



**LANCASTER**  
**CITY COUNCIL**

*Promoting City, Coast & Countryside*

# **COUNCIL MEETING**

**Wednesday, 23 July 2008**

**2.00 p.m.**

**Morecambe Town Hall**

Mark Cullinan  
Chief Executive  
Town Hall  
LANCASTER





Sir/Madam,

You are hereby summoned to attend a meeting of the Lancaster City Council to be held in the Town Hall, Morecambe on Wednesday, 23 July 2008 commencing at 2.00 p.m. for the following purposes:

1. **APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**

2. **MINUTES**

To receive as a correct record the Minutes of the Meeting of the City Council held on 18<sup>th</sup> June, 2008 (previously circulated).

3. **DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

4. **ITEMS OF URGENT BUSINESS**

5. **ANNOUNCEMENTS**

To receive any announcements which may be submitted by the Mayor or Chief Executive.

6. **QUESTIONS FROM THE PUBLIC UNDER COUNCIL PROCEDURE RULE 11**

To receive questions in accordance with the provisions of Council Procedure Rules 11.1 and 11.3 which require members of the public to give at least 3 days' notice in writing of questions to a Member of Cabinet or Committee Chairman.

7. **PETITIONS AND ADDRESSES**

To receive a Petition from Miles Bennington, notification of which has been received by the Chief Executive in accordance with the Council's Constitution.

8. **QUESTIONS UNDER COUNCIL PROCEDURE RULE 12.2**

To receive questions in accordance with the provisions of Council Procedure Rules 12.2 and 12.4 which require a Member to give at least 3 working days notice, in writing, of the question to the Chief Executive.

9. **LEADER'S REPORT (Pages 1 - 8)**

To receive the Cabinet Leader's report on proceedings since the last meeting of Council.

## **MOTIONS ON NOTICE**

### **10. RENEWABLE ENERGY TARIFF (Pages 9 - 10)**

To consider the following motion, notice of which has been received from Councillors Anne Chapman, Jon Barry, Chris Coates and Emily Heath:

“This Council notes:

- that the UK produces less than 2% of its total energy from Renewable Energy sources and is at the bottom the European Renewable Energy 'league table'
- that countries in the European Union that have adopted a fixed term Renewable Energy Tariff such as Germany, Italy and Spain have seen a substantial rise in the percentage of their energy from renewable sources.

This Council:

- supports the amendment to the Energy Bill currently before Parliament that calls on Government to establish a Renewable Energy Tariff within 12 months for the generation of local renewable heat, renewable power and renewable gas.
- will write to the Energy Minister Malcolm Wicks MP calling on the UK Government to act with urgency and to ensure the adoption of a Tariff for local energy under the current Energy Bill which will now be delayed over Summer.
- will contact Friends of the Earth and the Renewable Energy Association informing them of our support for their campaign.”

***An Officer Briefing Note is attached.***

## **OTHER BUSINESS**

### **11. ALLOCATION OF SEATS TO POLITICAL GROUPS (Pages 11 - 15)**

To consider the report of Chief Executive.

### **12. LANCASTER DISTRICT CORE STRATEGY (Pages 16 - 21)**

To consider the report of the Corporate Director (Regeneration).

A copy of the Lancaster District Core Strategy can be found at:

[www.lancaster.gov.uk/General.asp?id= SX9452-A780B905](http://www.lancaster.gov.uk/General.asp?id= SX9452-A780B905)

### **13. IRISH SEA REGION PLATFORM (Pages 22 - 30)**

To consider the report of the Corporate Director (Regeneration).

### **14. APPOINTMENTS TO OUTSIDE BODIES, PARTNERSHIPS AND BOARDS (Pages 31 - 33)**

To consider the report of the Chief Executive.

15. **MINUTES OF CABINET** (Pages 34 - 55)

To receive the Minutes of Meeting of Cabinet held 8<sup>th</sup> July, 2008.



.....  
Chief Executive

Town Hall,  
Dalton Square,  
LANCASTER,  
LA1 1PJ

Published on Monday 14<sup>th</sup> July, 2008



## Leader's Report

23<sup>rd</sup> July 2008

### Report of the Leader of the Council

#### PURPOSE OF REPORT

To present the Leader's report to Council.

This report is public.

#### RECOMMENDATIONS

- (1) To receive the report of the Leader of Council.

#### REPORT

##### 1.0 General Matters of Interest

My report informs Council of some of the items considered at Cabinet on 8<sup>th</sup> July 2008 and other matters. Details are set out below for Members' information.

##### Cabinet – 8<sup>th</sup> July 2008:

##### 1.1 Community Cohesion Call-In - Overview and Scrutiny

Cabinet considered a referral from the Overview and Scrutiny Committee as a result of the Call-in of Cabinet's decision with regard to Community Cohesion (Minute 12).

After considering the report it was agreed:

- (1) That Cabinet does not appoint a Community Cohesion officer at the present time.
- (2) That recommendation 2 of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee:

"That Cabinet considers alternative ways of achieving the aims of the Corporate Plan on cohesive communities, including working with the universities. Overview and Scrutiny draws the attention of Cabinet to priority outcome 16 and highlights that:

- The Community Cohesion Strategy could be achieved through working with the LSP and voluntary sector. A future programme of spending on Community Cohesion should be based upon this strategy.
- Area Based Grant (ABG) money could be used to implement the Children and Young People Strategic Plan.
- Area Based Grant money could be used to achieve the aim of a civic programme that celebrates our heritage and benefits our communities.”

be noted.

- (3) That Cabinet reconsiders the way the ABG be spent in November 2008, by which time the Local Strategic Partnership (LSP) should have options ready for consideration.

### **1.2 Canals Task Group – Final Report**

At the meeting Cabinet considered a report of the findings of the Canals Task Group, seeking the agreement of Cabinet to the recommendations set out in the report.

Following consideration of the report, Cabinet resolved:

- (1) That, regarding recommendation 1a, the Council retains its existing definition of a community asset.
- (2) That all other recommendations set out in the report, as far as they are capable of being taken forward within the current budget, be approved, including using existing links with the British Resorts and Destinations Association (BRADA) to pursue recommendation 4.
- (3) That a report be brought to a future meeting identifying possible funding for other recommendations within the Canals Task Group report.

### **1.3 Lancaster Science Park**

At the meeting Cabinet considered a report that advised of progress with project development work for Lancaster Science Park and requested confirmation that the Council should lead the next stages of project development, including the submission of outline planning application and recruitment of a development partner.

After considering the report, it was agreed:

- (1) That, subject to release of sufficient project development funding from the NWDA, the Corporate Director (Regeneration) be authorised to proceed with the next phases of project development, including the recruitment of a development partner on the basis outlined in the report, and commissioning of relevant specialist consultancy support.
- (2) That a further report be made back to Cabinet on the outcome of the developer recruitment and to agree the detailed terms and conditions of the development agreement.
- (3) That the Head of Financial Services be authorised to make the appropriate adjustments to the revenue and capital budgets.

- (4) That the Corporate Director (Regeneration) be authorised to make any amendments to the Memorandum of Understanding with Lancaster University if these are required to reflect the revised approach to the project, in consultation with the Head of Legal and HR and the Head of Financial Services.

### **1.4 Lancaster District Economic Vision**

A report was submitted that provided an update on both the management arrangements and key projects within the Lancaster District Economic Vision. It provided background to the strategic context for the Vision and funding arrangements, including the potential for regeneration funds to be delegated to the Council. The report recommended the means by which the Council might manage the development of the Vision projects and also proposed the means by which the range of projects within the Vision might be reviewed and adapted over time.

After considering the report it was agreed:

- (1) That the Corporate Director (Regeneration) is granted continuing authorisation to proceed with project development and feasibility work for currently identified Vision projects, including bidding for funds, subject to the availability of existing resources and/or external funding.
- (2) That the Corporate Director (Regeneration) is authorised to undertake investigation and development of new Vision projects requiring Council support, subject to the availability of resources and/or external funding, in order to determine their relevance and suitability to bid for funding support and gain formal Council endorsement as part of normal decision making processes.
- (3) That the Corporate Director is authorised to submit an application to North West Development Agency for further management costs to support the management and development of the Lancaster District Economic Vision for the financial years 2009/2010, 2010/2011 and 2011/2012.
- (4) That Cabinet approves the proposed strategic programme framework for the Economic Vision, as outlined in this report, as a basis for attracting external funding and managing delivery and performance.
- (5) That the Corporate Director (Regeneration) be asked to bring to Cabinet for approval programmes of activity relating to the Lancaster District's Economic Vision instead of approval on a project by project basis to be the basis of negotiations with the NWDA for future delegation of funding.
- (6) That the Head of Financial Services be authorised to update the General Fund Capital Programme and the General Fund Revenue Budget as required, subject to there being no net impact on the Council's budgets.

### **1.5 Lancashire Municipal Waste Strategy**

Members considered a report that informed of the implications of adopting the revised waste strategy 'Rubbish to Resources' for Lancashire 2008 to 2020 and requested a decision on the course of action regarding adoption of the strategy.



It was agreed:

- (1) That Cabinet adopt in principle, subject to financial capacity, the New Waste Management Strategy 'Rubbish to Resources' for Lancashire 2008 to 2020.
- (2) The Cabinet delegate the final adoption of the Strategy to the appropriate Cabinet Member, and subject to the budget framework being updated accordingly.
- (3) That a further report providing options for the implementation of the Strategy and its impact on the Medium Term Financial Strategy (MTFS) be presented to Cabinet in September 2008.
- (4) That Cabinet receives a further report on the Middleton Recycling and Re-use Plant.

## **1.6 Capital Programme for Private Sector Housing**

A report was submitted that sought approval for the allocation of the Regional Housing Board funding between the Winning Back Morecambe's West End, Poulton Renewal Area and Disabled Facilities Grants (DFG).

Cabinet agreed:

That Option 3 and the Disabled Facilities Grant funding from the capital allocation of the Regional Housing Board be approved, and that the Capital Programme be updated accordingly.

## **1.7 Homelessness Strategy**

At the meeting Cabinet considered a report that requested Members to approve the Homelessness Strategy 2008 – 2013, which was provided as an appendix to the report. The report provided details of the consultation undertaken as part of the development of the strategy.

After considering the report it was agreed:

- (1) That the commissioning of specialist housing advice be considered on renewal of the SLA with the CAB.
- (2) That the Homelessness Strategy 2008-13 be approved, subject to any cost implications being referred back to Cabinet to be considered as part of the 2009/10 budget exercise.

## **1.8 Review of Staff and Member Permits and Charges**

Cabinet considered a report that presented a review of Employee and Elected Member permits and charges.

Following consideration of the report it was agreed:

- (1) That the Employee, Member and Public permit renewal dates be realigned to ensure that all parking charges be determined and introduced at the same time, namely at 1<sup>st</sup> April.
- (2) That charges for permits of each type be increased with effect from the 1<sup>st</sup> April 2009 by a percentage no higher than the rate of inflation since the previous setting of the charge for that permit.
- (3) That with an implementation date of 1<sup>st</sup> April 2009, an option of a separately priced 5-day permit (i.e. 24-5) be introduced for all permit holders (at a cost lower than the equivalent 24-7 permit).
- (4) That charges for the eight month period from 1<sup>st</sup> August 2008 to 31<sup>st</sup> March 2009 should be at the same monthly rate as for the permits expiring on 31<sup>st</sup> July that they replace.

