



**Committee:** COUNCIL BUSINESS COMMITTEE

**Date:** THURSDAY, 2 NOVEMBER 2017

**Venue:** MORECAMBE TOWN HALL

**Time:** 6.00 P.M.

## A G E N D A

1. **Apologies for Absence**

2. **Appointment of Vice-Chairman**

To appoint a Vice-Chairman for the duration of the 2017/18 municipal year.

3. **Minutes**

Minutes of meeting held on 26 January, 2017 (previously circulated).

4. **Items of Urgent Business Authorised by the Chairman**

5. **Declarations of Interest**

To receive declarations by Members of interests in respect of items on this Agenda.

Members are reminded that, in accordance with the Localism Act 2011, they are required to declare any disclosable pecuniary interests which have not already been declared in the Council's Register of Interests. (It is a criminal offence not to declare a disclosable pecuniary interest either in the Register or at the meeting).

Whilst not a legal requirement, in accordance with Council Procedure Rule 9 and in the interests of clarity and transparency, Members should declare any disclosable pecuniary interests which they have already declared in the Register, at this point in the meeting.

In accordance with Part B Section 2 of the Code Of Conduct, Members are required to declare the existence and nature of any other interests as defined in paragraphs 8(1) or 9(2) of the Code of Conduct.

6. **Council Response to Government Consultation on Proposed Changes to the Planning System (Pages 1 - 20)**

Report of the Chief Officer (Regeneration and Planning).

7. **Community Governance Review of the District (Pages 21 - 24)**

Report of the Democratic Services Manager.

8. **Committee Timetable 2018/2019** (Pages 25 - 28)  
Report of the Democratic Services Manager.
9. **Ward Councillors Speaking at Planning** (Pages 29 - 34)  
Report of the Democratic Services Manager.
10. **Code of Conduct for Members** (Pages 35 - 39)  
Report of the Standards Committee.
11. **Designation of Veterans' Champion** (Pages 40 - 41)  
Report of the Democratic Services Manager.
12. **Appointments to Committees and Changes to Membership**

## **ADMINISTRATIVE ARRANGEMENTS**

### **(i) Membership**

Councillors John Reynolds (Chairman), Ian Clift, Janet Hall, Joan Jackson, Abi Mills, Andrew Warriner and Phillippa Williamson

### **(ii) Substitute Membership**

Councillors Tracy Brown, Susie Charles, Terrie Metcalfe, Susan Sykes and Nicholas Wilkinson

### **(iii) Queries regarding this Agenda**

Please contact Tessa Mott, Democratic Services - 01524 582074 or email [tmott@lancaster.gov.uk](mailto:tmott@lancaster.gov.uk).

### **(iv) Changes to Membership, substitutions or apologies**

Please contact Democratic Support, telephone 582170, or alternatively email [democraticsupport@lancaster.gov.uk](mailto:democraticsupport@lancaster.gov.uk).

SUSAN PARSONAGE,  
CHIEF EXECUTIVE,  
TOWN HALL,  
DALTON SQUARE,  
LANCASTER, LA1 1PJ

Published on Tuesday 24<sup>th</sup> October, 2017.

**COUNCIL BUSINESS COMMITTEE****Council Response to Government Consultation on  
Proposed Changes to the Planning System – “Planning  
for the Right Homes in the Right Places”****2 November 2017****Report of the Chief Officer (Regeneration and Planning)****PURPOSE OF REPORT**

To enable members to prepare a formal response to the Government’s consultation on a range of proposed changes to the planning system, in particular the Government’s emerging approach to re-calculating housing need. The report highlights the key issues which may form the basis for the Council’s response.

**RECOMMENDATION**

- (1) That the Committee consider the issues set out in Section 6 of this Report which may form the basis of the Council’s formal response to this consultation.**

**1.0 INTRODUCTION**

- 1.1 In February 2017 the Government published the Housing White Paper entitled ‘*Fixing our Broken Housing Market*’ which set out proposals to tackle the persistent national challenge of an inadequate supply of housing.
- 1.2 The Housing White Paper set out four main areas where action is needed:
- (a) Planning for the right homes in the right places, to make sure that sufficient land is released for new development, that the best possible use is made of that land, and that local communities have more control over where development goes and what it looks like.
  - (b) Building homes faster, where communities have planned for new homes, ensuring those plans are delivered to the timescales expected.
  - (c) Diversifying the market, to address the lack of innovation and competition in the home-building market.
  - (d) Helping people now, tackling the impacts of the housing shortage on ordinary households and communities.

- 1.3 The White Paper contained a number of specific proposals to reform the planning system in order to achieve these objectives. It confirmed the central role that local and neighbourhood plans have in the planning system so that local planning authorities and communities retain control of where development should or should not be located.
- 1.4 The White Paper stated that further consultation on specific issues would follow and, on 14 September, published a consultation document on a range of specific potential changes to the planning system. The Government has advised that in early 2018 it intends to revise the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF). The NPPF sets the national direction guiding the preparation of local plans and the determination of planning applications.
- 1.5 It is understood that the Government will await responses to this consultation to help shape revisions to the NPPF. Consultation on revisions to the NPPF are anticipated early in 2018.
- 1.6 The consultation document, as published by the Department for Communities and Local Government (DCLG) is attached. The DCLG's preferred form of response is that responders should respond to a set of questions. Nineteen questions about the consultation are posed by the DCLG and suggested answers for members to consider are provided in Appendix A.
- 1.7 The consultation is also being reported to the Planning Policy Cabinet Liaison Group to permit wider consideration that will assist the Portfolio Holder for Regeneration and Planning in her responsibilities for advancing the district's emerging new local plan.
- 1.8 The consultation document has also been considered by the senior council officers to represent their respective local authorities on the Shadow Combined Authority Housing Group to enable the preparation of a response that reflects the shared perspectives of the participating Lancashire local authorities.

## **2.0 GOVERNMENT'S PROPOSED APPROACH TO CALCULATING HOUSING NEED**

- 2.1 The key element of the Government's consultation paper relates to the method for calculating housing need at local planning authority level. Previously local planning authorities have been required to prepare their own assessment of housing need by preparing a Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA). The SHMA would provide an Objectively Assessed Housing Need figure – an OAN - which acts as a recommendation to the local planning authority on the scale of the housing requirement to be advanced by preparing the strategic element of their local plans.
- 2.2 Members will be aware that to inform the preparation of the emerging local plan Lancaster City Council appointed Turley (Economics) as an independent external consultant to investigate economy opportunity in the district. In 2015 Turley's provided the report "Lancaster District: Prospects and Recommendation for Achieving Economic Potential". The council further

commissioned Turley (Economics) to prepare an SHMA (Part 1) providing an OAN recommendation. In October 2015, in the context of their earlier report describing a positive assessment of local economic opportunity, Turleys recommended that the council's local plan should set a housing requirement of between 13,000 and 14,000 homes to be completed in the period between 2011 and 2031. Taking the mid-point of this range, this would equate to an annual average delivery rate of 675 new homes over the 20 year period.

- 2.3 On the 3<sup>rd</sup> February 2016 Council considered a report of the Chief Officer (Regeneration and Planning) and Chief Officer (Governance) which provided legal advice on the local plan housing requirements study. Council resolved to accept Turley's work as establishing the objectively assessed need for the local plan evidence base and moves to complete a draft Local Plan. Within that year, on 14 December 2016, the council unanimously resolved to consult on a draft local plan that sought to address Turley recommendation on housing need.
- 2.4 However, although Lancaster and many other local planning authorities have worked hard to advance local plans that intend to comply with the direction given in the NPPF on preparing local plan the Government in this current consultation takes a view that their present approach to establishing an OAN can be complex and costly, may take much time to conclude and may be inconsistently applied across the country.
- 2.5 The Government wants to reduce the time taken to agree local plan housing requirements and is therefore consulting on a simple, standardised approach to calculating housing need. By reducing the complexity of the process it is hope that speedier local plan outcomes may be achieved.
- 2.6 The proposed approach makes use of demographic projections from the Office of National Statistics (ONS) in relation to household growth over a 10 year period. These demographic projections set a baseline housing need for each local planning authority in England. The baseline is then adjusted to take account of the housing local affordability ratio, such that the baseline is increased in accordance with the relationship between local housing prices and local salaries<sup>1</sup>. **The consultation is accompanied by a spreadsheet which illustrates that for Lancaster District this local affordability-adjusted baseline position would be for 401 new homes per year.** This would be applicable for the 10 year period from 2016 to 2026.
- 2.7 The Government recognises that applying this approach to market adjustment would lead to a significant increase in the calculated housing need in the parts of the country where housing is most expensive. To help ensure the method arrives at a deliverable level of housing need, the Government proposes to cap the increase to according to the current status of the local plan in each authority as follows:

---

<sup>1</sup> For example, under the consultation methodology an area with a projected household growth of 100 a year would have an annual need of:

- 100 if average house prices were four times local average earnings
- 125 if average house prices were eight times local average earnings
- 150 if average house prices were twelve times local average earnings.

- a) for those authorities that have adopted their local plan in the last five years, the new annual local housing need figure should be capped at 40 per cent above the annual requirement figure currently set out in their local plan; or
- b) for those authorities that do not have an up-to-date local plan (i.e. adopted over five years ago), the new annual local housing need figure should be capped at **40 per cent above** whichever is higher of the projected household growth for their area over the plan period (using Office for National Statistics' household projections), or the annual housing requirement figure currently set out in their local plan.

