible for effecting the decision:**

Head of Environmental Services

**Reasons for making the decision:**

Morecambe Market is a well established market facility and Cabinet strongly supports the continuation of this facility. The decision will enable realistic plans for ensuring the sustainability of the Council's markets to be developed as well as addressing short term issues including parking, and marketing.

**55 MINUTES**

The minutes of the meeting held on Tuesday 4 September 2012 were approved as a correct record.

**56 ITEM OF URGENT BUSINESS - LIQUID NITROGEN INCIDENT**

Cabinet invited the Environmental Health Manager to provide an urgent oral report in light of the recent incident at a licensed premises in Lancaster which had resulted in the hospitalisation of a local 18 year old girl and intense media enquiries.

Councillor Smith proposed, seconded by Councillor Leytham:

- “(1) That this Council recognises the potential health risks associated with the consumption of liquid nitrogen with alcohol.
- (2) That this Council believes that there is a need to investigate these health risks and what steps can be taken to limit the selling of liquid nitrogen for consumption with alcohol.
- (3) That this Council resolves that the Chief Executive write to the Secretary of State for Health indicating Lancaster City Council's position.”

Councillors then voted:

***Resolved unanimously:***

- (1) That this Council recognises the potential health risks associated with the consumption of liquid nitrogen with alcohol.
- (2) That this Council believes that there is a need to investigate these health risks

and what steps can be taken to limit the selling of liquid nitrogen for consumption with alcohol.

- (3) That this Council resolves that the Chief Executive write to the Secretary of State for Health indicating Lancaster City Council's position.

**Officers responsible for effecting the decision:**

Chief Executive  
Head of Health & Housing

**Reasons for making the decision:**

A reactive and proactive response was necessary. As this was an Environmental Health issue rather than a Licensing issue it was within the remit of Cabinet to act for the Council on this matter.

**57 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

No declarations were made at this point.

**58 MUSEUMS SERVICE**

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

Cabinet was due to consider a report from the Head of Community Engagement to update members on the review of the Museums Partnership agreement with Lancashire County Council and agree future management responsibilities. In light of further information being required the Leader advised the meeting that she would be proposing that consideration of this item be deferred to a later meeting.

Councillor Blamire proposed, seconded by Councillor Sands:

- “(1) That consideration of the Museums Service report be deferred to a later meeting.”

Councillors then voted:-

***Resolved unanimously:***

- (1) That consideration of the Museums Service report be deferred to a later meeting.

**Officers responsible for effecting the decision:**

Chief Executive  
Head of Community Engagement

**Reasons for making the decision:**

Management of the Museums is an important element of the Council's priorities of Economic Regeneration – and is cited within the Corporate Plan 'An improved future for the district's museums is secured'. The decision to defer this item will enable Cabinet to

consider further the options available when the report is re-submitted.

**59 PERFORMANCE REWARD GRANT FUNDING**

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

Cabinet received a report from the Head of Community Engagement to seek approval of members for amendments to the allocation of the Performance Reward Grant funding previously allocated towards the Warm Homes Scheme.

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

	<b>Option 1:</b> The council directs PRG funding to the HIA to deliver a Affordable Warmth Improvement Programme which is supportive of the original aims of the Warm Homes scheme	<b>Option 2:</b> Take back the funds to address other priorities within the capital programme
Advantages	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Provides tangible benefits for vulnerable people</li> <li>• Contributes to the achievement of one of the Council's Corporate Priorities</li> <li>• Funds could be delivered as part of a capital programme through the HIA utilising their existing technical staff</li> <li>• The HIA have many years of experience delivering similar home improvement type grants utilising our directly employed handypersons and local approved contractors to carry improvements for vulnerable residents</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The council will be able to redirect the funds to meet alternative objectives</li> </ul>
Disadvantages	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Some officer time required to administer funds and monitor progress</li> <li>• Fund will be unavailable to support other initiatives</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The council will have lost an opportunity to reduce mortality and help vulnerable groups increase their resilience to periods of cold weather</li> <li>• Council will have reduced capacity to achieve Health and Wellbeing success measures</li> </ul>

Risks	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Project outcomes not delivered</b> - low risk but could occur due to failure to reach relevant client groups</li> <li>• <b>Mitigation:</b> The HIA have an excellent track record of delivering similar schemes and have management arrangements in place to address any issues which may arise</li> <li>• <b>Priorities may change dependent on need</b> – Low risk but could change the type of assistance provided by the HIA</li> <li>• <b>Mitigation:</b> Delegated decision making to the Leader of the Council will allow for quick progress.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Dependent on the alternative use of the funds</li> <li>• The PRG funding has been provided to support a range of partnership initiatives. Partners in the district have been engaged in the process of identifying priorities and will have expectations for the use of the funds</li> </ul>
-------	---	---