### **1.9 Lancashire Local Area Agreements**

Cabinet were advised of the decision taken by the Chief Executive in consultation with the Leader in accordance with Minute No. 3 of 3<sup>rd</sup> June 2008.

It was reported to Cabinet on 3<sup>rd</sup> June 2008 that the Government Office North West (GONW) required that the Local Area Agreement (LAA) submission, due to be sent to GONW by the end of that week, should show lead partners against each performance target.

In order to meet that deadline, Cabinet agreed to delegate this task to the Chief Executive, in consultation with the Leader of the Council as follows (Minute No. 3 refers):

*'That Cabinet authorise the Chief Executive, in consultation with the Leader of the Council, to agree a list of lead partners for delivering the individual Lancashire Local Area Agreement targets, and further to that, to determine those targets that Lancaster City Council will contribute to delivering, subject to sufficient resources being available within existing budgets.'*

The report outlined that the action taken by the Chief Executive in consultation with the Leader ensured that the Council has complied with its duty to co-operate in having regard for LAA targets and also met the designated deadline for supplying the information requested i.e. 10<sup>th</sup> June 2008. The decision would also ensure that the resources required to deliver the agreed targets are identified and considered before delivery commences and that they are consistent with the Corporate Plan.

A copy of the signed Partnership Agreement was attached to the report at Appendix B for information.

Following consideration of the report it was agreed:

That the following decisions of the Chief Executive, in consultation with the Leader of the Council, be noted:

- (1) That the list of targets, attached as Appendix A to the report, that the City Council will contribute towards delivering during the lifetime of the Local

Area Agreement, be agreed in principle, subject to sufficient resources either being available within existing budgets or being identified.

- (2) That the Lancashire Partnership Executive be advised of those targets by the due date (10<sup>th</sup> June 2008).
- (3) That officers undertake further work to ascertain the resources required to deliver the City Council's contribution to achieve the LAA targets agreed in (1) above.
- (4) That officers review the Council's existing Corporate Plan to ensure consistency with the targets agreed in (1) above and if amendments are required, they be reported back to full Council in due course.
- (5) That, notwithstanding the targets included in (1) above, the City Council will work with its partners in the Lancaster District Local Strategic Partnership to support the delivery/achievement of all the objectives, outcomes and targets referred to in the LAA wherever practicable.

## **2.0 Allocation of Cabinet Appointments**

Cabinet considered a report that advised of those appointments to partnerships and outside bodies which required re-allocation following the resignation of Councillor Johnson from the Cabinet.

After considering the report it was resolved:

- (1) That Councillor Susie Charles be appointed to fill the vacancies on the following Partnerships and Outside Bodies following the resignation from Cabinet of Councillor Tony Johnson:
  - LSP Management Group substitute.
  - Arnsdale and Silverdale AONB Unit Arnsdale and Silverdale AONB (Forum, Countryside Management Service and Limestone Heritage Project)
  - Forest of Bowland AONB Advisory Committee
  - Lancashire Rural Affairs
  - Lancashire Rural Partnership
  - Lancaster Canal Restoration Partnership
  - North West Rural Affairs Forum
  - LGA Rural Commission

## **2.1 Land at Scotforth**

At the meeting Cabinet was requested to consider the bids that had been received for the sale of the Council's land at Scotforth Road, Lancaster. Following consideration of both a public and exempt report it was resolved: -

It was agreed:

- (1) That the content of the public report be noted.
- (2) That the sale of land to EH Booth and Co Ltd, as outlined in Option 2 of the exempt report, be approved.

- (3) That the proposal to designate the footpath in the Council's retained land as a permissive right of way or a public footpath be included in the proposals for the overall development and if this cannot be achieved then Officers pursue such designation directly with the County Council.

## **2.2 Other Matters**

Since my last report, I have represented Lancashire at the Brussels meeting of the North West Region European Partnership. The item on The Irish Sea Platform that appears later in this agenda has been brought to Council as a consequence of a presentation at that meeting.

More recently, I attended (with Councillor Blamire) the annual conference of the Local Government Association in Bournemouth. As usual there were a number of speeches from national politicians representing the major parties. This year, the verbal message from all of them was of greater localism and the importance of democratic accountability in local government - but that did not mean that the parties had a single vision for the future.

On the subject of visions for the future, I was a guest at a dinner on 7 July to celebrate the opening of The Midland Hotel. The renaissance of the Hotel is a powerful symbol of the regeneration of Morecambe, and is expected to encourage the bringing forward of other regeneration projects.

On 10 July, I attended (with Councillor Sherlock) the Launch meeting of "Team Lancashire", a new partnership which has been signed up to by all the local authorities in Lancashire for working better together on the strategy for improvement and efficiency.

In relation to Lancaster District Local Strategic Partnership (LDLSP), I can report that all the newly created Thematic Groups have now had their initial meetings, and that the first meeting of the Management Group (consisting of representatives of six stakeholders and the chair persons of all of the Thematic Groups) will take place on 31 July.

Returning again to the subject of visions for the future, the Lancaster and Morecambe Vision Board was a Building Block of the former LSP, and is now represented alongside representatives from the City Council and the County Council on the Economy Thematic Group of the LDLSP. The Vision Board also currently provides the representatives of the Economy Stakeholder on the LDLSP Board and on the LDLSP Management Group. At the meeting of the Vision Board on 10 July, I was appointed to represent the Council on a small sub-group tasked with determining a firm recommendation for the future of the Vision Board to be put to Board Members at their next meeting on 5 September.

## **3.1 Decisions required to be taken urgently**

### **Summary of Decisions**

As required by Access to Information Procedure Rule 17.03, set out below are the matters which required immediate implementation and in respect of which call-in was waived in accordance with Overview and Scrutiny Procedure Rule 17.

**Luneside East Regeneration Project**

At its meeting, held on Tuesday, 3<sup>rd</sup> June 2008, Cabinet considered and approved the recommendations of a report on the Luneside East Regeneration Project (Minute 14 refers).

Having consulted the Chairman of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee, in accordance with Overview and Scrutiny Committee Procedure Rule 17(a), the Chief Executive agreed that call-in be waived to enable the immediate implementation of this decision.

The urgency to implement this decision was to enable the Council to begin to prepare for the Lands Tribunal and any delay could be detrimental to the Council's handling of any case.

**BACKGROUND PAPERS**

Cabinet minutes dated 3<sup>rd</sup> June and 8<sup>th</sup> July 2008.

**COUNCIL – 23<sup>rd</sup> July 2008****BRIEFING NOTE – Renewable Energy Tariff****Motion**

"This Council notes:

- that the UK produces less than 2% of its total energy from Renewable Energy sources and is at the bottom the European Renewable Energy 'league table'
- that countries in the European Union that have adopted a fixed term Renewable Energy Tariff such as Germany, Italy and Spain have seen a substantial rise in the percentage of their energy from renewable sources.

This Council:

- supports the amendment to the Energy Bill currently before Parliament that calls on Government to establish a Renewable Energy Tariff within 12 months for the generation of local renewable heat, renewable power and renewable gas.
- will write to the Energy Minister Malcolm Wicks MP calling on the UK Government to act with urgency and to ensure the adoption of a Tariff for local energy under the current Energy Bill which will now be delayed over Summer.
- will contact Friends of the Earth and the Renewable Energy Association informing them of our support for their campaign."

**Officer comments**

The Energy Bill was introduced in the House of Commons on 10 January 2008 and contains the legislative provisions required to implement UK energy policy following the publication of the Energy Review 2006 and the Energy White Paper 2007.

This policy is driven by the two long-term energy challenges faced by the UK: tackling climate change by reducing carbon dioxide emissions, and ensuring secure, clean and affordable energy.

A cross party amendment to the Bill, known as 'New Clause 4: "Renewable Energy Tariff"', was debated when the Energy Bill received its Third Reading in the Commons on 30 April. 270 MPs have signed a Parliamentary petition (Early Day Motion) asking for the Energy Bill to be amended to include a feed in tariff for small scale renewables.

The intention of a feed in tariff is to provide a financial incentive for householders and businesses to invest in clean technologies such as solar panels for their homes and offices.

Almost 50 countries have introduced some sort of feed-in tariff legislation. Most of those countries are well ahead of the UK in delivering a proportion of energy from renewable sources. The UK currently delivers about 2 per cent. of its energy from renewable

sources and the government have entered into an EU commitment to deliver 15 per cent. of our energy from renewable sources by that time.

At this stage Clause 4 only commits the Secretary of State to the establishment of a reward scheme for metered renewable energy and to do so within one year. The Clause leaves open until after consultation the detail of how a metered UK tariff would work, which scale and types of renewable technology would qualify and the level of any Tariff.

**COUNCIL****Allocation of Seats to Political Groups  
23rd July 2008****Report of Chief Executive****PURPOSE OF REPORT**

To advise Council of the calculations relating to the allocation of seats in accordance with the Local Government and Housing Act 1989 and the Council's agreed protocol following the resignation of a Member from a political group.

This report is public

**RECOMMENDATIONS**

- (1) That in accordance with Section 15 of the Local Government and Housing Act, 1989 and Part 4 of the Local Government (Committees and Political Groups) Regulations, 1990, the City Council approves the calculations and allocation of seats set out in paragraph 2 of the report.**
- (2) That nominations for appointment to Committees submitted by Group Administrators at the meeting be approved.**

**1.0 Introduction**

- 1.1 The Conservative Group have advised that with effect from 18<sup>th</sup> June 2008 Councillor Keith Sowden is no longer a member of that Group. Councillor Sowden has since stated his intention to be an independent, non-aligned Member.
- 1.2 This causes a change to Group numbers and requires a report on the recalculation of the proportional representation arrangements to the first available Council meeting in accordance with the Local Government and Housing Act 1989.
- 1.3 The revised calculations in relation to numbers from 1 to 20 are attached at Appendix A for information. Details of the effect of these calculations in respect of the current decision-making structure and agreed groupings of committees are set out in paragraph 2 below.
- 1.4 Members are requested to approve the calculation in order the enable adjustments to be made to appointments to committees to reflect the revised make-up of the Council.



**2.0 Calculations**

**2.1 Compilation of the Council**

Independents	16
Labour	13
Greens	12
Conservatives	11
Liberal Democrats	5
Non-aligned Independent (1)	1
Non-aligned Independent (2)	1
Non-aligned Independent (3)	1
	60

**2.2 Cabinet**

2.2.1 The PR Calculation for a Cabinet comprising 10 Members is unchanged.

**2.3 Overview & Scrutiny**

2.3.1 The PR Calculation for a single 9 Member Committee remains unchanged. However the calculation for the grouping of Overview & Scrutiny Committee and Budget & Performance Panel is now as follows:

I:	16	( x 18/60)	=	4.8813	=	5
L:	13	( x 18/60)	=	3.9661	=	4
G:	12	( x 18/60)	=	3.6610	=	4
C:	11	( x 18/60)	=	3.3593	=	3
LD:	5	( x 18/60)	=	1.5254	=	2
FI (1):	1	( x 18/60)	=	0.3050	=	0
FI (2):	1	( x 18/60)	=	0.3050	=	0
FI (3):	1	( x 18/60)	=	0.3050	=	0
						18

2.3.2 This is a change from the previous 5:4:4:4:1 resulting in a requirement for the Conservative Group to pass one seat on Budget & Performance Panel to the Liberal Democrat Group.