2.8 The consultation acknowledges that for some local planning authorities, a reduction in their local housing need compared to the existing approach can be attributed to the method not making a specific adjustment to take account of anticipated employment growth. However, as explained in paragraph 46 of the consultation, local planning authorities may plan for a higher number than set out by the proposed method. **This means that, where there is a policy in place to substantially increase economic growth, local planning authorities may wish to plan for a higher level of growth than the suggested formula proposes.**

2.9 As advised at paragraph 2.2 above, for Lancaster district evidence on the potential for economic growth, itself published in 2015, had already been prepared and taken into account in establishing the OAN recommendation. During the summer the council asked Turleys to review their 2015 work on Prospects and Recommendations for Achieving Economic Potential to establish of the evidence position supported the emerging local plan policies which had been prepared in light of their earlier work. The updated report, which will be published imminently states that Lancaster District's economy is in relatively good health compared with the position in 2015; with an improving employment position, approaching 10% growth in micro business formation, the delivery of strategic projects complete or underway and stakeholders exhibiting increasing confidence to invest." By 2031 however there will still be an imbalance in the demographic structure of the community because there will be a net reduction in the size of the working age population despite an overall growth in the population in general. Unchecked this could lead in economic decline.

2.10 The consultation states that the Government wants to make sure that it gives proper support to those "ambitious authorities" who want to deliver more homes. To facilitate this it proposes to amend planning guidance so that where a plan is based on an assessment of local housing need in excess of that which the standard method would provide, Planning Inspectors are advised to work on the assumption that the approach adopted is sound unless there are compelling reasons to indicate otherwise. The consultation document states that Government will seek to support the preparation of local plans which **plan proactively and positively for evidenced economic growth, however plans which seek to ignore such opportunities, or seek to not meet the baseline needs for housing will be critically analysed by Planning Inspectors at Public Examination.**

- 2.11 Detailed consideration is provided in section 6 below however, members are advised that in the particular current circumstances of Lancaster district, where economic prospects are already well evidenced, the outcomes for setting a local plan housing requirement are not likely to be significantly different when determined using the current methodology and when determined using the new methodology.

### **3.0 PREPARATION OF A STATEMENT OF COMMON GROUND**

- 3.1 The Government believe that the Duty-to-Cooperate system is not working and this is a key reason why some plans are not being found 'sound' at Public Examination. The Government have highlighted that there is a lack of transparency and certainty at the early stages of the plan-making process about how local planning authorities are working together to solve strategic cross-boundary issues, such as those relating to housing delivery, economic growth and environmental matters.
- 3.2 The role of co-operation is only tested at the very end of the process (i.e. at Examination) and the use of the Duty-to-Cooperate system does not require local planning authorities to reach an agreement on strategic cross-boundary issues. Therefore as a consequence strategic, cross boundary issues may not be satisfactorily addressed through the plan-making process.
- 3.3 As a result the Government will be expecting local planning authorities to prepare a Statement of Common Ground to address these matters in a more comprehensive and transparent manner.
- 3.4 The Statement of Common Ground should be prepared to reflect key issues over a particular geographical area. The consultation document suggests that local planning authorities should use agreed housing market areas as the geographical areas which statements should cover unless circumstances dictate otherwise. The statement should address key issues pertinent to the area and should secure signatories from neighbours and key partners over how key issues should be addressed. It should highlight where agreement and common ground has been reached but it should also importantly show where agreement hasn't been reached and the reasons behind why this hasn't been achieved.
- 3.5 The Statement of Common Ground should be in place within 12 months of the revised NPPF being issued (i.e. in place by spring 2019), however the Government expects local planning authorities to prepare an outline statement within six months of the revised NPPF (i.e. autumn 2018).

### **4.0 NEIGHBOURHOOD PLANNING**

- 4.1 The Government will continue to press local planning authorities to provide groups who are undertaking Neighbourhood Plans with a specific housing need figure for their plan to meet.
- 4.2 The figure provided should be based on the settlement hierarchy and

reasoned judgement and should be set out in the Local Plan. Where there is an absence of a local plan, the Government propose a simple, formula based approach which apportions an overall housing need based on local population of the neighbourhood plan area and calculate the percentage of the overall population in the local planning authority area. The housing need figure would be that percentage of the local authorities housing need.

- 4.3 The Government believe this approach would provide a strong starting point for neighbourhood plan groups in determining their response to meeting their housing need.

## **5.0 PROPOSED APPROACH TO VIABILITY ASSESSMENT**

- 5.1 The Government are keen to make sure that infrastructure matters are dealt with in a quick and simple manner to improve certainty and transparency. The government expect that local planning authorities set out the types / thresholds for affordable housing provision, the infrastructure needed to deliver the plan and expectations to how these will be funded (including the contributions which the development industry will be expected to make).

- 5.2 The Government expect these matters of principle to be resolved through the plan-making process and tested for their viability. Should it be concluded that the plan itself does not affect viability (through extensive and robust testing) then it is the Government's intention that these matters should not be revisited and retested as part of subsequent individual planning applications. This is anticipated to save time and resources from repetitive arguments for each planning application received.

- 5.3 The Government are also keen to increase the transparency of viability assessments, improving the engagement of both housing and infrastructure providers through the plan-making process so they can better inform the preparation of plans. In terms of viability evidence, the Government have an expectation that all evidence provided by the development industry should be open and available to all interested parties to maximise transparency and accountability.

## **6.0 KEY ISSUES TO RAISE IN THE CONSULTATION RESPONSE**

- 6.1 There are a range of issues arising from the consultation documents which require further consideration and clarity from the Government, these issues include the following:

### Calculation of Housing Need

- 6.2 The principle of providing a simpler, standardised method for calculating housing need is supported and could, with further clarification and consideration by the Government, reduce the opportunities for conflict both from local communities and the development industry over the future scale and direction of development in the local plan.
- 6.3 However, there are some significant concerns over the Government's proposed approach in that it lacks clarity and appears to be contradictory to



other elements of Government thinking, particular in relation to economic matters such as the Northern Powerhouse and Industrial Strategy, which was only published in January 2017.

- 6.4 There is concern over a public perception of this standardised approach, the publication of a 'starting point' or baseline position will be seen by many as 'the housing requirement' for the area without giving proper consideration for the need to uplift this figure, whether this uplift be in relation to market signals or the opportunity for economic growth.
- 6.5 The consultation paper makes reference for the need of local planning authorities to plan positively and proactively for economic growth, and indeed that failure to do so could lead to an unsound plan.
- 6.6 However, these notions are not expressed clearly enough and the methodology as currently presented appears to remove the need to align housing and economic growth needs, leaving the argument for economic growth up to local authorities to agree on whether they should meet the economic potential of the district.
- 6.7 Whilst this may place more control in the hands of local decision making, it may end up having the reverse outcome to what the Government intends in terms of reducing the protracted arguments over what the local housing need should be. As a result it is strongly urged that more recognition is given to the matters of addressing economic potential, the outcomes if such potential is not planned for.
- 6.8 There is support for a methodology which seeks to ensure that those areas where the greatest need for affordable housing is are required to provide additional housing to address this issue. This approach is not dissimilar from the current approach where market signals are taken into account. The proposed methodology would remove some of the ambiguity as to the level of additional uplift required based on market signals which is a positive step forward.
- 6.9 However, it must be recognised in planning for needs where the demand is greatest (i.e. the South East and Greater London) rather than seeking to provide a more spatial approach which would seek to rebalance development needs towards the Northern Powerhouse may lead to continuing problems through the widening of the North-South divide.
- 6.10 The proposed approach also lacks advice and guidance on other key issues relating to housing delivery. For example presently there is no guidance on how any housing backlog previously built-up under the old approach to calculating housing need will be taken into account and the timeframe for which future calculations will be based.
- 6.11 Currently housing backlogs are taken into account through the arithmetic for calculating an areas objectively assessed housing need with this figure ultimately having regard to past periods of under delivery. For Lancaster district these periods of under delivery, particularly between 2010 and 2013

have been significant and has presented a significant challenge to the Council demonstrating a 5-year supply of housing.

- 6.12 The emerging approach presented by the Government provides no guidance on this issue, potentially implying that any backlog will be wiped off once the new requirement is calculated with this representing a new base date. This potentially has implications for the calculation of longer term housing delivery and the 5 year supply position and further clarity should be provided by the Government to this significant matter.

#### Statement of Common Ground

- 6.13 The Council already have a strong track record in engaging with its neighbours in relation to cross-boundary matters via the Duty-to-Cooperate process. Both Members and Officers have ensured that active dialogue has taken place through the plan-making process allowing for respective positions to be understood and, where necessary, addressed in the emerging local plan.
- 6.14 The proposed Statement of Common Ground provides a further level of formality to this process to ensure that there are clear outcomes to discussions and that clarity is provided on responsibilities, shared challenges and strategic issues and timescales.
- 6.15 In principle the local of Statements of Common Ground are supported and could provide further clarity and transparency in ensuring that cross boundary matters are effectively resolved. Given the self-contained nature of this district the complexity of cross-boundary issues are considered to be relatively low, however the preparation of such statements elsewhere in the country may be particularly complex and challenging.