The officer preferred option was Option 1 as this delivered the original objectives of the funding and supported Health and Wellbeing Outcomes and Success Measures in the Council's Corporate Plan. The Council could demonstrate its strong commitment to health and wellbeing in the Lancaster district by directing the available PRG funding towards the proposed Affordable Warmth Improvement Programme. This would enable the HIA to offer support to vulnerable residents which was not available elsewhere. However, these initiatives were complex and amendments to the plans would certainly be required – by delegating authority to the Leader to approve those decisions Cabinet would ensure that approval was given in a timely manner.

Through identifying and applying for additional external funding where opportunities might arise, Cabinet would be able to continue to add value to affordable warmth related activities operating in the district. Affordable Warmth was also being considered as a priority in the emerging county wide Health and well being strategy being developed by the Shadow Health and well being Board and was also being targeted for intervention by our local clinical commissioning group.

Councillor Blamire proposed, seconded by Councillor Hanson:-

“(1) That recommendations 2, 3, 4, 5 and 6 as set out in the report, be approved but that only half of the £96,521.00 be allocated at this time with a report back to Cabinet later in the municipal year to determine how the remainder of the grant be utilised.

Councillors then voted:-

***Resolved unanimously:***

(1) That half of the £96,521.00 of the Performance Reward Grant Funding be allocated at this time with a report back to Cabinet later in the municipal year to determine how the remainder of the grant be utilised.

- (2) That any PRG funds allocated to the Affordable Warmth Improvement Programme are specifically used to support measures to reduce the level of excess deaths and avoid hospital admissions that are due to vulnerable people living in cold housing conditions.
- (3) That subject to Cabinet's support for the Affordable Warmth Improvement Programme, the Home Improvement Agency (HIA) within Health and Housing be the delivery agent.
- (4) That the authority to approve any further amendments specific to the Affordable Warmth Improvement Programme is delegated to the Leader of the council, ensuring that the council's responsibilities for PRG are met.
- (5) That the General Fund Capital Programme be updated accordingly.
- (6) That the Head of Health and Housing be authorised to apply for any suitable external funding to support the delivery of affordable warmth related activities, subject to a fit with corporate priorities and Resources confirming that there be no additional call on the City Council.

**Officers responsible for effecting the decision:**

Head of Community Engagement  
Head of Health & Housing  
Head of Resources

**Reasons for making the decision:**

Health and Wellbeing is one of the key priorities within the Corporate Plan 2012-15 including "continuing work to improve the quality and availability of housing". In particular, two of the Plan's outcomes are to "enhanced quality of life of local residents through access to good quality housing" and "health and wellbeing improved and mortality rates reduced for vulnerable people in the district". Furthermore, the Corporate Plan includes a success measure of the "number of vulnerable individuals benefiting from Warm Homes initiatives". The provision of a Affordable Warmth Improvement Programme will allow Lancaster City Council to achieve these outcomes and deliver the success measure.

**60 BUDGET AND PLANNING PROCESS 2013/14**

**(Cabinet Members with Special Responsibility Councillors Blamire & Bryning)**

Cabinet received a report from the Chief Executive to agree a process for reviewing the Council's Budget and Policy Framework for 2013/14.

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

The following options were available to Cabinet.

- (1) Approve the proposals and timetable set out in the report for reviewing and

revising the Council's Budget and Policy Framework.

- (2) Approve an amended version of the proposals, drawing on any specific issues that Cabinet have.

Assuming that Cabinet had no other specific issues to address, Option 1 was the Officer preferred option, as it set out a structured approach for Cabinet to review the existing Budget and Policy Framework, to identify savings/efficiency options, and for it to bring forward its budget and policy framework proposals for 2013/14 and beyond, within the statutory timescales. As usual, the consideration and management of risk formed a key part of the process.

Councillor Bryning proposed, seconded by Councillor Blamire:-

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

Councillors then voted:-

***Resolved unanimously:***

- (1) That the report be noted and the outline budget and planning timetable set out in the report attached to the agenda, be approved).

**Officers responsible for effecting the decision:**

Head of Resources

**Reasons for making the decision:**

The annual review of the budget and policy framework ensures that the Council's plans and strategies are kept up to date and compliant with the above criteria for assessing their impact on local communities.