2.3.3 Whilst this is the most straightforward option, the correct PR could also be achieved by the Independent Group reducing their membership on Budget & Performance Panel to 2 and increasing Overview & Scrutiny Committee to 3, thereby allowing the Liberal Democrat Group to take a seat on Budget & Performance Panel and the Conservative Group to retain 2 seats on that Panel but reduce their membership on the Overview & Scrutiny Committee to one. This is subject to negotiation between the Groups concerned.

**2.4 Regulatory and Timetabled Committees of Council**

2.4.1 The PR calculation for 15 Member Committees remains unchanged at 4:4:3:3:1 and for 7 Member Committees at 2:2:1:1:1.

2.4.2 However the total seats to be allocated for the grouping comprising Planning and Highways Regulatory, Licensing Act, Licensing Regulatory, Personnel and Audit Committees is as follows:

$20 + 15 + 7 + 7 + 7 = 56$  (  $-: - 60$  ) = 0.9333 seats per member

I:	16	x 0.9333	=	14.9328	=	15
L:	13	x 0.9333	=	12.1329	=	12
G:	12	x 0.9333	=	11.1996	=	11
C:	11	x 0.9333	=	10.2663	=	10
LD:	5	x 0.9333	=	4.6665	=	5
FI(1):	1	x 0.9333	=	0.9333	=	1
FI(2):	1	x 0.9333	=	0.9333	=	1
FI(3):	1	x 0.9333	=	0.9333	=	<u>1</u>
						56

2.4.3 This is a change from 15:12:11:11:5:1:1, to 15:12:11:10:5:1:1:1, i.e. the Conservative Group must pass one seat from the above Grouping to one of the non-aligned independents. Whilst the simplest 'transfer' would be the seat on Planning Committee which Councillor Sowden previously held as a Conservative Member, the Conservative Group are in fact over represented in terms of PR on the Audit Committee and they may wish to relinquish one of their two seats on this committee. It is for the Conservative Group to decide.

## 2.5 Other Standing Committees

2.5.1 Remaining Standing Committees currently constituted with a PR of 7 are the Appeals, Appraisal, Council Business and Standards Committees. The PR calculation remains unchanged at 2:2:1:1:1.

## 2.6 Joint Committees

2.6.1 The Lancashire Locals – Lancaster District Joint Committee has a PR of 10. The PR for this remains unchanged at 3:2:2:2:1.

## 3.0 Conclusion

3.1 Members are requested to approve the calculations and to accept any nominations for Committees made as a result of this re-calculation.

### CONCLUSION OF IMPACT ASSESSMENT

**(including Diversity, Human Rights, Community Safety, Sustainability and Rural Proofing)**

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

### FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

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

### SECTION 151 OFFICER'S COMMENTS

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

### LEGAL IMPLICATIONS

This report has been prepared in accordance with the provisions of Section 15 of the Local Government and Housing Act, 1989 and Part 4 of the Local Government (Committees and Political Groups) Regulations 1990.

**MONITORING OFFICER'S COMMENTS**

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

**BACKGROUND PAPERS**

Proportional Representation calculation file.  
Letter from the Conservative Group dated  
18<sup>th</sup> June 2008  
Email notification from Councillor Sowden  
dated 19<sup>th</sup> June 2008.

**Contact Officer:** Gillian Noall  
**Telephone:** 01524 582060  
**E-mail:** gnoall@lancaster.gov.uk

**P.R. LIST**

		<b>Ind</b>	<b>Labour</b>	<b>Green</b>	<b>Cons</b>	<b>Lib Dem</b>
1	=	1	0	0	0	0
2	=	1	1	0	0	0
3	=	1	1	1	0	0
4	=	1	1	1	1	0
5	=	1	1	1	1	1
6	=	2	1	1	1	1
7	=	2	2	1	1	1
<b>*8</b>	=	<b>2</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>
9	=	2	2	2	2	1
10	=	3	2	2	2	1
11	=	3	3	2	2	1
<b>*12</b>	=	<b>3</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>1</b>
13	=	3	3	3	3	1
14	=	4	3	3	3	1
15	=	4	4	3	3	1
16	=	4	4	3	3	2
<b>*17</b>	=	<b>5</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>*18</b>	=	<b>5</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>2</b>
19	=	5	4	4	4	2
20	=	6	4	4	4	2

\*change in allocation since the last calculation was carried out

NB – change in order of Groups since the last published table

Independent	16
Labour	13
Green	12
Conservative	11
Liberal Democrats	5
Non-aligned Free Independent	1
Non-aligned Free Independent	1
Non-aligned Free Independent	1
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>60</b>



**LANCASTER DISTRICT CORE STRATEGY**

**23<sup>rd</sup> July 2008**

**Report of Corporate Director – Regeneration**

<b>PURPOSE OF REPORT</b>
<b>To formally adopt the Lancaster District Core Strategy as the key component of the Council’s Local Development Framework and, as such, part of the Council’s Policy Framework</b>
<b>This report is public</b>

**RECOMMENDATIONS OF CORPORATE DIRECTOR - REGENERATION**

***That the Lancaster District Core Strategy be adopted as a Local Development Document***

***That the Forward Planning Team be congratulated for making the Council the first in the North West to adopt a Core Strategy under the reformed planning system***

**Introduction**

1. Lancaster City Council’s Core Strategy has been found sound. It is the first such strategy in the North West of England to pass this test and as such Lancaster City Council is pioneering the introduction of the reformed Development Plan system. A facsimile of the approved Core Strategy can be viewed on the LDF section of the Council’s website.
2. Members will recall that the Local Development Framework (LDF) is the collection of documents which replaces the Lancaster District Local Plan. Core Strategy identifies the overall spatial vision for the District. It identifies broad locations for new development and sets the strategic framework for the preparation of other LDF documents such as land allocation policies, development management policies and action area plans.
3. The reformed Development Plan system is meant to produce plans which are shorter, clearer, quicker to produce and more flexible. The Core Strategy is 69 pages long. Lancaster City Council’s adopted Local Plan is more than 200. The Core Strategy contains 18 policies. The Local Plan contains 156. The Local Plan took nine years to proceed from commencement to adoption. The Core Strategy has taken

three and a half years. The Local Plan Inquiry took 8 months and the Inspector took more than a year to submit his report. The Core Strategy examination involved two weeks of formal hearings and the Inspector delivered his initial report for fact checking in ten weeks and his final report in thirteen weeks.

4. Whilst the Local Plan is a more comprehensive document, it appears that the new process produces quicker and more succinct results. At the same time, the new system is a great deal more resource intensive and a substantial evidence base was required to justify the Strategy. It should also be noted that one of the main reasons why the Core Strategy has progressed quickly is because of the preparation of a vast body of supporting evidence by the Forward Planning Team;
5. Lancaster City Council's Core Strategy sets out a vision of Lancaster District as 'a sustainable, self contained and varied group of communities which will lead the North West in its quality of life, environment and design standards. The main elements of the Strategy are;
  - The concentration of most new development on Previously Developed Land within existing urban areas;
  - A strong emphasis on sustainable development and policy criteria to ensure that new development is as sustainable as possible;
  - Policies to maximise the economic benefit of the Higher Education sector;
  - The identification of the regeneration of Morecambe as the District's No 1 regeneration priority;
  - The identification of other regeneration priority areas at Luneside, South Heysham, Central Lancaster, White Lund, East Lancaster and Carnforth;
  - Policies to manage the impact of the Heysham-M6 link road and maximise sustainable transport choices;
6. Issues and Options Consultation for the Core Strategy was carried out throughout 2005. Preferred Options consultation was carried out in the spring of 2006. The original submission date of August 2006 was postponed to May 2007 in order to consider the implications of a number of early Core Strategies by other authorities being found unsound. In the intervening period, the opportunity was taken to reinforce the evidence base with additional material on flood risk and recreation needs. The Strategy was submitted in May 2007. The Pre-Examination Meeting took place on 6<sup>th</sup> December 2007 and the Independent Examination was held in March. The Inspector submitted his binding report on June 12<sup>th</sup>, more than a month ahead of schedule.

## **Independent Examination**

7. The Core Strategy was subject to Independent Examination by an Inspector (Mr Stephen Pratt). The oral hearings took place between March 4<sup>th</sup> and March 14<sup>th</sup> 2008. In addition, the Inspector considered representations made by means of written representations. Unlike Local Plan Inquiries where objections to the plan are considered individually, in an Independent Examination, the Inspector's brief is to consider the Strategy against nine tests of soundness. These are;
  - i) The DPD has been prepared in accordance with the Local Development Scheme;

- ii) The DPD has been prepared in compliance with the Statement of Community Involvement (SCI), or the minimum requirements set out in the regulations where no SCI exists;
  - iii) The plan and its policies have been subjected to Sustainability Appraisal;
  - iv) The plan is a spatial plan which is consistent with national planning policy and in general conformity with the Regional Spatial Strategy;
  - v) It has had regard to the authority's Community Strategy;
  - vi) The strategies/policies/allocations in the plan are coherent and consistent within and between Development Plan Documents prepared by the authority and by neighbouring authorities, where cross boundary issues are relevant;
  - vii) The strategies/policies/allocations represent the most appropriate in all the circumstances, having considered the relevant alternatives, and they are founded on a robust and credible evidence base
  - viii) There are clear mechanisms for implementation and monitoring
  - ix) It is reasonably flexible to enable it to deal with changing circumstances
8. As part of the examination process, the Council prepared an extensive Soundness Self Assessment document which was commended by the Inspector for its thoroughness.
9. The Inspector considers the soundness of the whole document irrespective of whether objections have been raised. Objections are considered insofar as they call the soundness of the document into question. The Inspector does not give a detailed response to each individual objection. Like a Structure Plan Examination in Public, issues are grouped into themes. **The recommendations in the Inspectors Report are binding.** This means that the Council is obliged to accept the changes required by the Inspector if it wishes to adopt the Core Strategy.
10. The Inspector considered the representations made. He submitted his draft report the Council for fact checking on 23<sup>rd</sup> May and his final report on 12<sup>th</sup> June. A copy of the Inspector's report can be viewed on the Forward Planning page of the Council's website. He concluded that subject to minor changes suggested by the Council and a few minor modifications, he was satisfied that the Core Strategy met all nine tests and was sound. The Inspector has very little discretion to make changes to the submission strategy. Accordingly the changes which he requires are minor matters of clarification and updating and do not affect the overall substance of the Strategy. Some of the required changes are;
- Inclusion of reference to the sequential test for new development included in the emerging Regional Spatial Strategy which , namely:
    - first, using buildings (including conversions) within settlements and previously developed land within settlements;
    - second, using other suitable infill opportunities within settlements where compatible with other RSS policies;

- third, the development of other land where this is well located in relation to housing, jobs other services and infrastructure, normally on the fringes of settlements.
- An amendment to Policy EC1 sought to direct Lancaster University related development to the existing built up part of the Campus. Following representations from the University, the Inspector required that the policy be amended to allow development outside this area where special justification is demonstrated;
- In relation to the Heysham M6 Road, the Inspector requires that the sentence of Para 6.18. of the Strategy which read *'This application has been called in by the Government and a decision is not due until later in 2007'* be updated to read ***'Following a public inquiry in July/August 2007, this road scheme was approved by the Secretary of State in February 2008'***

The inspector also identified Affordable Housing, Planning Obligations and Climate Change as areas which should be prioritised in the next tranche of LDF documents.