#### Neighbourhood Planning

- 6.16 The principles of providing Neighbourhood Plan groups with a specific housing need would provide certainty to local communities over the scale of housing required in their area. However, there are a number of fundamental challenges to implementing such an approach.
- 6.17 Firstly, it is not clear what robust evidence could be used to demonstrate and justify the figure provided to local communities, particularly on occasions where there is an expectation from the local planning authority that the Neighbourhood Plan area has opportunities to meet wider development needs than merely the specific community within the Neighbourhood Plan area.
- 6.18 Any numerical figure provided is likely to be immediately challenged from all sides, from the local community suggesting the requirement is too high and from the development industry suggesting the requirement is too low. This will lead to significant challenges and tensions within the Neighbourhood Plan system causing conflict and delay to the preparation of such plans.
- 6.19 To ensure that these challenges are addressed, the Government, through revisions to the National Planning Policy Framework, must provide more clarity on the basis on which such figures should be provided.

Viability Assessments

- 6.20 The role of viability assessments becoming ever more important to the planning process to ensure that much needed development can be delivered. However, the role of viability assessments to escape from the delivery of much needed infrastructure is becoming a more regular occurrence through the application process.
- 6.21 Presently the majority of significant development proposals are accompanied by viability assessments which seek to lower the levels of contributions which can be achieved, whether this relates to the provision of affordable housing or other infrastructure delivery. The assessment of such assessments take time, placing pressures on development management timescales and incur extra officer resource in checking the validity of such assessments.
- 6.22 Therefore the proposed approach from the Government that an understanding should be secured in the plan-making process (through the preparation of the local plan) and then not revisited on a case-by-case basis through the application process is welcomed in principle. Such an approach would mean that decisions on planning applications can be made in a timelier manner and resources would not have to be directed into the individual assessment of viability on a site-by-site basis.
- 6.23 However, there are clear challenges to this approach which are not addressed by the Government. For example, it is highly likely that applicants will continue to challenge assumptions on development viability in relation to site-by-site abnormal costs or that the assumptions made within the plan-making process are incorrect or out-of-date.
- 6.24 As a result at this stage whilst the principles of this approach are supported, it is not clear that the outcomes described can be realistically achieved.

**7.0 CONCLUSIONS**

- 7.1 The key issues raised in Section 6 of this Report are considered to be the main points which should be raised as part of this consultation. Suggested answers to help prepare the council's formal response are presented in Appendix 1. The consultation deadline is 9th November 2017.
- 7.2 Officers will continue to monitor changes to national planning policy, particularly in relation to how such changes may affect the preparation of the emerging local plan.

**Appendix A:**

Suggested Answers to Consultation Questions for discussion (attached).

**CONCLUSION OF IMPACT ASSESSMENT**

**(including Health & Safety, Equality & Diversity, Human Rights, Community Safety, Sustainability and Rural Proofing):**

This response is to a consultation on a potential revision to methodology, as such the report has no implications.

**LEGAL IMPLICATIONS**

The council has a responsibility to prepare a local plan, in order to prepare a plan that is sound it must do this in accordance with current national guidance. The council needs to maintain awareness of revisions to national policy and guidance for the preparation of local plans. This response is to a consultation on a potential revision to methodology, as such the report has no legal implications.

**FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS**

There are no additional financial implications arising as a direct result of this report.

The council has published its intention to advance the Local Plan in its local Development Scheme (formal project timetable), this anticipates that the council will formally submit its emerging Local Plan to Government around next April. The preparation of timely local plans is an expectation of national government and is also a significant council priority. The local plan must be advanced in the context of extant national guidance and ongoing consultations on prospective changes to national planning guidance should not delay the preparation of local plans. The council is therefore advised to maintain progress on plan preparation. Having an up to date local plan in plan will reduce the prospect of the authority losing planning appeals and therefore reduce the risk of the risk of exposure to cost claims from successful appellants.

**OTHER RESOURCE IMPLICATIONS, such as Human Resources, Information Services, Property, Open Spaces:**

None

**SECTION 151 OFFICER'S COMMENTS**

The Section 151 Officer was consulted and had no further comments.

**MONITORING OFFICER'S COMMENTS**

The Monitoring Officer was consulted and had no further comments.

**BACKGROUND PAPERS**

Available on link to DCLG Website [here](#)

1. Planning for the right homes in the right places: consultation proposals DCLG September 2017.
2. Application of proposed formula for assessing housing need, with contextual data.

**Contact Officer:** Maurice Brophy, Planning and Housing Policy Manager

**Telephone:** 01524 582330

**E-mail:** mbrophy@lancaser.gov.uk.

**Ref:** LDLP

## Introduction

Lancaster City Council welcome the opportunity to provide a response to the Government's consultation on potential changes to the planning system.

In summary, whilst a simplified approach to calculating future housing requirements is welcomed further clarity is required on how this will be prepared and implemented. There is for example presently no guidance on how any backlog previously built up under the old calculations will be taken into account and the timeframe for which future calculations will be based.

Under current practice backlog is taken into account through the arithmetic for calculating an areas objectively assessed need with this figure ultimately having regard to ant past periods of under delivery. The emerging methodology provides no guidance on this implying that any backlog will be wiped off once the new requirement is calculated with this representing the new base date.

This has implications for calculating both longer term delivery and the five year supply position. Further clarity on this is therefore required.

Similarly greater clarity is required on the components of the housing requirement. There is for example no description on how students have been taken into account in the figures. For a University authority this is obviously a key component of our housing market. Whilst it is assumed that these are included in the ONS data and as such the overall figure confirmation of this is required.

## Question 1

- a) **Do you agree with the proposed standard approach to assessing local housing need? If not, what alternative approach or other factors should be considered?**

### Proposed Council Response

Whilst there is great merit in providing a standardised methodology to assessing housing need not least that a more simplified approach is more accessible to those without technical expertise, the methodology presented in the consultation paper is considered somewhat flawed.

From the perspective of a Local Planning Authority which would see a reduction in the Objectively Assessed Need as do many in the north of England, the current approach shows real ambition from national government for authorities to seek to fulfil unmet economic potential. Unfortunately the methodology as proposed removes government backing for such an approach which feels alien with the Government's support for a Northern Powerhouse. Removing the need to align housing and economic growth needs, leaves the argument up to local authorities to agree whether they should seek to meet economic potential, whilst this puts more control in the hands of local decision making, it may have a reverse outcome to that intended from the consultation of a reducing protracted discussion over Objectively Assessed Need. We would strongly urge that more recognition is given to authorities where there is unmet economic potential that that Local Planning Authorities should be seeking to plan for this where constrains allow.

The Council generally supports a methodology which seeks to ensure that those areas where the greatest level of affordable need exists are required to provide additional housing to address this issue, which is not dissimilar from the current methodology where market signals are taken into account. The proposed methodology would remove some of the ambiguity as to the level of additional uplift based upon market signals, which is a positive step forward. However, it must be

recognised that by doing so, this seeks to provide housing where demand is greatest i.e. the South East and Greater London regions rather than seeking to provide a spatial approach which would seek to rebalance economic growth towards the Northern Powerhouse and may lead to a continuation of problems through a widening north-south divide. Housing affordability is also a moving feast, with significant changes in affordability over a short period of time dependent upon market conditions.

Finally, as per the original proposals in the Local Plan Expert Group's report in March 2016, taking long term migration into account would provide a more robust approach to understanding long term need rather than basing an approach on household projections which can be significantly influenced by short term economic circumstances. This can be seen in the differences that lie between the 2012 and 2014 projections, where the latter projections in Lancaster shows a figure of 54 additional homes per annum projected, which over a 15 year plan period results in 804 homes, which can be quite significant in providing for land allocations. Such an approach may be achieved through a sense check of the previous Sub National Household Projections.

## **b) How can information on local housing need be made more transparent?**

### Proposed Council Response

It is important that information needed to make the assessment is made centrally available for those without specialist skills. Whilst the two elements that make up the proposed approach are retrievable from ONS, they are not easily accessible for those without an understanding of where to look. Local Authorities should also set out in brief papers what they expect their housing need to be, i.e. where they propose to plan for higher levels of need based on economic growth. This is likely to require a more simplified Strategic Housing Market Assessment.

## **Question 2**

**Do you agree with the proposal that an assessment of local housing need should be able to be relied upon for a period of two years from the date a plan is submitted?**

### Proposed Council Response

It is agreed that this would be sensible as it would not invalidate a submitted plan during the course of examination. However, this leads a vacuum gap between publication and submission, and it may be advisable to consider for example, a three year period from the point that a plan is publishes instead of two years from the point of submission.

## **Question 3:**

**Do you agree that we should amend national planning policy so that a sound plan should identify local housing need using a clear and justified method?**

### Proposed Council Response:

Yes. Given the importance of address the housing shortages within the country and recognising the controversial nature of identifying land for new housing development, it is important that these matters are addressed using a sound and robust method of calculation. Such an approach will ensure that local communities understand how such requirements have been arrived at.

However, there is concern over the standardised approach which has been proposed unnecessarily highlighted a baseline position (or starting point) for housing delivery which makes use of demographic profiles. The publication of such figures will be seen by many as 'the housing requirement' for the LPA area without considering the need for economic growth.

This will make it significantly more difficult for LPAs to justify economic growth, as this appears too much as an optional approach.

#### **Question 4**

**Do you agree with our approach in circumstances when plan makers deviate from the proposed method, including the level of scrutiny we expect from Planning Inspectors?**

Proposed Council Response:

There should be scrutiny with the outcomes of all plans, this includes where plan seeks to deliver development which is more, less or at the baseline position.

Where a plan seeks to identify less than the baseline position, it is important that this is based on robust evidence and a genuine and thorough investigation of all reasonable alternatives, including opportunities to meet development needs within the plan area or through assistance from neighbours.

Where a plan seeks to identify more than the baseline position, it is important that genuine and robust evidence should be provided to justify that such an uplift is reasonable and realistic. It should not be the case that plans which provide for uplift (for economic growth or other reasons) should not be scrutinised (as the consultation paper appears to infer).