*Councillor Bryning left the meeting at this point.*

**61 STOREY CREATIVE INDUSTRIES CENTRE**

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

Cabinet received a report from the Head of Resources which provided an update on the position regarding the Storey Creative Industries Centre following the decision of Council on the 12 September 2012.

As this report was for information, no options were presented.

Cabinet were advised of the practical measures that had been undertaken now that the City Council had resumed management of the building.

Councillor Blamire proposed, seconded by Councillor Barry:-

- “(1) That officers be requested to identify options available regarding the future running of the Storey including dealing with enquiries from Litfest and NICE and

bring back any Cabinet decisions required.

- (2) That a written update report be tabled at each Cabinet meeting.
- (3) That arrangements be made for Cabinet as a group to visit the Storey and meet with tenants before the end of November 2012.”

Councillors then voted:-

***Resolved unanimously:***

- (1) That officers be requested to identify options available regarding the future running of the Storey including dealing with enquiries from Litfest and NICE and bring back any Cabinet decisions required.
- (2) That a written update report be tabled at each Cabinet meeting.
- (3) That arrangements be made for Cabinet as a group to visit the Storey and meet with tenants before the end of November 2012.

**Officers responsible for effecting the decision:**

Chief Executive  
Head of Resources

**Reasons for making the decision:**

With the management of the Storey now back with the Council, the decision enables officers to identify options for the future running of the building and for Cabinet to receive regular updates.

**62 CORPORATE PLAN 2012-15 - HALF YEARLY MONITORING AT SEPTEMBER 2012**

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

Cabinet received a report from the Head of Community Engagement to report progress on actions in the Corporate Plan 2012-15 at the half way point of 2012.

The report was for noting and comment.

Councillor Blamire proposed, seconded by Councillor Barry:-

- “(1) That the report be noted.
- (2) That Cabinet Members consider any new priorities and reports these formally by 4 December, 2012.”

Councillors then voted:-

***Resolved unanimously:***

- (1) That the report be noted.
- (2) That Cabinet Members consider any new priorities and reports these formally by

4 December, 2012.

**Officers responsible for effecting the decision:**

Head of Community Engagement

**Reasons for making the decision:**

The Council's Performance Management Framework requires the regular reporting of operational, as well as, financial performance. The review of progress on corporate plan actions at this early stage in the life of the 2012 -2015 Corporate Plan clearly demonstrates that good progress is being made towards the achievement of the council's stated outcomes and priorities.

*Councillor Leytham left the meeting during discussion of the following item and did not vote on the following two items.*

**63 WASTE COLLECTION - COST SHARING**

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

Cabinet received a report from the Head of Environmental Services to seek Cabinet's agreement for entry into a revised cost sharing agreement with the County Council from April 1<sup>st</sup> 2013.

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

The County Council was essentially proposing the following-

**PROPOSAL-** To accept a revised cost sharing agreement from 2012/13 (one year ahead of the termination of the current arrangement). This agreement would provide the City Council with a contribution of £6,099,594 over a 5 year period from April 2013. The amount also included payments for loss of recycling income as were currently provided. The amount offered was less than the amount offered under the current agreement. Two sub-options were presented to provide choice as to the contribution received. Sub-option 1a saw the contribution spread equally over the 5 year period. In 2012 /13 this option would mean that approximately £104,000 extra savings would have to be made by the Council. Sub- option 1b saw the contribution front loaded in profile. Based on the financial appraisal (see financial implications in the report to the agenda) it appeared that Sub-option 1a would be the easier option to manage.

Acceptance of the cost sharing agreement required a commitment to provide at least 90% of households with three- stream waste collection arrangements (which Lancaster City Council had already achieved). Increasing of collection frequencies of residual waste (grey bins) to less than fortnightly would not be acceptable. If the City Council wished to accept the County Council have requested for budgeting purposes that we inform them by October 31<sup>st</sup>.

If the City Council did not wish to accept the revised offer it would remain within the current cost sharing agreement until its end in 2013/14. At this point there was no indication that any further financial support would be provided by the County Council. In

theory this would allow Lancaster City Council greater freedom as to collection arrangements e.g. reintroduction of weekly grey bin collections. In practice the combined cost of the loss of cost sharing (£1.2million / year) and the increased cost of reintroduction of weekly bin collections (£1- 1.5 million / year) would make this option unrealistic from a financial perspective. It would also be contrary to the aims of the Council's corporate plan.