### **What Happens Next**

11. The Inspector's recommendations as described in Paragraph 10 are binding. This means that the Council in adopting the Core Strategy must include the amendments required by the Inspector. A mock-up of the adopted Core Strategy can be viewed on the LDF section of the Council's website. Adoption will mean publishing a Statutory Notice of Adoption and notifying all persons who requested to be notified throughout the process. There will then be a six week period during which a High Court Challenge to the document may be made.
12. Work will then start on the next tranche of LDF documents. A revised Local Development Scheme is currently in preparation which will set these out. Matters which will require coverage include Development Management Policies, Land Allocations and any necessary Action Area plans.

### **OPTIONS APPRAISAL**

***Note) The Inspector's Report is binding in that the Council cannot make additional changes to the Core Strategy or refuse to accept the Inspector's recommendations.***

13. The Council must adopt the Core Strategy subject to the changes recommended by the Inspector unless it wishes to start the 3 year preparation process again from the beginning. Adoption of the Core Strategy would put in place the cornerstone of the Local Development Framework. It will give the District an up-to-date spatial planning strategy to guide investment and decisions on development in the District. It will mainstream sustainable development within the Council's spatial policy framework.
14. The development of the Core Strategy is a major step forward in modernising the Council's planning policy framework. The Council is now leading the reform of the planning system in the North West. The Strategy ensures that sustainability considerations are hardwired into the planning process. It provides a strategic basis for the regeneration of the District. It sets a framework for achieving high quality design. It provides a foundation for the next generation of LDF documents including land allocations and action areas.



**RECOMMENDATION**

*That the Lancaster District Core Strategy, as amended by the changes required by the Inspector, be adopted as a Local Development Framework Document*

*That the Forward Planning Team be thanked for making the Council the first in the North West to adopt a Core Strategy under the reformed planning system*

<p><b>RELATIONSHIP TO POLICY FRAMEWORK</b> The Adopted Core Strategy will be the cornerstone of the Local Development Framework Document and a key element of the Council's Policy Framework.</p>	
<p><b>CONCLUSION OF IMPACT ASSESSMENT</b>  <b>Diversity;</b> A wide variety of community and interest groups were consulted in preparing the Core Strategy.  <b>Human Rights;</b> The Council has had full regard to the Human Rights Act in preparing the Core Strategy;  <b>Community Safety;</b> Policy SC6 of the Core Strategy addresses Community Safety  <b>Sustainability</b> The Core Strategy is a vital means to ensure that sustainability is given full weight in decisions on planning applications, site allocations and other Council strategies. Policy SC1 deals with sustainability  <b>Personnel</b> None  <b>Rural Proofing</b> Policy SC3 deals with rural communities and envisages a strong role for parish councils in shaping their area.</p>	
<p><b>FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS</b> There are no uncostered or unbudgeted proposals in the Core Strategy and therefore there are no direct financial implications arising from adopting the Strategy.</p>	
<p><b>SECTION 151 OFFICER'S COMMENTS</b> The s151 Officer has been consulted and has no further comments.</p>	
<p><b>LEGAL IMPLICATIONS</b> Under Section 38(3) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, the development plan is                  (a) the regional spatial strategy, and                  (b) The development plan documents (taken as a whole) [including the Core Strategy] which have been adopted or approved in relation to that area.                  Under Section 38 (6) If regard is to be had to the development plan for the purpose of any determination to be made under the planning Acts the determination must be made in accordance with the plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise.</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> Town and Country Planning (Local Development)(England) Regulations 2004, HMSO</p>	<p><b>Contact Officer: Dan Hudson</b> <b>Telephone:X2329</b> <b>E-mail:dhudson@lancaster.gov.uk</b></p>

ODPM, (2004) Planning Policy Statement 12:  
Local Development Frameworks, HMSO  
Submission Lancaster District Core Strategy  
May 2007;  
Inspector's Report into Lancaster District Core  
Strategy June 2008



## Irish Sea Region Platform 23<sup>rd</sup> July 2008

### Report of Corporate Director (Regeneration)

#### PURPOSE OF REPORT

To consider whether the Council should become a member of the Irish Sea Regions Platform, as a basis for future partnership working with the regions around the Irish Sea on common issues and projects.

**This report is public**

#### RECOMMENDATIONS

**(1) That the Council signs the declaration of Intent to become a member of the Irish Sea Region Platform**

##### 1.0 Introduction

1.1 Within the European Union there is considerable support in terms of policy and funding for the development of longer term partnerships at the macro level. Potentially such partnerships offer many benefits where regions have combined interests and are acting together to influence policy, seek solutions and access funding. The administrations around the Irish Sea have now established a partnership, the Irish Sea Region Platform, which brings together marine, spatial, economic and cultural interests. The Council has been asked to join this arrangement by signing a Declaration of Intent.

Other administrations in Europe are already finding this type of cross border collaboration to be useful. As an example, the administrations around the Baltic Sea are currently taking a similar approach and this has been well received in European institutions, including the Committee of the Regions.

The Irish Sea Region Platform was initially set up in 2007 and is made up of representatives from Ireland, North West England, Isle of Man and the devolved administrations of Scotland, Wales and Northern Ireland. In reality there are six different 'states', each with its own distinct form of government, and economic characteristics - The Republic of Ireland, The Province of Northern Ireland, The Principality of Wales, the North West Region of England, Scotland and the Crown Protectorate of the Isle of Man. Although they all share a common resource - the Irish Sea, their policies, trade, business, commercial and cultural interests are quite diverse.

The initial focus of the Irish Sea Region Platform was to respond to the impending UK Marine Bill and indicated the need for new links and networks between the 6 different administrations around the Irish Sea. Whilst this collaborative approach was initially around marine spatial planning systems, it is very clear that there are other shared issues for the regions around the Irish Sea where a joint approach could deliver benefits.

The Platform, or partnership, will provide the 'region' with a collective voice which can be used to influence policy development and assist the 'region' to be recognised throughout Europe and globally as a recognised entity for economic activity. There is current collaboration on a range of issues which present both opportunities and threats to the development of the Irish Sea region.

Initiatives currently under development include:

- Ecosystem based marine spatial planning – maximising value of goods and services to sustainable development.
- Cities for Co-operation – cities and city regions connectivity
- Enterprise Strategy for the Irish Sea Region – assisting competitiveness in the creative and knowledge economies
- Irish Sea Cruise Programme – promotion of the Irish Sea as a cruising destination  
Transport Framework –assessment of UK – Ireland transport challenges

## **2.0 Proposal Details**

2.1 The Leader of the Council represents Lancashire on the North West Regional European Partnership (NWREP), which steers European policy for the North West region. NWREP is currently supporting the development of the Irish Sea Region Platform and has requested that North West coastal authorities consider signing a Declaration of Intent, which sets the scene for future collaborative working. The request will also be forwarded to other Lancashire coastal authorities via the Lancashire European Advisory Group.

As context for this proposal there is currently a strong encouragement to work across administrative boundaries from national government and from the European Union. In many cases this will be essential in order to gain access to external funding to support key initiatives but there are also advantages in sharing understanding, best practice and resources, developing solutions to common issues and working within a competitive Europe at the macro level.

Lancaster District has some important strategic assets and opportunities that are very relevant within the context of the Irish Sea region and can potentially gain added value from the opportunities to work with other strategic partners. These include the Port of Heysham, a potential new link road that opens up the East - West transport corridor, a reviving coastal town and an historic city, a rural area that acts as a gateway to the North, two Universities and a growing local economy. In addition, the Morecambe Bay Regional Park initiative also offers the potential to work jointly with partners based on community of interest regardless of artificial administrative boundaries and will have many common issues with the Irish Sea Regions Platform.

If the Council wishes to sign the Declaration of Intent, this does not imply support for any specific projects generated within the Irish Sea Region Platform. Such projects would need to be considered separately as part of normal Council decision making processes. However, some limited officer time would be required to monitor developments and to attend approximately six meetings a year.

### 3.0 Details of Consultation

3.1 It is likely that there would be future consultation requirements arising from specific project activity.

### 4.0 Options and Options Analysis (including risk assessment)

#### 4.1

Option	Advantages	Disadvantages	Risks
Join the Irish Sea Region Platform	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Potential access to additional external funds.</li> <li>• Potential to participate in and influence regional, Irish Sea and European agendas.</li> <li>• Sharing of information and resources with other Irish Sea partners.</li> <li>• A platform for working on key issues with other strategic partnerships across Europe.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Some officer time required to monitor developments and attend meetings.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Opportunity risks arising from access to funding and efficient/shared use of resources</li> </ul>
Decline the opportunity to join the Irish Sea Region Platform	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No officer time required.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• More difficult to access EU funds such as Interreg</li> <li>• Reliance on regional bodies to influence policy on behalf of the District</li> <li>• Reduced access to information and no opportunity to share resources to develop key projects.</li> <li>• Exclusion from a potentially important network dealing with strategic issues of local interest</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Risk of loss of access to funding opportunities</li> </ul>

### 5.0 Conclusion

5.1 The location of the District within the Irish Sea 'region' and the links with Irish Sea partners in relation to marine issues, transport, economy, culture and heritage, indicate the potential to work very usefully in partnership on projects and issues that are directly relevant to the District. This seems, therefore, like a good opportunity to add value to the local agenda. A limited investment of officer time would be required to monitor developments and attend meetings although any specific projects arising would need to be considered as part of the Council's normal decision making processes.

**CONCLUSION OF IMPACT ASSESSMENT**

**(including Diversity, Human Rights, Community Safety, Sustainability and Rural Proofing)**

Any project proposals that might arise would need to be fully appraised and would necessarily consider any impacts before approval.

**FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS**

There are no direct financial implications although there is the requirement for some limited officer time to monitor developments and attend up to six meetings per annum. This would be managed as part of day to day work in the Regeneration Directorate. Any specific proposals that might arise could have financial implications but these would be considered at that time as part of normal Council decision making processes.

**SECTION 151 OFFICER'S COMMENTS**

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

**LEGAL IMPLICATIONS**

There are no legal implications arising from this report.

**MONITORING OFFICER'S COMMENTS**

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

**BACKGROUND PAPERS**

Irish Sea Region Platform – Declaration of Intent

**Contact Officer:** Anne Marie Harrison

**Telephone:** 01524 582308

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

**Ref:** [Click here and type Ref, if applicable]

# IRISH SEA REGION PLATFORM



# Declaration of Intent

February, 2008

A Declaration of Intent by the Cities and Regions of the Irish Sea to establish a programme of mutually beneficial joint co-operation

## **Introduction**

The greater integration of the European Union in recent years has seen an increasing emphasis on cross-border links. In terms of EU policy making, the original interest was with land borders, however, growing levels of trade and co-operation between the countries of the European Union has meant that cross-border areas became more significant. Ireland and the United Kingdom, being island states, have a strong dependence on cross-border co-operation and this dependence is even greater since the recent enlargement of the European Union, which has seen the west coast of the United Kingdom and the island of Ireland become, in many respects, more peripheral from mainland Europe.