Where plans seek to merely meet the baseline position provided by the Government, this should be accompanied by evidence to show that potential opportunities have been thoroughly investigated.

#### **Question 5**

- a) Do you agree that the Secretary of State should have discretion to defer the period for using the baseline for some local planning authorities? If so, how best could this be achieved, what minimum requirements should be in place before the Secretary of State may exercise this discretion, and for how long should such deferral be permitted?**

Proposed Council Response:

Yes. As acknowledged in the consultation paper there may be circumstances where plans take longer to bring forward, especially where authorities are pursuing ambitious proposals for growth and significant infrastructure proposals. Authorities should not be penalised for such ambition. This will need to be taken into account on a case by case basis having regard to the progress made. It is recognised that in such circumstance local authorities will need to evidence progress providing confidence to the Secretary of State that deferring the baseline is appropriate.

- b) Do you consider that authorities that have an adopted joint local plan, or which are covered by an adopted spatial development strategy, should be able to assess their five year land supply and/or be measured for the purposes of the Housing Delivery Test, across the area as a whole?**

Council Proposed Response:

It would seem sensible to calculate the five year housing land supply on the same area basis used to prepare the Local Plan and wider evidence base.

- c) Do you consider that authorities that are not able to use the new method for calculating local housing need should be able to use an existing or an emerging local plan figure for housing need**

**for the purposes of calculating five year land supply and to be measured for the purposes of the Housing Delivery Test?**

Proposed Council Response:

No specific views on this at this time. Further clarity will be required to explore this matter.

## **Question 6**

**Do you agree with the proposed transitional arrangements for introducing the standard approach for calculating local housing need?**

Proposed Council Response:

It is agreed that a transitional period is required to ensure that plans which are in the latter stages of preparation are not subject to unnecessary and inappropriate delay. There is concern that the transitional periods highlighted in the consultation paper are not sufficient particularly in the context of the expected review to the NPPF. Any revisions to the NPPF should be finalised before any transitional period ends.

## **Question 7**

**a) Do you agree with the proposed administrative arrangements for preparing the statement of common ground?**

Proposed Council Response:

Yes, because it allows for a record to be kept of what has been done but also of the degree of progress or agreement, and the process allows for repeat iterations at different stages of plan-making. Qualified subject to:

- Concern about workload, in spite of the claims in paragraph 65 of the consultation document. DTC has already grown considerably in scope and effort since it was introduced, because best practice and methods were not clear to all parties at the outset;
- Some DTC matters are not conveniently dealt with just within HMAs, including minerals, waste, transport and AONB planning;
- Clarification of the role of elected members in the new process.

**b) How do you consider a statement of common ground should be implemented in areas where there is a Mayor with strategic plan-making powers?**

Proposed Council Response:

No comment on this matter.

**c) Do you consider there to be a role for directly elected Mayors without strategic plan-making powers, in the production of a statement of common ground?**

Proposed Council Response:

No comment on this matter.

## **Question 8**



**Do you agree that the proposed content and timescales for publication of the statement of common ground are appropriate and will support more effective co-operation on strategic cross-boundary planning matters?**

Proposed Council Response:

The timescales provided appear to be reasonable and achievable. It is important that a deadline is provided to establish a framework and basis for the Statement of Common Ground, this should be finalised and published in advance of discussions on matters of detail. It is important that an appropriate length of time is provided to address matters of detail, particularly complex matters such as housing distribution. Resolutions to such matters may be challenging and complex and therefore the 12 month period given may be unrealistic and it is recommended that the timescales for preparation of the Statement should be tied closer to the plan-preparation process itself (i.e. the Statement must be completed prior to the Submission of the plan to ensure soundness). If need calculations are set for local authority areas there will be less scope or need to negotiate this matter with neighbouring authorities.

## **Question 9**

- a) **Do you agree with the proposal to amend the tests of soundness to include that:**
- a. **Plans should be prepared based on a strategy informed by agreements over the wider area;**
  - b. **Plans should be based on effective joint working on cross-boundary strategic priorities, which are evidenced in the statement of common ground?**

Proposed Council Response:

Yes. In the absence of any wider strategic function within the regions, it is important that LPAs consider the wider impacts of their local plans from across their boundaries, particularly in relation to economic and housing matters. The ability to discuss such challenges, share relevant evidence and come to agreements over common ground (or indeed the lack of common ground) is important and should be maintained, either via the Duty-to-Cooperate process or a new process involving Statements of Common Ground.

The ability to demonstrate the cross-boundary matters have been recognised, considered and discussed with neighbours remains a key element of the plan making process.

- b) **Do you agree to the proposed transitional arrangements for amending the tests of soundness to ensure effective co-operation?**

Proposed Council Response:

Agree with the proposed transitional arrangements, particularly given the staged approach taken.

## **Question 10**

- a) **Do you have suggestions on how to streamline the process for identifying the housing need for individual groups and what evidence could be used to help plan to meet the needs of particular groups?**

Proposed Council Response:

Unfortunately at present this element of the consultation without a clearer understanding of how it would work in practice is rather ambiguous. The Council has appointed consultants to prepare a Strategic Housing Market Assessment to understand the needs of different groups, this includes

both a qualitative and quantitative understanding of the level of need for these groups. As such it is unclear how the proposals would result in significant changes. The Council agrees that it is important to understand the needs of different section of the community in order to understand full housing need as this helps to shape policy decision in the Local Plan.

**b) Do you agree that the current definition of older people within the National Planning Policy Framework is still fit-for-purpose?**

Proposed Council Response:

Further clarity should be provided about why the Government feel it necessary to amend the definition of older people within the NPPF.

**Question 11:**

**a) Should a local plan set out the housing need for designated neighbourhood planning areas and parished areas within the area?**

Proposed Council Response:

The principles of providing Neighbourhood Plan Groups with a specific housing need would provide certainty to local communities over the scale of housing required in their area. However, there are several fundamental challenges to such an approach ever being implementable.

Firstly, it is not clear what robust evidence could be used to demonstrate and justify the figure provided to local communities, particularly in occasions where there is an expectation from the LPA that the Neighbourhood Plan (NP) area has the opportunities to meet wider development needs than merely the needs of the specific community within the NP area.

Any numerical figure provided for NP's is likely to be immediately challenged, from the local communities who will suggest the need is too high and the development industry who will suggest the need is insufficient. This will lead to significant challenges with the NP system as NP groups will seek to challenge the need with their own evidence and the development industry seeking to challenge plans on the basis that they are not addressing housing needs sufficiently.

Therefore, secondly, the imposition of a 'number' on local communities to delivery will in the majority of cases be disputed and challenged, leading to further delays to the plan-making process.

The only way for such a process to be effective would be to make the figures placed on NPs 'strategic' in nature, providing the NP groups no scope or opportunity to dispute the requirement through the preparation of alternative evidence or the preparation of a plan which runs contrary to such a requirement. In essence, if the NP fails to meet with the housing need identified it also fails the basic conditions (unless there are exceptional circumstances to demonstrate why this need cannot be met). Such an approach however would appear to run contrary to the basic principles of neighbourhood planning in terms of communities making their own decisions in relation to the delivery of developed.

**b) Do you agree with the proposal for a formula-based approach to apportion housing need to neighbourhood plan bodies in circumstances where the local plan cannot be relied on as a basis for calculating housing need?**

Proposed Council Response:

No. Experiences from working with NP groups suggest that each community feels that their area is unique and different. The imposition of a formula-based approach (i.e. one size fits all) is not likely to be supported particularly where the outcomes of such a formula result in the delivery of significant development.

The two key elements of understanding opportunities for development in NP areas are an understanding of housing needs from the SHMA process and an understanding of land availability via the SHLAA / SHELAA / SHELMA process. With a good understanding from both of these elements a locally specific approach for each NP can be achieved (provided such evidence is accepted by local communities).

## **Question 12:**

**Do you agree that local plans should identify the infrastructure and affordable housing needed, how these will be funded and the contributions developers will be expected to make?**

### Proposed Council Response

Yes. It is important that LPAs, via the plan making process highlight the types of housing needed with their areas and then are given the correct support from National Government to actually deliver this. LPAs have a good understanding of what type of housing is needed in their areas, however this housing (whether affordable housing, first-time buyers housing or other housing for specialist sections of the community) can be impossible to effectively deliver given the development industries drive towards building the most-profitable types of housing. The NPPF is deficient in ensuring that LPAs have the most effective set of tools to ensure the right housing is built in the right places.

In terms of infrastructure, it is clear from consultations on plan-making that the demands and impacts on infrastructure are critical to local communities who see new development as a threat to such services. It is therefore correct and important for the plan-making process to set out what new infrastructure is required, when it is required and how it will be paid for. This level of certainty not only works for local communities but also provides certainty to the development industry who can take account of infrastructure demands when going through the land acquisition, planning application and construction phases of development.

## **Question 13**

**In reviewing guidance on testing plans and policies for viability, what amendments could be made to improve current practice?**

### Proposed Council Response:

One of the main areas of discrepancy relates to land value and threshold and benchmark land values. Guidance could be made clearer as to arriving at a definition of threshold land value. The Harman Guidance currently advocates taking a residual based approach which the Council agrees with. However, determining a threshold land value is contentious amongst developers and local authorities and can vary significantly within a district with different sub markets. It is important that there is a consistent and clear methodology in identifying threshold land value, and whilst this should not swing vastly in the favour of either Local Authority, developer or landowner, it should enable housing to be delivered.