Essentially there were two choices-

- Accept the revised cost sharing agreement
- Not accept the revised cost sharing agreement

For the reasons outlined above the officer preferred, and only realistic option, was to accept the County Council's proposal of entry into a revised cost sharing agreement from April 1<sup>st</sup> 2013. The most preferable sub-option from both an operational and financial perspective was to accept the contribution spread equally over the 5 year period of the agreement (Sub – option 1a).

Councillor Smith proposed, seconded by Councillor Blamire:-

“(1) That the recommendations, as set out in the report, be approved.”  
Councillors then voted:-

***Resolved unanimously:***

- (1) That Lancaster City Council agrees to entry into the revised cost sharing agreement with the County Council from April 1<sup>st</sup> 2013.
- (2) That Lancaster City Council indicates that its' preference is to have the contribution from the cost sharing agreement spread evenly over the 5 year period (Sub-option 1a).
- (3) That the Head of Environmental Services informs County of the above and is delegated to agree the precise operational details of the agreement.
- (4) That budget projections are updated accordingly

**Officers responsible for effecting the decision:**

Head of Environmental Services  
Head of Resources

**Reasons for making the decision:**

Waste collection / recycling is provided to all households in the District and is a statutory service. Whilst the decision to accept the proposals would require the Council to consider potential savings and efficiencies as part of the forthcoming MTFs and budget review, it provided a clearer and less risky picture for the future and greater stability in year-on-year operational and financial planning.

## 64 COUNCIL HOUSING - ROTA PAINTING

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

Cabinet received a report from the Head of Environmental Services to outline options for the way the rota painting of Council houses is undertaken and request an 'in principle' decision.

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

	<b>Option 1:</b> Deliver rota painting via 3 <sup>rd</sup> party – through a tendering exercise	<b>Option 2:</b> Seek an 'in principle decision' to develop a business plan to deliver rota painting directly via expansion of the Council's in-house team
Advantages	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Once tendered requires less ongoing management input.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Increased flexibility</li> <li>Increased control</li> <li>Ability to align more with corporate objectives (eg apprenticeships)</li> <li>Consistent with objectives of the RMS change programme</li> <li>Will be delivered within existing budgets</li> </ul>
Disadvantages	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Reduction in flexibility</li> <li>Reduction in control</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Requires more ongoing management input</li> <li>Requires significant initial input from a number of Council services to ensure the transition goes as intended.</li> </ul>
Risks	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>TUPE may apply</li> <li>A tendering exercise may result in an increase in costs</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Detailed business case may identify some unforeseen issues</li> </ul>

Changing the means of delivering the service would generate, at least initially, significant extra work. However, within the context of the change programme that was underway the effort involved would result in sustained improvements. Therefore, the officer preferred option was Option 2.

Councillor Smith 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 rota painting contract for Council Housing is not retendered.
- (2) That in order to deliver the service an in principle decision is taken to deliver in-house via expansion of the Council's repairs and maintenance team.
- (3) That in taking this decision the assumption is made that the service can be delivered at less than the amount currently budgeted and to a suitable level of service. Otherwise a further report will be brought back to Cabinet.
- (4) That the Cabinet Member with responsibility for Environmental Services monitors the performance of the in-house service via the quarterly Performance Review Meetings for the service area.

**Officers responsible for effecting the decision:**

Head of Environmental Services

**Reasons for making the decision:**

The Council has its own Council Housing stock which it has a duty to maintain and provision of the service contributes to ensuring the Council's housing stock is maintained to a suitable standard. The estimated cost of Option 2, exploring the delivery of rota painting internally by an expansion of the in-house team was significantly below the budgeted contribution resulting in savings which could be utilised elsewhere in the delivery of planned maintenance throughout the district.

*Councillor Leytham returned to the meeting at this point.*

**65 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 Blamire and seconded by Councillor Barry:

"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:-

***Resolved unanimously:***

- (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.

**66 COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT INITIATIVE (Page 19)****(Cabinet Member with Special Responsibility Councillor Blamire)**

Cabinet received a report from the Head of Community Engagement 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 Blamire proposed, seconded by Councillor Hanson:-

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

Councillors then voted:-

***Resolved unanimously:***

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

**Officers responsible for effecting the decision:**

Head of Community Engagement

**Reasons for making the decision:**

The reasons for 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 12.15 p.m.)

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

**MINUTES PUBLISHED ON FRIDAY 12 OCTOBER, 2012.**

**EFFECTIVE DATE FOR IMPLEMENTING THE DECISIONS CONTAINED IN THESE MINUTES:  
MONDAY 22 OCTOBER, 2012.**

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

Document is Restricted