The Irish Sea provides important links between the island of Ireland, the Isle of Man and the UK. This maritime area is effectively a member state border zone with its own characteristics, very different from those of a land border. The Irish Sea is, therefore, of high importance not only to all surrounding regions but also to the further development of Ireland and United Kingdom in a European context. There are various strategic interests operating in and around the Irish Sea as well as many overlapping uses, and this, together with the fact that there has never been coherent planning of the area forms the context for the development of an Irish Sea Region Platform.

The Irish Sea Region Platform, which comprises all of the regions of the Irish Sea working in a collaborative and cohesive manner will address, among other things, the challenges the Irish Sea faces as a result increased urbanisation, tourism, fishing, sporting, energy consumption, economic and port uses, etc. The Irish Sea Platform also offers a valuable and rare opportunity for co-operation to encourage a partnership approach bringing together cities, universities, marine and environmental professionals, transport, fishing, energy, business and public administrations to identify, develop and deliver a range of innovative projects, which taken together, will result in the coherent development of the Irish Sea region.

## **Balanced economic development**

The European Union is, currently, dominated economically by the London-Hamburg-Munich-Milan-Paris Pentagon which is a zone of global economic



significance. The European Spatial Development Perspective (ESDP), which aims to encourage the balanced spatial development of the European Union based on polycentric development, argues that other zones should be developed to counteract this Pentagon. The Irish Sea, which is of high economic importance to the surrounding regions, provides a unique opportunity for the collectively development of this zone as a potential counterbalance to this Pentagon. For example, as well as the marine aspect, there are many regions, cities and towns surrounding the Irish Sea who working together could be motors of growth, jobs, innovation and technology for the Irish Sea area, bringing together business, academia and public administrations as well as providing centres of learning and cultural. The Irish Sea area has the potential to be placed at the cutting edge of European competitiveness.

### **TERRITORIAL AGENDA FOR THE EUROPEAN UNION**

Building upon the ESDP principle of an integrated view of the whole European continent the Territorial Agenda will aid the development of a polycentric, competitive, attractive and balanced urban system and strengthening of the partnership between urban and rural areas.

The Irish Sea Region, in the context of the Territorial Agenda, will contribute to improved and renewed urban and rural partnerships within its own territorial area and thus to a more competitive and sustainable Europe. The Irish Sea Region aim to achieve this through the use of a trans-sectoral and proactive approach to urban-rural relationships and interdependencies across the Irish Sea regions and a framework for joint regional and sub-regional policies and strategies. Through increased cooperation the facilitation of increased competitiveness and innovation will subsequently be fostered across the urban and rural landscape of the Irish Sea area.

### **OUR PRINCIPLES FOR CO-OPERATION**

There is a long history of common activity in and around the Irish Sea such as fishing, transport, migration and culture. Reflecting this, there are various completed and current co-operation projects at EU and Member State level on

particular topics, for example, the DEFRA pilot marine spatial planning project, the INTERREG A Wales-Ireland cross border programme, the NETA (North European Trade Axis) initiative and the Dublin-Belfast-Merseyside initiative.

The Irish Sea Region Platform provides the opportunity for all regions and sectors in and surrounding the Irish Sea and the Isle of Man, to work together to provide opportunities to, not only develop new projects, but also to be aware of developments in other sectors which may have a wide impact. It is our intention that this initiative will go some way to help resolve areas of conflict or at least to provide the opportunity for a clearer understanding of the issues and difficulties each sector faces, operating in the Irish Sea. Our principles for co-operation are based on the following principles:-

- building on the existing strong links and synergies between the cities, regions and ports
- focusing on shared priority themes for action
- seeking an integrated basis for action through a programme-based approach
- realising tangible and practical benefits to be gained through territorial co-operation
- linking actions to current and proposed strategies/action plans for the respective regions, the Member States and the European Union.

### **OUR PRIORITY THEMES FOR CO-OPERATION**

The Irish Sea can be viewed as a 'common resource' and opportunity for all surrounding regions. The following four strands emerged from discussions and the Irish Sea Region will develop projects and initiatives under these heading in a strategic and integrated manner, bearing in mind the differing policies, legislation and interpretation by the various administrations:-

1. City-Region Co-operation
2. Transport/Trade Logistics
3. Future Challenges in Coastal and Marine Management
4. Maritime Spatial Resource

---

**OUR DECLARATION OF INTENT**

We, the undersigned, declare our intention to work towards a programme of mutual co-operation. In so doing we endeavour to ensure that we maximise the potential benefits to our regions by actively pursuing cross-border initiatives within the Irish Sea region and in the wider European Union.

We are prepared to work closely with our national governments and appropriate sectors, agencies and authorities to further these objectives.

We will continue to lobby support from local and regional interests and bodies; national governments; and the European Union for our efforts to intensify the links between our organisations and to create new opportunities for co-operation across the Irish Sea.

Signed: \_\_\_\_\_

Title: \_\_\_\_\_

Organisation: \_\_\_\_\_

Date: \_\_\_\_\_

# Council

## Appointments to Outside Bodies, Partnerships and Boards 23<sup>rd</sup> July 2008

### Report of Chief Executive

#### PURPOSE OF REPORT

This report enables Council to determine the basis for an appointment to a newly established outside body.

This report is public.

#### RECOMMENDATIONS

- (1) That Council agree the basis for an appointment to serve as a Council representative on the newly established North Lancashire Health and Wellbeing Group.

#### 1.0 Introduction

- 1.1 In October 2003 it was agreed that Council would determine the basis on which all appointments to outside bodies and partnerships are made. Unless otherwise requested by the outside body concerned, appointments are made to the date of the next City Council elections, subject to confirmation at each Annual Council meeting.
- 1.2 Council has the option to make any appointment on a PR basis or by virtue of a Councillor's position, such as a Cabinet Member, Committee Chairman or Ward Councillor. Where an appointment is made on the basis of PR, the appointing Group(s) may notify the Head of Democratic Services in writing of their appointment without the need for further Council approval. Where necessary, Cabinet or other Committee representatives are referred to the appropriate member body for appointment.

#### 2.0 Proposal

- 2.1 North Lancashire Teaching Primary Care Trust (PCT) is proposing to establish a Health and Wellbeing Group for North Lancashire to provide inter-agency leadership and coordination of action to improve health, reduce health inequalities, and enhance wellbeing for the population. The North Lancashire Director of Public Health has written inviting the Council to nominate an Elected Member to represent Lancaster City Council on the Group.
- 2.2 The proposal is for the Group to meet quarterly and to report to:-
- North Lancashire PCT's operational Management Executive Group
  - The Lancashire Partnership through the county-wide Health and Wellbeing Group

- Local Strategic Partnership Health and Wellbeing Thematic Groups.

North Lancashire's Director of Public Health will chair the Group.

- 2.1.1 The intention is for the Group to further strengthen collaborative working and promote consistency of approach across Lancashire as a whole.

### **3.0 Details of Consultation**

- 3.1 Not applicable

### **4.0 Options and Options Analysis (including risk assessment)**

- 4.1 As referred to in paragraph 1.3 above Council has the option to decide whether any appointment should be made on a PR basis or by virtue of a Councillor's position, such as a Cabinet Member, Committee Chairman or Ward Councillor and the most appropriate form of representation should be considered in each case.

- 4.2 Unless there is a statutory duty to participate, Council may also determine that there is no benefit to be gained from representation and decline the invitation. There is no statutory duty in respect of the invitation presented to Council in this report.

### **5.0 Conclusion**

- 5.1 Annual Council agreed the basis of all appointments to Outside Bodies, Partnerships and Boards using a combination of proportional representation and in line with a Member's role such as Ward Councillor, Cabinet member, Overview & Scrutiny member, etc.

- 5.2 Since then the Council bodies such as Cabinet and Overview & Scrutiny have made their appointments and political groups have forwarded their appointments to the Head of Democratic Services.

- 5.3 This report sets out a request to make a new appointment.

<b>CONCLUSION OF IMPACT ASSESSMENT</b> <b>(including Diversity, Human Rights, Community Safety, Sustainability and Rural Proofing)</b>
---

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

<b>FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS</b>
-------------------------------

Members of Outside Bodies are entitled to travel expenses. Any extra cost resulting from this additional appointment is not likely to be significant. Any extra cost can therefore be funded from within existing democratic representation budgets.

<b>SECTION 151 OFFICER'S COMMENTS</b>
---------------------------------------

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

**LEGAL IMPLICATIONS**

There are no legal implications.

**MONITORING OFFICER'S COMMENTS**

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

**BACKGROUND PAPERS**

Letter from North Lancashire Teaching PCT dated 23<sup>rd</sup> May 2008, which included draft terms of reference for the North Lancashire Health and Wellbeing Group.

**Contact Officer:** Debbie Chambers

**Telephone:** 01524 582057

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

## CABINET

10.00 A.M.

8TH JULY 2008

**PRESENT:-** Councillors Roger Mace (Chairman), Evelyn Archer, Jon Barry, Eileen Blamire, Abbott Bryning, Shirley Burns, Susie Charles, Jane Fletcher, John Gilbert and David Kerr.

Also in attendance:-

Councillor Tina Clifford (for minute 20)

Officers in attendance:-

Mark Cullinan	Chief Executive
Peter Loker	Corporate Director (Community Services)
Heather McManus	Corporate Director (Regeneration)
Roger Muckle	Corporate Director (Finance and Performance)
Sarah Taylor	Head of Legal and Human Resources and Monitoring Officer
Debbie Chambers	Principal Democratic Support Officer
Elizabeth Bateson	Senior Democratic Support Officer (part)
Sharon Marsh	Democratic Services (part)

### 15 MINUTES

The Minutes of the meeting held on 3<sup>rd</sup> June 2008 were approved as a correct record.

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

The Chairman advised that there was one item of Urgent Business regarding the Call-in by the Overview and Scrutiny Committee of the item previously considered by Cabinet regarding Community Cohesion (Minute 19 refers).

### 17 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Councillors Susie Charles and John Gilbert declared a personal and prejudicial interest with regard to that part of the report on the Homelessness Strategy that referred to the Citizens Advice Bureau (CAB) as members of the CAB (Minute 25 refers).

### 18 PUBLIC SPEAKING

Members were advised that there had been two requests to speak by a member of the public at the meeting in accordance with Cabinet's agreed procedure, set out in Cabinet Procedure Rule 2.7 with regard to Lancaster Science Park and Land at Scotforth Road (Minutes 21 and 29 refer).

**19 ITEM OF URGENT BUSINESS - COMMUNITY COHESION CALL-IN - OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY**

**(Cabinet Members with Special Responsibility Councillors John Gilbert and Roger Mace)**

**In accordance with Section 100B (4) of the Local Government Act 1972, the Chairman agreed to consider the report as urgent business as there was a need for a decision prior to the next meeting of Cabinet.**

The Head of Democratic Services submitted a report requesting Cabinet to consider the referral from the Overview and Scrutiny Committee as a result of the Call-in of Cabinet's decision with regard to Community Cohesion (Minute 12).