## Question 14

**Do you agree that where policy requirements have been tested for their viability, the issue should not usually need to be tested again at the planning application stage?**

Proposed Council Response:

Whilst such an approach has obvious merits in reducing conflict at the application stage, there are considerations which would make such an approach hard to work in practice. For example, where abnormalities exist, where market conditions change etc. It is likely that such an approach would require a larger buffer to ensure that schemes were viable, this may have an impact on the overall level of affordable housing required by policy and thereby reduce affordable housing delivery. Whilst the principle is supported there are concerns over how realistic such an approach is. Given the sheer scale and number of challenges received from the development industry to viability matters it is not clear that a simple assumption that these matters have been addressed at the plan making stage will be sufficient. Matters such as site-specific abnormalities or a local plan which may be 3 to 4 years old (hence claims that the viability testing is out of date) will be predictable arguments which will continue to drain LPA resources on matters of development viability.

## Question 15

**How can Government ensure that infrastructure providers, including housing associations, are engaged throughout the process, including in circumstances where a viability assessment may be required?**

Proposed Council Response:

The Council has recently held a consultation on the potential of introducing fixed transfer values. This was on the request of a Registered Provider who considered that they were not able to compete in the market with other providers offering a different business model. The consultation received negative response from the development industry. However, through the whole plan viability study the Council is keen to understand what an appropriate value would be, as the benefits of certainty are considered important. This would reduce the protracted nature of some of the viability discussion that goes hand in hand with residential schemes. It is considered vitally important that stakeholders are fully involved including infrastructure providers and housing associations when whole plan viability study is prepared. A statement of common ground or similar mechanism being signed up to by different stakeholders when a whole plan viability study is undertaken including principle inputs such as costs, land values etc. may be a means of reducing conflict at application stage.

## Question 16

**What factors should we take into account in updating guidance to encourage viability assessments to be simpler, quicker and more transparent, for example through a standardised report or summary format?**

Proposed Council Response:

The proposed approach of making viability appraisals more transparent is considered beneficial and would ensure that decisions on planning applications are considered more openly with the public being able to interpret reasons where it may not be possible to achieve the full scale of planning obligations. However, it is important that such an approach does not lead to a significantly increased burden on decision makers through increased time corresponding with people wishing to make representations as this would result in application timescales increasing further to the detriment of

the development industry. There may also be situations where there is a legitimate reason why developers need to maintain the confidentiality of appraisal inputs or outputs, in such situations this should be respected.

## Question 17

- a) **Do you agree that local planning authorities should set out in plans how they will monitor and report on planning agreements to help ensure that communities can easily understand what infrastructure and affordable housing has been secured and delivered through developer contributions?**

Proposed Council Response:

Matters of infrastructure are a key issue to local communities, the impact on existing infrastructure and the delivery of new infrastructure as a result of new development are highlighted as very important through responses to the local plan.

As a result a standardised approach to monitoring and reporting on planning obligations is welcomed in principle providing the proposed approach is reasonable, proportionate and realistic.

- b) **What factors should we take into account in preparing guidance on a standard approach to monitoring and reporting planning obligations?**

Proposed Council Response:

The Government should provide clear and unambiguous guidance on what type of information should be published at part of reporting / monitoring information on planning obligations.

- c) **How can local planning authorities and applicants work together to better publicise infrastructure and affordable housing secured through new development once development has commenced, or at other stages of the process?**

Proposed Council Response:

Local Planning Authorities already do significant levels to publicise the levels of infrastructure and affordable housing through the plan process through maintaining an up to date Infrastructure Delivery Plan and Housing Monitoring Reports / Supply Statements. This information is publically available. It is therefore not clear how such information could be better publicised.

## Question 18

- a) **Do you agree that a further 20 per cent fee increase should be applied to those local planning authorities who are delivering the homes their communities need? What should be the criteria to measure this?**

Proposed Council Response

This is difficult to answer without further detail on how this performance criteria would be effectively measured. It would appear that the most straightforward method of measuring performance of housing delivery is if the payment acts as a simple 'bonus' for demonstrating – at a single point each year (30 September is suggested so that it aligned with the current planning applications performance regime) – that each Council has a 5-year supply of deliverable housing sites. However, does the Council measure its 5-year supply itself, and then inform DCLG? Or is the assessment made independently?

- b) Do you think there are more appropriate circumstances when a local planning authority should be able to charge the further 20 per cent? If so, do you have views on how these circumstances could work in practice?**

Proposed Council Response

The 20% additional increase could be more appropriately levied if it measured planning approval rates of housing-related applications (rather than assessment against 5 year supply). There could instead be a sliding scale linked to the level of fee increase. E.g. – 80% of all housing applications received that are subsequently approved by the LPA = 5% additional fee increase for the following 12 months. 85% = 10% additional fee increase, etc. A housing-related application could be defined as applications for 5 or more residential units.

- c) Should any additional fee increase be applied nationally once all local planning authorities meet the required criteria, or only to individual authorities who meet them?**

Proposed Council Response

Only to individual authorities. And the sliding scale method described in (b) above is preferred.

- d) Are there any other issues we should consider in developing a framework for this additional fee increase?**

Proposed Council Response

To avoid confusion amongst developers and applicants, local authorities would need certainty about their fee levels well in advance of implementation.

## **Question 19**

**Having regard to the measures we have already identified in the housing White Paper, are there any other actions that could increase build out rates?**

**COUNCIL BUSINESS COMMITTEE****Community Governance Review of the District  
02 November 2017****Report of Democratic Services Manager****PURPOSE OF REPORT**

To agree the timetable for the Community Governance Review of the whole of the Lancaster District, and the format for the initial consultation stage.

**This report is public.**

**RECOMMENDATIONS**

- (1) To agree the indicative timetable for the review set out in paragraph 2.2 below.**
- (2) To agree provisional additional meeting dates of this Committee to fit with the indicative timetable.**
- (3) To agree the format of the first stage of consultation for the Community Governance Review, in particular who should be consulted and how; and how the review will be publicised.**

**1.0 Introduction**

- 1.1 A community governance review is the Council's opportunity to look at the most local tier of government in the district. It allows the Council to examine whether changes should be made to the current parish council arrangements and what should happen in the areas not covered by a parish or town council.
- 1.2 Following the introduction of the Local Government and Public Involvement in Health Act 2007, which devolved decision-making on parish electoral arrangement to principal councils such as Lancaster City Council, government guidance was issued. The guidance says it is good practice for a district-wide community governance review to be carried out every 10-15 years to consider any population changes in the district, and to ensure the best governance arrangements for the area are in place. Lancaster City Council has not yet carried out a district-wide community governance review.
- 1.3 Council, at its meeting on 27 September 2017 took the decision to carry out a review in the coming twelve months and authorised this committee to oversee it.

**2.0 Details**

2.1 The community governance review should encourage participation from individuals and organisations throughout the whole district and can consider questions such as:

- Should an area without a parish council have a parish or town council created?
- Should the number of parish councillors on an existing parish council be changed?
- Should a parish council boundary be altered to better reflect the community?

2.2 An indicative timetable is as follows:

Report to Council to commence review	September 2017
Initial consultation stage to establish what issues need to be addressed during the review	November to December 2017
Consideration of submissions and the preparation of the terms of reference and draft recommendations and processes for consultation	January to March 2018
Consultation on draft terms of reference and recommendations	March to May 2018
Consideration of responses to consultation and preparation of final recommendations	June to August 2018
Council to approve final recommendations and any re-organisation orders	September 2018

2.3 The review must be concluded within 12 months of the publication of terms of reference. By concluding the process in October 2018 not only will this deadline be met but it will also allow adequate planning for the local elections in May 2019 and for council tax information to be updated accordingly.

2.4 Democratic Services are already aware of several issues that may be raised. The most significant request is likely to be for the creation of a new parish council in the Heysham area, where a neighbourhood council has already been in existence for some years. Democratic Services officers have already met with a group who are interested in taking this forward and advised them that it can be dealt with as part of this full review.

2.5 By establishing firstly what issues need to be considered, this committee then can develop relevant terms of reference and a plan for further consultation.

2.6 It is envisaged that further meetings of this committee will be required in February and July 2018.

**3.0 Initial Consultation Stage**

3.1 The Democratic Services and Elections Managers have discussed the extent of the first stage of consultation and have a list of consultees, the majority of which will be contacted by email to keep expense to a minimum:

- All Clerks and Chairmen of existing parish councils and parish meetings in



- the district
- City Councillors
- Local MPs
- Lancashire County Council and County Councillors
- Members of the public via press releases and the website

It might also be useful for officers to invite parish members to Lancaster Town Hall for a short presentation on CGRs to respond to any questions and invite submissions.

- 3.2 Colleagues in communications will be able to assist with promoting the review through the Council's website and social media channels.

#### **4.0 Conclusion**

- 4.1 In conducting the community governance review, Council Business Committee should consider all aspects of the process to be undertaken. Although there is no standard format for carrying out a review, thought must be given to the most appropriate way to conduct a review to achieve a balanced view from the affected areas before any final recommendations are proposed for agreement by Council.

- 4.2 Should any reorganisation orders be required, it is proposed that they would be effective for the financial year commencing 01 April 2019.

#### **CONCLUSION OF IMPACT ASSESSMENT**

**(including Health & Safety, Equality & Diversity, Human Rights, Community Safety, Sustainability and Rural Proofing):**

None.