The options were set out in the report as follows:

1. Reaffirm the decision of Cabinet on 3<sup>rd</sup> June 2008. (The original report to Cabinet on Community Cohesion with appendices and relevant minute was attached to the report.)
2. Accept the recommendations either wholly or in part made by the Overview and Scrutiny Committee at the Call-in on 25<sup>th</sup> June 2008, and make resolutions in line with those recommendations.
3. Decide to spend the Area Based Grant (ABG) in some other way or defer consideration to a later meeting.

The report contained Officer comments regarding the recommendations of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee.

It was moved by Councillor Roger Mace and seconded by Councillor Evelyn Archer:-

"That recommendation 1, as set out in the report, be approved; that the items in recommendation 2 be noted and that Cabinet reconsiders the way the ABG be spent in November 2008, by which time the Local Strategic Partnership (LSP) should have options ready for consideration."

Members then voted as follows.

***Resolved Unanimously:***

- (1) That Cabinet does not appoint a Community Cohesion officer at the present time.
- (2) That recommendation 2 of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee:

"That Cabinet considers alternative ways of achieving the aims of the Corporate Plan on cohesive communities, including working with the universities. Overview and Scrutiny draws the attention of Cabinet to priority outcome 16 and highlights that:

- The Community Cohesion Strategy could be achieved through working with the LSP and voluntary sector. A future programme of spending on Community Cohesion should be based upon this strategy.



- Area Based Grant (ABG) money could be used to implement the Children and Young People Strategic Plan.
- Area Based Grant money could be used to achieve the aim of a civic programme that celebrates our heritage and benefits our communities.”

be noted.

- (3) That Cabinet reconsiders the way the ABG be spent in November 2008, by which time the Local Strategic Partnership (LSP) should have options ready for consideration.

**Officers responsible for effecting the decision:**

Chief Executive.  
Head of Democratic Services.

**Reason for making the decision:**

The decision was made in line with recommendation 1 of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee and in recognition of the need to consider how ABG for community cohesion will be allocated. The ABG can be spent according to City Council priorities and each of the issues identified in recommendation 2 are included in this years Corporate Plan Priority Outcome 16 “work to maintain a cohesive community where respect for all is valued and celebrated”.

**20 CANALS TASK GROUP FINAL REPORT**

**(Cabinet Member with Special Responsibility Councillor Susie Charles)**

***(Councillor Tina Clifford, in her capacity as Chairman of the Canals Task Group, was allowed to speak upon the item in accordance with Cabinet Procedure Rule 2.6)***

Cabinet considered a report of the findings of the Canals Task Group, seeking the agreement of Cabinet to the recommendations set out in the report.

The report made it clear that, if Cabinet approved the recommendations, each one would be scoped and developed further with all relevant services consulted as to what could realistically be achieved with the resources available. A number of recommendations would require further reports on options for implementation and the identification of potential funding.

Cabinet considered the Officer comments on the Task Group recommendations, which were set out in a covering report. With regard to recommendation 1a, asking Council to adopt a definition of a community asset, it was noted that the Authority already had a definition in use, which the Task Group had not been aware of at the time of writing its report.

It was moved by Councillor Roger Mace and seconded by Councillor Abbott Bryning:-

- “(1) That, regarding recommendation 1a, the Council retains its existing definition of a community asset.

- (2) That all other recommendations set out in the report, as far as they are capable of being taken forward within the current budget, be approved, including using existing links with the British Resorts and Destinations Association (BRADA) to pursue recommendation 4.
- (3) That a report be brought to a future meeting identifying possible funding for other recommendations within the Canals Task Group report.”

Members then voted as follows:-

***Resolved Unanimously:***

- (1) That, regarding recommendation 1a, the Council retains its existing definition of a community asset.
- (2) That all other recommendations set out in the report, as far as they are capable of being taken forward within the current budget, be approved, including using existing links with the British Resorts and Destinations Association (BRADA) to pursue recommendation 4.
- (3) That a report be brought to a future meeting identifying possible funding for other recommendations within the Canals Task Group report.

**Officers responsible for effecting the decision:**

Corporate Director (Community Services)  
 Corporate Director (Finance and Performance).  
 Head of Democratic Services  
 Head of Cultural Services  
 Head of Economic Development and Tourism  
 Head of Planning Services  
 Head of City Council (Direct) Services

**Reason for making the decision:**

The decision was taken in line with the findings and recommendations of the Overview and Scrutiny Canals Task Group.

**21 LANCASTER SCIENCE PARK**

**(Cabinet Member with Special Responsibility Councillor Abbott Bryning)**

***(Mr T Hamilton-Cox, who had registered to speak on this item in accordance with the City Council's agreed procedure and Cabinet Procedure Rule 2.7, spoke to this item)***

The Head of Economic Development & Tourism submitted a report that advised of progress with project development work for Lancaster Science Park and requested confirmation that the Council should lead the next stages of project development, including the submission of outline planning application and recruitment of a development partner.

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

**Options and Options Analysis (including risk assessment)**

<b>Option</b>	<b>Advantages</b>	<b>Disadvantages</b>	<b>Risk assessment</b>
1: Do nothing – do not proceed with the project		The opportunity to secure a regionally significant strategic employment site will be lost.  Adverse impact on the Council's relationship with NWDA and Lancaster University	The Council would be in default of its funding agreement with NWDA and its contract with the current landowner, and may face action for breach of contract with the latter. (These are primarily reputational issues rather than significant financial ones)
2: Proceed with the project as outlined in this report, seeking to transfer risk associated with the Innovation Centre to a development partner	Secures a major strategic project for the District, leading to the anticipated release of £10+ million NWDA funding	A private sector operator may take a more commercial approach towards operation of the Innovation Centre and this may reduce the level of advice and support given to tenant businesses compared with a non profit operation	Achieves the strategic benefits from the project whilst minimising ongoing operational costs and risks for the Council  Possibility that the private sector may not respond
3: Develop the Innovation Centre as a public sector project and manage it either directly or via the University	May provide the most supportive form of management for tenant businesses	NWDA would not support this approach unless option (2) has failed to attract developer interest	Leaves the Council with the risk of meeting any operational deficit in future years. Note this option would need to be the subject of a full appraisal before being considered in any detail.

The Officer preferred option was Option 2.

It was moved by Councillor Abbott Bryning and seconded by Councillor Shirley Burns:-

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

Members then voted as follows.

**Resolved:**

***(6 Members (Councillors Blamire, Bryning, Burns, Charles, Gilbert and Mace voted in favour, 2 Members (Councillors Barry and Fletcher) voted against and 2 Members (Councillors Archer and Kerr) abstained):***

- (1) That, subject to release of sufficient project development funding from the NWDA, the Corporate Director (Regeneration) be authorised to proceed with the next phases of project development, including the recruitment of a development partner on the basis outlined in the report, and commissioning of relevant specialist consultancy support.
- (2) That a further report be made back to Cabinet on the outcome of the developer recruitment and to agree the detailed terms and conditions of the development agreement.
- (3) That the Head of Financial Services be authorised to make the appropriate adjustments to the revenue and capital budgets.
- (4) That the Corporate Director (Regeneration) be authorised to make any amendments to the Memorandum of Understanding with Lancaster University if these are required to reflect the revised approach to the project, in consultation with the Head of Legal and HR and the Head of Financial Services.

**Officers responsible for effecting the decision:**

Corporate Director (Regeneration).  
Head of Economic Development & Tourism.  
Head of Financial Services.  
Head of Legal and HR.

**Reason for making the decision:**

The decision secures a major strategic project for the District, leading to the anticipated release of £10+ million NWDA funding.

Lancaster Science Park is a key strategic project for the City Council, Lancaster University, Lancashire Sub Region and North West Regional Development Agency. Now that a way forward has been identified for the highways issues, the Council is the most appropriate organisation to take the lead in taking it forward.

It is very much in the Council's interest to secure the involvement of a private sector development partner at an early stage. If successful, this will allow the Council to minimise the operational risks associated with the ongoing operation of the project.

**22 LANCASTER DISTRICT ECONOMIC VISION**

**(Cabinet Members with Special Responsibility Councillors Evelyn Archer and Abbott Bryning)**

The Corporate Director (Regeneration) submitted a report providing an update on both the management arrangements and key projects within the Lancaster District Economic Vision. It provided background to the strategic context for the Vision and funding arrangements, including the potential for regeneration funds to be delegated to the Council. The report recommended the means by which the Council might manage the development of the Vision projects and also proposed the means by which the range of projects within the Vision might be reviewed and adapted over time.

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

Options	Approach	Advantages	Disadvantages	Risks
<b>Option 1</b>	Do nothing. Initiate no changes and continue to apply for NWDA funding on a project by project basis	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>North West Development Agency (NWDA) currently undertakes the full project appraisal for all projects, whilst the Council is able to concentrate on local appraisal issues and risk</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>It is difficult to ensure that local priorities are fully recognised</li> <li>There is less opportunity to ensure that a strategic approach to the Vision is taken as each project is likely to be seen in isolation</li> <li>Performance in terms of high level outcomes and impact is very difficult to evaluate.</li> <li>Progress is slow due to additional stages in the decision making processes required.</li> <li>The level of bureaucracy is increased at all stages as there is the requirement to bring all decision making arrangements together at local and regional level.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>There are some risks to the Council as Accountable Body for individual projects. Risks include potential clawback of funds if projects fail to perform.</li> </ul>

<b>Option 2</b>	Seek a delegation of funds from NWDA to support a programme of activity in the District	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A far more strategic approach is possible that takes account of a whole programme of activity rather than individual projects. This includes the potential to forward plan against a longer timeline and capitalise on other funding opportunities that support strategic objectives</li> <li>There is an</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Council would take on additional responsibilities for project appraisal and approval arrangements</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>There are some risks to the Council as Accountable Body for a programme of activity. Risks include potential clawback if projects within the programme fail to</li> </ul>
-----------------	---	---	---	--

		<p>opportunity to increase the level of local engagement with partnerships at district level.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Performance monitoring and management would fit much better as part of a programme management approach allowing more easily for evaluation of outcomes and impacts across the district.</li> <li>• Management arrangements within the Council would be far less complex and a programme management approach would be more straightforward</li> <li>• Approval processes would be quicker and more controllable.</li> </ul>		perform.
--	--	---	--	----------

The Officer preferred option was option 2. This approach offered many benefits in terms of strategic programme management and ensuring that local priorities were fully recognised. In terms of risk, the Council had robust systems in place to identify and manage risks at both project and programme level. There was no additional risk created by accepting the Accountable Body role for a delegated fund although there was the opportunity for more local controls, which might slightly reduce risk.

It was moved by Councillor Roger Mace and seconded by Councillor Abbott Bryning:-

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

By way of an amendment to recommendation 5, which was accepted as a friendly amendment by the mover and seconder of the original proposition, it was proposed by Councillor Jon Barry and seconded by Councillor Shirley Burns:-

“That the Corporate Director (Regeneration) be asked to bring to Cabinet for approval programmes of activity relating to the Lancaster District’s Economic Vision instead of approval on a project by project basis to be the basis of negotiations with the NWDA for future delegation of funding.”