#### **LEGAL IMPLICATIONS**

Chapter 3 of Part 4 of The Local Government and Public Involvement in Health Act 2007 devolved the power to take decisions about such matters as the creation of parishes and their electoral arrangements to local government and local communities in England. Principal councils are required, by Section 100(4) of the 2007 Act to have regard to guidance issued by the Secretary of State when undertaking reviews and the guidance has been followed in drafting this report to Council.

#### **FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS**

An amount of £10,000 has been included in the 2017/2018 budget and £25,000 in the 2018/2019 budget in order to resource this project. There will be costs associated with carrying out the consultation which will be met from within the budget provision that has been allocated. If ultimately new parish arrangements are made, that would have implications for council tax setting as the new parish would have powers to precept, the same as others parishes within the district. Reaching a decision by October 2018 should allow sufficient time for council tax records to be updated prior to the release of the 2018/2019 charge notices. It is expected that the amendment of Council tax records could cost in the region of £15,000 and sufficient funding for this has been included within the budget allocation for 2018/2019.

**OTHER RESOURCE IMPLICATIONS, such as Human Resources, Information Services, Property, Open Spaces:**

None

**SECTION 151 OFFICER'S COMMENTS**

The Section 151 Officer has been consulted and has no further comments.

**MONITORING OFFICER'S COMMENTS**

The Monitoring Officer has been consulted and has no further comments.

**BACKGROUND PAPERS**

**Contact Officer:** Lisa Vines  
**Telephone:** 01524 582070  
**E-mail:** lvines@lancaster.gov.uk  
**Ref:**

**COUNCIL BUSINESS COMMITTEE****Committee Timetable 2018/19  
2 November 2017****Report of the Democratic Services Manager****PURPOSE OF REPORT**

To agree the timetable of committee meetings for the 2018/19 municipal year.

This report is public.

**RECOMMENDATIONS**

- 1. That Members approve the proposed timetable of meetings, times and venues for the 2018/19 municipal year as set out within the report and appendices.**
- 2. That, if the Committee is minded to make any substantial proposals for change, that these be submitted to Council for approval.**

**1.0 Introduction**

- 1.1 Council Business Committee has delegated authority to agree the annual timetable of City Council meetings.

**2.0 Proposal Details**

- 2.1 The appended timetable is based on the timetable for 2017/18 which was set by Council on 1 March 2017.
- 2.2 The number of meetings, committee start times and venue details are provided at Appendix A to this report, with the timetable at Appendix B.
- 2.3 The City Council Elections are scheduled for 2 May 2019. Due to the Elections the Planning and Highways Committee, that would have been scheduled for this week, has been re-scheduled to be held on Monday, 29 April 2019.
- 2.4 A Bank Holiday on Monday, 28 May 2018 has caused a Planning and Highways Committee meeting to be moved to Monday, 4 June 2018, with the Christmas period and a Bank Holiday on Tuesday, 1 January 2019 has caused the Planning and Highways Committee site visit, if required, to be moved to Wednesday, 2 January 2019 and a Bank Holiday on Monday, 22 April 2019 has caused the Planning and Highways Committee site visit, if required, to be moved to Tuesday, 23 April 2019.
- 2.5 The timetable includes an increase in the number of meetings of the Audit Committee from 3 to 4 meetings. This will enable a faster close down and for the Annual Governance Statement to be considered prior to the sign off of the accounts.

**3.0 Conclusion**

3.1 Members are asked to consider and approve a timetable of meeting dates, times, and venues for the 2018/19 municipal year; or to refer any recommendations for substantial changes to Council for approval.

<p><b>CONCLUSION OF IMPACT ASSESSMENT</b>  <b>(including Health &amp; Safety, Equality &amp; Diversity, Human Rights, Community Safety, Sustainability and Rural Proofing)</b></p> <p>None.</p>	
<p><b>LEGAL IMPLICATIONS</b></p> <p>It is a legal requirement that the City Council publishes its timetable of meetings by the commencement of each Municipal Year. Amendments can be made throughout the year provided at least 5 days' notice is given.</p>	
<p><b>FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS</b></p> <p>There are no additional financial implications for the above proposals. The costs of the meetings will be met from existing budgets.</p>	
<p><b>OTHER RESOURCE IMPLICATIONS, such as Human Resources; Information Services; Property; Open Spaces:</b></p> <p>None.</p>	
<p><b>SECTION 151 OFFICER'S COMMENTS</b></p> <p>The Section 151 Officer has been consulted and has no further comments.</p>	
<p><b>MONITORING OFFICER'S COMMENTS</b></p> <p>The Monitoring Officer has been consulted and has no further comments.</p>	
<p><b>BACKGROUND PAPERS</b></p> <p>None.</p>	<p><b>Contact Officer:</b> Debbie Chambers  <b>Telephone:</b> 01524 582057  <b>E-mail:</b> dchambers@lancaster.gov.uk  <b>Ref:</b> SJM</p>

### Meeting Start Times/Venues/Number of meetings 2018/19

Meeting	Venue(s)	Start Time	Number of meetings
Annual Council (Ceremonial)	Ashton Hall, LTH	12 noon	1
Council (including Annual Business Council)	MTH	6.00pm	8
Council Business Committee	MTH	6.00pm	3
Cabinet	Alternating between LTH/MTH	6.00pm	10
Overview and Scrutiny Committee	MTH	6.00pm	9
Budget and Performance Panel	LTH The stakeholder meeting in January 2018 to be held in MTH commencing at 6.00pm.	6.10pm	5
Licensing Regulatory Committee	LTH	1.00pm	8
Licensing Act Committee	LTH	2.00pm	2
Planning & Highways Regulatory Committee	LTH	10.30am	13
Personnel Committee*	LTH	6.10pm, 'or at the rise of JCC, whichever is the later'.	2
JCC	LTH	4.00pm. Chairman to use their discretion regarding an earlier start for JCC depending on the amount of business to be considered.	2
Audit Committee	LTH	6.10pm	4 (previously 3 – please see report).
Standards Committee*	LTH	6.10pm	2

**Notes:**

(LTH = Lancaster Town Hall)

(MTH = Morecambe Town Hall)

The Appeals Committee is convened as and when necessary at LTH with no set day or time.

\*These Committees will begin earlier in the day where additional meetings are convened to hear specific cases.

**COMMITTEE TIMETABLE 2018/2019 – working copy**  
2018

**APPENDIX B**

2019

	May	June	July	August	September	October	November	December	January	February	March	April	May	
Mon						1						1 Planning		Mon
Tue	1					2 Cabinet LTH			1 Bank Holiday			2		Tue
Wed	2			1		3			2 Planning Site Visit			3 Overview and Scrutiny Committee	1	Wed
Thur	3			2		4 Member Briefing	1 Council Business Committee		3 Licensing Reg			4	2 CITY COUNCIL ELECTIONS	Thur
Fri	4	1		3		5	2		4	1	1	5	3	Fri
Sat	5	2		4	1	6	3	1	5	2	2	6	4	Sat
Sun	6	3	1	5	2	7	4	2	6	3	3	7	5	Sun
Mon	7 Bank Holiday	4 Planning	2	6	3	8 Planning Site Visit	5 Planning Site Visit	3 Planning Site Visit	7 Planning	4 Planning	4 Planning	8	6 Bank Holiday	Mon
Tue	8	5	3	7 Cabinet LTH	4 Cabinet MTH	9	6 Cabinet MTH	4 Cabinet LTH	8	5 Budget and Performance Panel	5	9	7	Tue
Wed	9 Planning	6 Overview & Scrutiny Committee	4	8	5	10	7	5	9 Overview and Scrutiny Committee	6 Overview and Scrutiny Committee	6 Overview and Scrutiny Committee	10 Council	8	Wed
Thur	10	7 Standards	5 Member Briefing	9	6 Member Briefing	11 Licensing Reg	8 Member Briefing	6	10 Member Briefing	7 Licensing Reg Member Briefing	7 Council Business Committee	11	9	Thur
Fri	11 Annual Council	8	6	10	7	12	9	7	11	8	8	12	10	Fri
Sat	12	9	7	11	8	13	10	8	12	9	9	13	11	Sat
Sun	13	10	8	12	9	14	11	9	13	10	10	14	12	Sun
Mon	14 Business Council	11	9	13 Planning Site Visit	10 Planning Site Visit	15 Planning	12 Planning	10 Planning	14	11	11	15	13	Mon
Tue	15	12	10 Budget and Performance Panel	14	11 Budget and Performance Panel	16	13 Budget and Performance Panel	11 JCC Personnel	15 Cabinet MTH	12 Cabinet LTH	12	16	14	Tue
Wed	16	13	11 Overview and Scrutiny	15	12	17 Overview and Scrutiny Committee	14 Council	12	16	13	13	17	15	Wed
Thur	17	14 Licensing Act Member Briefing	12 Licensing Reg	16	13	18	15	13	17 Standards	14	14 Member Briefing	18	16	Thur
Fri	18	15	13	17	14	19	16	14	18	15	15	19 Bank Holiday	17 Annual Council	Fri
Sat	19	16	14	18	15	20	17	15	19	16	16	20	18	Sat
Sun	20	17	15	19	16	21	18	16	20	17	17	21	19	Sun
Mon	21	18 Planning Site Visit	16 Planning Site Visit	20 Planning	17 Planning	22	19	17	21	18	18	22 Bank Holiday	20 Business Council	Mon
Tue	22	19 JCC Personnel	17	21	18	23	20	18	22 Budget & Perf Panel - MTH	19	19 Cabinet MTH	23 Planning Site Visit Cabinet LTH	21	Tue
Wed	23 Audit	20	18 Council	22	19 Overview and Scrutiny Committee	24	21 Overview and Scrutiny Committee	19 Council	23	20 Audit	20	24	22	Wed
Thur	24	21 Council Bus Com	19	23	20	25	22 Licensing Reg	20	24	21	21 Licensing Reg	25	23	Thur
Fri	25	22	20	24	21	26	23	21	25	22	22	26	24	Fri
Sat	26	23	21	25	22	27	24	22	26	23	23	27	25	Sat
Sun	27	24	22	26	23	28	25	23	27	24	24	28	26	Sun
Mon	28 Bank Holiday	25 Planning	23 Planning	27 Bank Holiday	24	29	26	24	28 Planning Site Visit	25 Planning Site Visit	25 Planning Site Visit	29 Planning	27 Bank Holiday	Mon
Tue	29 Planning site visit	26 Cabinet MTH	24	28	25	30	27	25 Bank Holiday	29	26	26	30	28	Tue
Wed	30	27	25	29	26 Council	31	28 Audit	26 Bank Holiday	30 Council	27 Budget Council	27	29 Audit	29 Audit	Wed
Thur	31 Licensing Reg	28	26	30 Licensing Reg	27		29 Licensing Act	27	31	28	28	30	30	Thur
Fri		29	27	31	28		30	28			29		31	Fri
Sat		30	28		29			29			30			Sat
Sun			29		30			30			31			Sun
Mon			30					31						Mon
Tue			31 Audit											Tue

**COUNCIL BUSINESS COMMITTEE****Ward Councillors Speaking at Planning  
2 November 2017****Report of the Democratic Services Manager****PURPOSE OF REPORT**

To consider the time allotted to Ward Councillors to speak at meetings of the Planning and Highways Regulatory Committee.

This report is public.

**RECOMMENDATION**

- (1) **That, in view of the unanimous decision of the Planning and Highways Regulatory Committee, no change is made to the current time limit of three minutes.**
- (2) **That, in the event that the Committee does not agree with recommendation (1), the matter be referred to Council.**

**1.0 Introduction**

- 1.1 The Chairman of Council Business Committee (CBC) was approached earlier this year by Councillors, who are not members of the Planning and Highways Regulatory Committee (P&HRC), asking if there could be a discussion regarding increasing the time limit for Ward Councillors to speak at P&HRC meetings. He asked the Democratic Services Manager to place this on the agenda for the next meeting of CBC.
- 1.2 In view of this request, the Democratic Services Manager drafted a report for P&HRC members to consider at their meeting on 18 September 2017, to allow the Committee to express its view. That report is appended. It sets out the relevant issues to take into account when considering any revision to the time limits for speakers.

**2.0 Proposal Details**

- 2.1 This Committee has delegated authority to amend procedure rules within the Council's Constitution. The Procedure Rules regarding Ward Councillors speaking at P&HRC meetings are set out in Council Procedure Rule 26.2. Ward Members may speak "for a maximum of three minutes".
- 2.2 When the P&HRC considered the report on 18 September 2017 there was a unanimous decision to recommend to this Committee:-

*That the time limit for Ward Councillors to speak at Planning Committee remain at three minutes.*

- 2.3 It is therefore recommended that this Committee take the views of the Planning Committee into account and do not propose any alteration to the three minute time limit for Ward Councillors to speak. Whilst, as noted above, this Committee has delegated authority to amend procedure rules, it is strongly recommended that any proposal to go against the views of the Planning Committee be referred to Council for a final decision.

**3.0 Conclusion**

- 3.1 The Committee is asked to have regard to the view of the P&HRC when considering this issue.

<p><b>CONCLUSION OF IMPACT ASSESSMENT</b>                  (including Health &amp; Safety, Equality &amp; Diversity, Human Rights, Community Safety, Sustainability and Rural Proofing)                  None.</p>	
<p><b>LEGAL IMPLICATIONS</b>                  As per the report attached.</p>	
<p><b>FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS</b>                  As per the report attached.</p>	
<p><b>OTHER RESOURCE IMPLICATIONS, such as Human Resources; Information Services; Property; Open Spaces:</b>                  None.</p>	
<p><b>SECTION 151 OFFICER'S COMMENTS</b>                  The Section 151 Officer has been consulted and has no further comments.</p>	
<p><b>MONITORING OFFICER'S COMMENTS</b>                  The Monitoring Officer has been consulted and has no further comments.</p>	
<p><b>BACKGROUND PAPERS</b>                  None.</p>	<p><b>Contact Officer:</b> Debbie Chambers  <b>Telephone:</b> 01524 582057  <b>E-mail:</b> dchambers@lancaster.gov.uk</p>



**PLANNING AND HIGHWAYS REGULATORY**

**COMMITTEE**

**Ward Councillors Speaking at Planning Committee  
18 September 2017**

**Report of Democratic Services Manager**

**PURPOSE OF REPORT**

To enable the Committee to express a view on increasing the time limit for Ward Councillors to address the Committee.

**This report is public.**

**RECOMMENDATIONS**

- (1) **That the Committee considers whether or not it would be in favour of increasing the time limit for Ward Councillors to address the committee from three minutes to five minutes.**

**1.0 Introduction**

- 1.1 Members will be aware of the public participation scheme set out in Part 4, Section 9 of the Council's Constitution (Planning and Highways Regulatory Committee Procedure Rules). The rules set out the process to follow for members of the public, applicants and Ward Councillors wishing to speak at meetings of this Committee. There is a three minute time limit which each speaker must adhere to.
- 1.2 The Chairman of Council Business Committee (CBC) has been approached by other Councillors and has asked if there could be a discussion regarding increasing the time limit for Ward Councillors at the next meeting of CBC. Hence this report has been drafted for Planning Committee members to consider in advance of the CBC meeting on 2 November 2017. It is important that consultation takes place with Planning Committee Members and a view is formed which can be reported to CBC by the Democratic Services Manager.
- 1.3 For Members' information the matter of Ward Councillors speaking at Planning Committee was last discussed at the 8 April 2013 Planning Committee, in relation to a request to remove the time limit for Ward Councillors only. Members of the Planning Committee voted to retain the three-minute speaking time limit, because this "mirrored the time allowed for a member of the public to speak". (11 in favour, 3 against, 1 abstention).

## 2.0 The Rules Currently

- 2.1 The current rules allow Ward Councillors the same speaking rights as members of the public, no more, no less. Each is allowed to speak for three minutes. This is in line with the advice from the Planning Advisory Service (part of the Local Government Association), set out in its document *"Probity in Planning – for Councillors and Officers"* (April 2013). The relevant part is shown in bold type, below:-

*"Where public speaking is allowed, clear protocols should be established about who is allowed to speak, including provisions for applicants, supporters, **ward councillors**, parish councils and third-party objectors. **In the interests of equity, the time allowed for presentations for and against the development should be the same**, and those speaking should be asked to direct their presentation to reinforcing or amplifying representations already made to the council in writing".*

## 3.0 Time Limit Issues

- 3.1 Arguments which have been put forward to the Chairman of the CBC and to Democratic Services are:-

- Ward Councillors do not often speak at Planning Committee meetings, so it would not increase the length of the meetings very much if Ward Councillors were allowed to speak for two minutes more than other speakers.
- Ward Councillors addressing the meeting on behalf of residents may encompass views of several people who for a variety of reasons, do not wish to speak in person. This saves the Committee time and lets local people feel that the democratic process is being served.
- The 3-minute time limit is too short to present the views of the Community adequately and cover the reasons why they support acceptance or rejection.
- Planners have unrestricted time in which to present an application and answer questions.
- The Planning Committee carries out a quasi-judicial process, whatever time is given to witnesses should not be equated with the time given to the Advocates, as on the one hand the Planning Officer and on the other a Ward Councillor speaking on behalf of the community are.

- 3.2 Reasons why increasing the time limit to five minutes would not be desirable are:-

- PAS advice (see para 2.1) is for protocols to allow equal speaking times. If the time limit for Ward Councillors were to be increased to five minutes, then the limit for all speakers should be increased to five minutes which would considerably lengthen busy meetings of the Planning Committee. Lancaster already has one of the most generous public speaking schemes in operation, with no limit on the total number of speakers on any individual item.

- It is recognised that some people would not wish to address the Committee themselves and would prefer their Ward Councillor to speak for them. However, the expectation is that they would have submitted written representations. The Ward Councillor should direct their presentation to reinforcing and amplifying those written representations within the three minutes, in accordance with the advice given by the Planning Advisory Service.
- The role of Planners at the Committee is to provide professional advice, which cannot and should not be subject to any time limit.
- Allowing any group or individual longer to speak than other registered speakers risks exposing the Council to allegations that it disproportionately allowed one side of the debate to be aired for longer than the other.

3.3 In considering this proposal, it is also prudent to recall the findings of the Local Government Association/Planning Advisory Service when they carried out a 'Planning Peer Challenge' of the City Council's Planning Service in April 2014. Some Members will recall being interviewed as part of the Peer Challenge process. The final report was complimentary about the Planning Service and noted that it was delivering significant outcomes. In relation to the issue of public speaking at Planning Committee, the Local Government Association/Planning Advisory Service report concluded:

*"The Council allows up to three minutes for anyone who wishes to speak on an individual planning application. This can also take up a lot of time and the Council may wish to continue monitoring the situation to determine whether it would like to make any changes to these arrangements in the future".*

#### **4.0 Details of Consultation**

4.1 This report is presented today to consult with Planning Members so that the view of the Planning Committee can be reported to Members of the CBC when it meets on 2 November 2017.