By way of amendment to recommendation 4, it was proposed by Councillor Jon Barry and seconded by Councillor Jane Fletcher:-

“That Cabinet approves the proposed strategic framework for the Economic Vision, as set out under the strategic aims in the Lancaster Sustainable Community Strategy document as a basis for attracting external funding and managing delivery and performance.”

After hearing the debate, Councillor Jon Barry as proposer, withdrew the proposed amendment to recommendation 4 with the permission of his seconder, Councillor Jane Fletcher, and the meeting.

Members then voted as follows.

**Resolved:**

***(8 Members (Councillors Archer, Blamire, Bryning, Burns, Charles, Gilbert, Kerr and Mace) voted for and 2 Members (Councillors Barry and Fletcher) abstained from voting):***

- (1) That the Corporate Director (Regeneration) is granted continuing authorisation to proceed with project development and feasibility work for currently identified Vision projects, including bidding for funds, subject to the availability of existing resources and/or external funding.
- (2) That the Corporate Director (Regeneration) is authorised to undertake investigation and development of new Vision projects requiring Council support, subject to the availability of resources and/or external funding, in order to determine their relevance and suitability to bid for funding support and gain formal Council endorsement as part of normal decision making processes.
- (3) That the Corporate Director is authorised to submit an application to North West Development Agency for further management costs to support the management and development of the Lancaster District Economic Vision for the financial years 2009/2010, 2010/2011 and 2011/2012.
- (4) That Cabinet approves the proposed strategic programme framework for the Economic Vision, as outlined in this report, as a basis for attracting external funding and managing delivery and performance.
- (5) That the Corporate Director (Regeneration) be asked to bring to Cabinet for approval programmes of activity relating to the Lancaster District's Economic Vision instead of approval on a project by project basis to be the basis of negotiations with the NWDA for future delegation of funding.
- (6) That the Head of Financial Services be authorised to update the General Fund Capital Programme and the General Fund Revenue Budget as required, subject to there being no net impact on the Council's budgets.

**Officers responsible for effecting the decision:**

Corporate Director (Regeneration).  
Head of Economic Development and Tourism.  
Head of Financial Services.

**Reason for making the decision:**

This approach offered many benefits in terms of strategic programme management and ensuring that local priorities were fully recognised. In terms of risk, the Council had robust systems in place to identify and manage risks at both project and programme level. There

was no additional risk created by accepting the Accountable Body role for a delegated fund although there was the opportunity for more local controls, which might slightly reduce risk.

## 23 LANCASHIRE MUNICIPAL WASTE STRATEGY

### (Cabinet Member with Special Responsibility Councillor Jon Barry)

The Head of City Council (Direct) Services submitted a report that informed members of the implications of adopting the revised waste strategy 'Rubbish to Resources' for Lancashire 2008 to 2020 and requested a decision on the course of action regarding adoption of the strategy.

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

Option	Pro	Con
Cabinet resolves to adopt the strategy in principle and to delegate the acceptance of the final version of the document to the appropriate Cabinet member	The taking up of this option will enable the Council to formally adopt the new strategy within the allocated time scale. This would be beneficial to the County Council in order for it to proceed with plans in respect of waste disposal. Lancaster City Council are already a member of the Lancashire Waste Partnership that has developed the strategy to date and have already signed up to the cost sharing arrangement.	Cabinet will not have the opportunity to consider any amendments to the Strategy that have resulted from the public consultation process
Cabinet resolves to await the publication of the final version of the strategy document prior to deciding upon the adoption of the strategy	A decision in respect the Council's adopting the new strategy and remaining in the Lancashire Waste Partnership will be taken by Cabinet	The awaiting of the final version of the document will delay the publication of the finalised Waste Strategy. This in turn, could delay planning within the County
Cabinet resolves not to adopt the strategy and withdraw from the Lancashire Waste Partnership.	None	The Council lose the benefits of partnership working, together with Cost Sharing payments

The Officer preferred option was that Cabinet agree to adopt the Strategy in principle and that the decision to adopt the Strategy, once the final version had been published, be delegated to the appropriate Cabinet member.



It was proposed by Councillor Jon Barry and seconded by Councillor Evelyn Archer:-

- “(1) That the recommendations, as set out in the report, be approved, with the addition that recommendation 1 is approved in principle, subject to financial capacity.
- (2) That Cabinet receives a report on the Middleton Recycling and Re-use Plant.”

Members then voted as follows.

***Resolved Unanimously:***

- (1) That Cabinet adopt in principle, subject to financial capacity, the New Waste Management Strategy ‘Rubbish to Resources’ for Lancashire 2008 to 2020.
- (2) The Cabinet delegate the final adoption of the Strategy to the appropriate Cabinet Member, and subject to the budget framework being updated accordingly.
- (3) That a further report providing options for the implementation of the Strategy and its impact on the Medium Term Financial Strategy (MTFS) will be presented to Cabinet in September 2008.
- (4) That Cabinet receives a further report on the Middleton Recycling and Re-use Plant.

**Note:** Councillor John Gilbert was not present when the vote was taken.

**Officers responsible for effecting the decision:**

Corporate Director (Community Services).  
Head of City Council (Direct Services).

**Reason for making the decision:**

This decision enables the Council to formally adopt the new strategy within the allocated time scale. This will be beneficial to the County Council in order for it to proceed with plans in respect of waste disposal.

The Council is already a member of the Lancashire Waste Partnership that has developed the strategy to date and has already signed up to the cost sharing arrangement.

**24 CAPITAL PROGRAMME FOR PRIVATE SECTOR HOUSING**

**(Cabinet Member with Special Responsibility Councillor David Kerr)**

The Corporate Director (Community Services) submitted a report seeking the approval of Cabinet for the allocation of the Regional Housing Board funding between the Winning Back Morecambe’s West End, Poulton Renewal Area and Disabled Facilities Grants (DFG).

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

To continue with the Council's commitment to providing Disabled Facilities Grants it was suggested that in 2008/09 £323,333 (mandatory) and £39,667 (discretionary) grant be 'top-sliced' from the Regional Housing Board allocation. The remaining £918,000 to be split between Winning Back Morecambe's West End and the Poulton Renewal Area. In future years, the discretionary element of the DFG's would cease to be provided from this source.

		2008/09 £'000	2009/10 £'000	2010/11 £'000
Allocation (assumed continuation at 08/09 level)		1,281	1,281	1,281
DFG Proposed Budget		363	323	323
Available for Housing Regeneration		918	958	958
<b>Option 1</b> (as Existing – 60% WE 40% Poulton)	West End Poulton	551 367	575 383	575 383
<b>Option 2</b> (70% WE 30% Poulton)	West End Poulton	643 275	670 287	670 287
<b>Option 3</b> (recommended proposal) 75% WE 25% Poulton. The Poulton allocation reducing to reflect programme completion.	West End Poulton	689 230	718 239	718 239

The Officer preferred option was Option 3.

It was moved by Councillor David Kerr and seconded by Councillor Shirley Burns:-

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

Members then voted as follows.

***Resolved Unanimously:***

- (1) That Option 3 and the Disabled Facilities Grant funding from the capital allocation of the Regional Housing Board be approved, and that the Capital Programme be updated accordingly.

**Officers responsible for effecting the decision:**

Corporate Director (Community Services).  
Head of Health and Strategic Housing.  
Head of Financial Services

**Reason for making the decision:**

The decision is consistent with previous Cabinet decisions and will continue to support the Winning Back Morecambe's West End, Poulton Renewal Area and Disabled Facilities Grants.

**25 HOMELESSNESS STRATEGY****(Cabinet Member with Special Responsibility Councillor John Gilbert)**

The Corporate Director (Community Services) submitted a report requesting Members to approve the Homelessness Strategy 2008 – 2013, which was provided as an appendix to the report. The report provided details of the consultation undertaken as part of the development of the strategy.

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

Cabinet could approve the Strategy recommended by the Steering Group.

This would allow the Council to meet the requirement to produce a Strategy by the end of July 2008 and implementation could commence. CAB would be free to tender for advice and support services.

Cabinet could approve the Strategy subject to one or both of the following:

1. Add commissioning specialist housing advice
2. Delete the reference to free food for people in tenancies (so the current practice of free food for both the homeless and those in tenancies would remain)

or

Revert to the original Steering Group proposal that no free food at all should be on offer from those with Service Level Agreements

This would allow the Council to meet the requirement to produce a Strategy by July 2008 and implementation could commence.

**Commissioning specialist housing advice** - the action plan includes tendering contracts for Service Level Agreements (SLAs) with voluntary organisations: the total budget for such SLAs is £85,600 in 2008/9 (this does not include the funding for Portland St which comes from a separate and time limited stream of funding, though administered through an SLA with YMCA). There is no planned provision for increasing the SLA budget.

If specialist housing advice was to be commissioned, as proposed by CAB, then this will have to be addressed within the tendering exercise. As noted above, the implication is for either a reduction in other aspects of the service, or an increase in costs. The following points should be noted:

- The specialist housing advice that CAB propose providing is already provided by them to those on low enough incomes to qualify for Legal Aid.

CAB receive funding from the Legal Services Commission (LSC) to provide this service.

- Those on slightly higher incomes are ruled out by the LSC.
- CAB see this specialist advice as particularly assisting those struggling with mortgage arrears.
- Less money would be available for the provision of general housing advice and support services through other SLAs – the current SLA contracts cover services such as helping people access private sector accommodation which prevents homelessness.
- There are also no other local organisations that could compete for the specialist work that CAB propose.

**Free food** - the reference to free food for those in tenancies could be deleted. The following points should be noted:

- Council Housing Services are experiencing problems with tenants housed from Homeless Action Service's Edward St centre when the link with the centre is maintained. This causes problems for neighbours, particularly in sheltered schemes, or when the tenant is vulnerable and unable to control the behaviour of their visitors from the Centre. Floating support is available to tenants and those from Edward St should be accessing this to learn independence.
- Similar problems have been experienced in RSL supported housing schemes (hostels) such as Carr Gomm and Stonham. In addition, those living in this type of accommodation have support available to them to learn how to be independent and it is difficult to get residents to engage if the option of free food is available.
- A counter argument from the Homeless Action Service is that the continued contact helps people get through a transitional stage.
- It is also argued that the provision of free food helps substance misusers to remain healthier than they would otherwise be: they would not otherwise spend their benefit money on food.
- The City Council do not directly fund the free food service, which is provided through donations of money and in kind from shops and harvest festivals.
- If free food is provided to those who are homeless but not when housed, this may act as a disincentive to rough sleepers to move into accommodation – this argument can be used to either argue for continuing with free food for those in tenancies, or an argument for why no free food at all should be on offer.

Cabinet could approve the Strategy, subject to further amendments required by Members.

Cabinet could reject the Strategy.

The Officer preferred option was that Cabinet approve the Strategy recommended by the Steering Group.

***(It was noted that Councillors Susie Charles and John Gilbert had previously declared a personal and prejudicial interest in the following item as Members of the CAB. They both left the meeting prior to consideration of matters in the report relating to their interest.)***

Councillor Jon Barry proposed and Councillor Jane Fletcher seconded:-

“That the commissioning of specialist housing advice be considered on renewal of the SLA with the CAB”.

Members then voted as follows:-

***Resolved Unanimously (8 Members):***

- (1) That the commissioning of specialist housing advice be considered on renewal of the SLA with the CAB.