#### **5.0 Conclusion**

5.1 Members are asked whether they would support an increase in the time limit for Ward Councillors speaking at Planning Committee from three minutes, to five minutes.

<b>CONCLUSION OF IMPACT ASSESSMENT</b>
--

<b>(including Health &amp; Safety, Equality &amp; Diversity, Human Rights, Community Safety, Sustainability and Rural Proofing)</b>
---

None.
-------

<b>LEGAL IMPLICATIONS</b>
---------------------------

Whilst it is not a legal requirement, Members are strongly encouraged to have regard to the Planning Advisory Service guidance quoted in paragraph 2.1 and ensure that the time limits for all speakers is the same. If the Committee is minded to increase the time limit for Ward Councillors, it would be best practice to increase the time limit for all speakers.
---

**FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS**

None identified.

**OTHER RESOURCE IMPLICATIONS**

**Human Resources:** None

**Information Services:** None

**Property:** None

**Open Spaces:** None.

**SECTION 151 OFFICER'S COMMENTS**

The Section 151 Officer has been consulted and has no further comments.

**MONITORING OFFICER'S COMMENTS**

The Monitoring Officer has been consulted and has no further comments.

**BACKGROUND PAPERS**

**Contact Officer:** Debbie Chambers

**Telephone:** 01524 582057

**E-mail:** dchambers@lancaster.gov.uk

**Ref:**

<b>COUNCIL BUSINESS COMMITTEE</b>
-----------------------------------

**Code of Conduct for Members  
2 November 2017**

**Report of the Standards Committee**

<b>PURPOSE OF REPORT</b>
To advise Council Business Committee of recommendations of the Standards Committee to append the definition and examples of bullying and harassment, as set out in paragraph 3.0 of this report, to the Council's Code of Conduct for Members.
This report is public.

**RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE STANDARDS COMMITTEE**

- (1) That the definition and examples of bullying and harassment, as set out in paragraph 3.0 of this report, be appended to the Council's Code of Conduct for Members (Part 7, Section 2 of the Constitution).
- (2) That the Monitoring Officer be asked to amend the Members' Code of Conduct accordingly.

**1.0 Introduction**

- 1.1 At their meeting on 19 January 2017, members of the Standards Committee asked the Monitoring Officer to ascertain whether and/or how other local authorities defined bullying and report back to a future meeting. This was with a view to providing a definition to assist with assessment of allegations of bullying behaviour.

**2.0 Proposal**

- 2.1 At the Committee meeting on 18 September 2017, Standards members considered a report (copy attached) containing definitions and examples of bullying and resolved:

*(3) That the Standards Committee recommends to Council that the definition and examples of bullying and harassment, as set out in the report, be appended to the Council's Code of Conduct.*

- 2.2 Amendments to the Members' Code of Conduct can be approved by this Committee, without the need for taking the matter to full Council, hence this report today.

**3.0 Definitions and Examples**

- 3.1 The definition and examples set out in the report to Standards Committee were:

Definition:

“Offensive, intimidating, malicious or insulting behaviour, abuse or misuse of power through means that undermine, humiliate, denigrate or injure the recipient”.

Examples of bullying include:

- Spreading malicious rumours;
- Unfair treatment;
- Picking on someone;
- Regularly undermining a competent worker;
- Denying someone training or promotion opportunities.

Bullying can happen:

- Face to face;
- By letter;
- By email;
- By phone.

#### 4.0 Conclusion

- 4.1 The Committee is requested to consider the recommendations of the Standards Committee regarding an appendix to the Code of Conduct for Councillors defining ‘bullying’ and providing the above examples of bullying behaviour.

<b>CONCLUSION OF IMPACT ASSESSMENT</b> (including Diversity, Human Rights, Community Safety, Sustainability and Rural Proofing)	
None.	
<b>FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS</b>	
None directly arising from the report.	
<b>LEGAL IMPLICATIONS</b>	
None directly arising from the report.	
<b>SECTION 151 OFFICER’S COMMENTS</b>	
The Section 151 Officer has been consulted and has no further comments.	
<b>MONITORING OFFICER’S COMMENTS</b>	
The Monitoring Officer has been consulted and has no further comments.	
<b>BACKGROUND PAPERS</b>	<b>Contact Officer:</b> Debbie Chambers <b>Telephone:</b> 01524 582057 <b>E-mail:</b> dchambers@lancaster.gov.uk

**STANDARDS****Advice on Bullying and Harassment  
18<sup>th</sup> September 2017****Report of the Monitoring Officer****PURPOSE OF REPORT**

To advise the Committee on the definition of bullying.

**This report is public**

**RECOMMENDATIONS**

**(1) That the report be noted.**

**1.0 Introduction**

1.1 At the meeting on the 19<sup>th</sup> January 2017 the Monitoring Officer was requested to ascertain how other local authorities define bullying and report back, to a future meeting.

**2.0 Legal Background**

The Government Guidance Notes on the Equality Act 2010 provides a helpful overview of bullying and harassment and defines it as follows:

“behaviour that makes someone feel intimidated or offended”

Examples of bullying or harassing behaviour include:

- Spreading malicious rumours;
- Unfair treatment;
- Picking on someone;
- Regularly undermining a competent worker;
- Denying someone training or promotion opportunities.

Bullying and harassment can happen:

- Face to face;
- By letter;
- By email;
- By phone.

Bullying itself is not against the law, but harassment is. This is when the unwanted behaviour is related to one of the following:

- Age;
- Sex;
- Disability;
- Gender;
- Marriage and civil partnership;
- Pregnancy and maternity;
- Race;
- Religion or belief;
- Sexual orientation.

### 3.0 Employers' responsibilities

Employers are responsible for preventing bullying and harassment and are liable for any harassment suffered by their employees.

ACAS has produced a useful guide on this which is attached.

The Council has a Dignity at Work Policy & Procedure and an Equality & Diversity Policy which mirrors the provisions of the Act. Other Councils in the North West area have similar provisions, e.g. Preston City Council (Equalities Policy) defines bullying as:

'offensive, intimidating, malicious or insulting behaviour, abuse or misuse of power through means that undermine, humiliate, denigrate or injure the recipient.'

<b>CONCLUSION OF IMPACT ASSESSMENT</b> <b>(including Health &amp; Safety, Equality &amp; Diversity, Human Rights, Community Safety, Sustainability and Rural Proofing):</b>
None directly arising from this report.
<b>LEGAL IMPLICATIONS</b>
None directly arising from this report.
<b>FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS</b>
None directly arising from the report.
<b>SECTION 151 OFFICER'S COMMENTS</b>
The Section 151 officer has been consulted and has no further comments on this report.



**MONITORING OFFICER'S COMMENTS**

This report is in the name of the Monitoring Officer

**BACKGROUND PAPERS**

none

**Contact Officer:** Anne Streeter

**Telephone:** (01524 )582192

**E-mail:** [astreeter@lancaster.gov.uk](mailto:astreeter@lancaster.gov.uk)

**COUNCIL BUSINESS COMMITTEE**

**Designation of Veterans’ Champion  
2 November 2017**

**Report of the Democratic Services Manager**

**PURPOSE OF REPORT**

To consider recommending to Council that the title of “Veterans’ Champion” be changed to “Armed Forces Champion”.

This report is public.

**RECOMMENDATION**

- (1) **The Committee is asked to consider the request from the Veterans’ Champion, that the name of her role be changed to ‘Armed Forces Champion’.**
- (2) **That, if the Committee is minded to recommend a change of name for the role, the matter be referred to Council.**

**1.0 Introduction**

- 1.1 The current Veterans’ Champion met with the Democratic Services Manager, and the Democratic Services Officer who provided support to Champions, on 25 May 2017 to discuss arrangements for flag raising for Armed Forces Day.
- 1.2 It was noted during the meeting that Councillor Scott usually referred to herself as ‘Armed Forces Champion’, which had caused some confusion. It was agreed that the Democratic Services Manager would draft a report to Council Business Committee in June asking the Committee to consider a change of name for the role. The June meeting of the Committee was cancelled due to lack of any other business, hence the report has come to this meeting.

**2.0 Proposal Details**

- 2.1 The role of Veterans’ Champion was established by Council in February 2013 specifically “to support and champion the plight of services leavers within Lancaster District.”
- 2.2 Councillor Scott is seeking a change of name for the Veterans’ Champion to Armed Forces Champion in recognition of what she believes to be the wider remit of the role to include serving members of the armed forces.

**3.0 Conclusion**

3.1 The Committee is asked for its views on the change of name. If Committee members are in agreement that the name should be changed, then a referral report will be drafted to Council to recommend the change.

<b>CONCLUSION OF IMPACT ASSESSMENT</b> (including Health & Safety, Equality & Diversity, Human Rights, Community Safety, Sustainability and Rural Proofing) None.	
<b>LEGAL IMPLICATIONS</b> None identified.	
<b>FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS</b> None identified.	
<b>OTHER RESOURCE IMPLICATIONS, such as Human Resources; Information Services; Property; Open Spaces:</b> None.	
<b>SECTION 151 OFFICER'S COMMENTS</b> The Section 151 Officer has been consulted and has no further comments.	
<b>MONITORING OFFICER'S COMMENTS</b> The Monitoring Officer has reviewed the report and has no further comments.	
<b>BACKGROUND PAPERS</b> None.	<b>Contact Officer:</b> Debbie Chambers <b>Telephone:</b> 01524 582057 <b>E-mail:</b> dchambers@lancaster.gov.uk