***(Councillors Susie Charles and John Gilbert rejoined the meeting.)***

It was moved by Councillor John Gilbert and seconded by Councillor David Kerr:-

“That the Homelessness Strategy 2008-13, as appended to the report, be approved, subject to any cost implications being referred back to Cabinet to be considered as part of the 2009/10 budget exercise.”

Members then voted as follows.

***Resolved Unanimously:***

- (1) That the Homelessness Strategy 2008-13 be approved, subject to any cost implications being referred back to Cabinet to be considered as part of the 2009/10 budget exercise. .

**Officer responsible for effecting the decision:**

Corporate Director (Community Services).

**Reason for making the decision:**

The decision would allow the Council to meet its requirement to produce a Strategy by the end of July 2008 and implementation could commence. Actions that had resource implications would be considered further as part of the 2009/10 budget exercise.

**26 REVIEW OF STAFF AND MEMBER PERMITS AND CHARGES**

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

The Chief Executive submitted a report presenting a review of Employee and Elected Member permits and charges.

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

Option 1 was to approve the principle of an increase with a stepped increase over a number of years to reduce the gap with the full cost of the permit. This will give employees more time to adjust to the new arrangements and to find alternative methods of travel. It is likely to result in a reduction of permits sold to staff over time but whether

there would be any effect on traffic congestion and carbon emissions depends on how those staff eventually decide to travel to work.

Option 2 was to provide an option as recommended by the JCC which would reduce employee and Elected Member permits from seven day a week use to a five day a week permit. Officers propose that this should be at the current staff permit cost. In most cases, this would involve a reduction to Monday to Friday use but would allow for use by staff who are required, for example, to work weekends as part of their 5 day working pattern. This could be combined with limiting the use of the permit to the permit holder only. Together this would reduce the maximum potential car parking usage by a significant amount but avoid the stepped increase set out in option 1.

A sub-option 2a would be in line with the JCC recommendation 4, to charge part time staff on a pro rata basis (number of hours worked per week divided by 37, and multiplied by the permit charge). The permit would then be valid only for use during their working hours. It is anticipated that such an arrangement could be difficult to enforce due to the range of part time hours worked by different staff across the authority. Consideration of how this could happen would need to be undertaken should this option be chosen.

Option 3 would be to retain the option of a seven day a week permit at a cost to be agreed that is in excess of the proposed five day permit. It should be noted that this would be in addition to the introduction of a five day permit.

Option 4 would be to review employee and Elected Member permit charges in line with the annual review of fees and charges in order to meet parking and budgetary commitments. This is effectively the "do nothing" option as it follows existing practice.

A further option (Option 5) could be combined with options 1, 2, 3 or 4, but would have further enhancements that include Green Badge parking and discounted bus travel. This may result in an increased number of fuel efficient vehicles being used by staff or a general move to public transport and is in line with the recommendations made by the JCC.

In all options there is also the opportunity to consider the parking practices that are currently in place. In particular there is an option to remove the specific parking permits that are available for The Wash at Lancaster Town Hall and make these spaces available to visitors to the Town Hall. In addition all permits could become personal to the permit holder and also during working hours only. This does have difficulties in enforcement as reflected in cabinet's resolution in December 2006 when existing practices were maintained. Furthermore, should a decision be taken to subsidise permits for essential users only, it may be possible to consider alternative parking arrangements for the smaller group of staff that fall into this category and allow them to use short stay car parks which are nearer to their work base.

In all options, although particularly where there is a new form of permit being provided e.g. a five day permit, the lead in time to amend the Off-Street Parking Places Order would suggest that the implementation of the recommendations should be effective from 1<sup>st</sup> April 2009 so that the employee, Member and public permit renewal dates become aligned and to ensure that all parking charges be determined at the same time.

The Officer preferred option was Options 2 (with option 2a) and 5 with an implementation date of 1<sup>st</sup> April 2009.

Recommendations to Cabinet from the Joint Consultative Committee (JCC) meeting held on 16<sup>th</sup> June 2008 were also included in the report as follows:

- (1) That the employee, Member and public permit renewal dates be realigned to ensure that all parking charges be determined and introduced at the same time.
- (2) That permit charges be increased no higher than the rate of inflation, with effect from the 1<sup>st</sup> April 2009.
- (3) That there be an option for employee and Member permits to be used 24 hours, 5 days, per business week.
- (4) That part-time staff be charged pro-rata.
- (5) That subsidised bus travel at sensible rates be looked at.

It was moved by Councillor Roger Mace and seconded by Councillor David Kerr:-

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

By way of an amendment, it was proposed by Councillor Jon Barry and seconded by Councillor Jane Fletcher :-

- “(1) That the word ‘Member’ be deleted from recommendation 1; that the word ‘all’ be replaced in recommendation 3 with the word ‘public’ and that two further recommendations be added:-
- (2) Recommendation 5: that Members do not have access to a subsidised permit but that parking costs be reimbursed when on council business.
- (3) Recommendation 6: that discounted bus travel be negotiated with Stagecoach as part of the Council’s Business Travel Plan.

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

Councillor Jon Barry then proposed a further amendment, seconded by Councillor Jane Fletcher, for a fifth recommendation be added to the four existing recommendations in the report:-

“That discounted bus travel, at no additional cost to the Council, be negotiated with Stagecoach as part of the Council’s Business Travel Plan.”

3 Members (Councillors Barry, Fletcher and Gilbert) voted in favour of the amendment, 7 Members (Councillors Archer, Blamire, Bryning, Burns, Charles, Kerr and Mace) voted against, whereupon the Chairman declared the amendment to be lost.

Members then voted on the original proposition.

**Resolved:**

***(8 Members voted in favour (Councillors Archer, Blamire, Bryning, Burns, Charles, Gilbert, Kerr and Mace) and 2 Members voted against (Councillors Barry and Fletcher).***

- (1) That the Employee, Member and Public permit renewal dates be realigned to ensure that all parking charges be determined and introduced at the same time, namely at 1<sup>st</sup> April.
- (2) That charges for permits of each type be increased with effect from the 1<sup>st</sup> April 2009 by a percentage no higher than the rate of inflation since the previous setting of the charge for that permit.
- (3) That with an implementation date of 1<sup>st</sup> April 2009, an option of a separately priced 5-day permit (i.e 24-5) be introduced for all permit holders (at a cost lower than the equivalent 24-7 permit).
- (4) That charges for the eight month period from 1<sup>st</sup> August 2008 to 31<sup>st</sup> March 2009 should be at the same monthly rate as for the permits expiring on 31<sup>st</sup> July that they replace.

**Officers responsible for effecting the decision:**

Chief Executive.  
Corporate Director (Regeneration).  
Head of Property.

**Reason for making the decision:**

The decision to realign employee, Member and public permit renewal dates would ensure that all parking charges could be determined and introduced at the same time and that charges for each type of permit are increased by a percentage no higher than the rate of inflation.

**27 LANCASHIRE LOCAL AREA AGREEMENT**

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

Cabinet received a report advising of the decision taken by the Chief Executive in consultation with the Leader in accordance with Minute No. 3 of 3<sup>rd</sup> June 2008.

It was reported to Cabinet on 3<sup>rd</sup> June 2008 that the Government Office North West (GONW) required that the Local Area Agreement (LAA) submission, due to be sent to GONW by the end of that week, should show lead partners against each performance target.

In order to meet that deadline, Cabinet agreed to delegate this task to the Chief Executive, in consultation with the Leader of the Council as follows (Minute No. 3 refers):

*'That Cabinet authorise the Chief Executive, in consultation with the Leader of the Council, to agree a list of lead partners for delivering the individual Lancashire Local Area Agreement targets, and further to that, to determine those targets that Lancaster City*



*Council will contribute to delivering, subject to sufficient resources being available within existing budgets.'*

The report outlined that the action taken by the Chief Executive in consultation with the Leader ensured that the Council has complied with its duty to co-operate in having regard for LAA targets and also met the designated deadline for supplying the information requested i.e. 10<sup>th</sup> June 2008. The decision would also ensure that the resources required to deliver the agreed targets are identified and considered before delivery commences and that they are consistent with the Corporate Plan.

A copy of the signed Partnership Agreement was attached to the report at Appendix B for information.

It was moved by Councillor Shirley Burns and seconded by Councillor Jane Fletcher:-

"That the recommendation to note the decisions of the Chief Executive in consultation with the Leader of the Council, as set out in the report, be approved."

Members then voted as follows.

***Resolved Unanimously:***

That the following decisions of the Chief Executive, in consultation with the Leader of the Council, be noted:

- (1) That the list of targets, attached as Appendix A to the report, that the City Council will contribute towards delivering during the lifetime of the Local Area Agreement, be agreed in principle, subject to sufficient resources either being available within existing budgets or being identified.
- (2) That the Lancashire Partnership Executive be advised of those targets by the due date (10<sup>th</sup> June 2008).
- (3) That officers undertake further work to ascertain the resources required to deliver the City Council's contribution to achieve the LAA targets agreed in (1) above.
- (4) That officers review the Council's existing Corporate Plan to ensure consistency with the targets agreed in (1) above and if amendments are required, they be reported back to full Council in due course.
- (5) That, notwithstanding the targets included in (1) above, the City Council will work with its partners in the Lancaster District Local Strategic Partnership to support the delivery/achievement of all the objectives, outcomes and targets referred to in the LAA wherever practicable.

**Officer responsible for effecting the decision:**

Chief Executive

**Reason for making the decision:**

Cabinet noted the decisions made about Lancaster City Council's contributions to the Lancashire Local Area Agreement targets for information.

## 28 ALLOCATION OF CABINET APPOINTMENTS

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

The Head of Democratic Services submitted a report that advised of those appointments to partnerships and outside bodies which required re-allocation following the resignation of Councillor Johnson from the Cabinet.

It was moved by Councillor Jon Barry and seconded by Councillor Shirley Burns:-

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

Members then voted as follows.

***Resolved Unanimously:***

That Councillor Susie Charles be appointed to fill the vacancies on the following Partnerships and Outside Bodies following the resignation from Cabinet of Councillor Tony Johnson:

- LSP Management Group substitute.
- Arnsdale and Silverdale AONB Unit Arnsdale and Silverdale AONB (Forum, Countryside Management Service and Limestone Heritage Project)
- Forest of Bowland AONB Advisory Committee
- Lancashire Rural Affairs
- Lancashire Rural Partnership
- Lancaster Canal Restoration Partnership
- North West Rural Affairs Forum
- LGA Rural Commission

**Officer responsible for effecting the decision:**

Head of Democratic Services.

**Reason for making the decision:**

The decision was to ensure that Councillor Susie Charles be appointed to the vacancies on outside bodies and partnerships relevant to her portfolio without delay.

## 29 LAND AT SCOTFORTH ROAD

**(Cabinet Member with Special Responsibility Councillor Evelyn Archer)**

*(Mr T Hamilton-Cox, who had registered to speak on this item in accordance with the City Council's agreed procedure and Cabinet Procedure Rule 2.7, spoke to this item.)*

*(The meeting adjourned at 1.05pm and re-convened at 1.25pm.)*

The Corporate Director (Regeneration) submitted a report requesting Cabinet to consider the bids that had been received for the sale of the Council's land at Scotforth Road, Lancaster.

The options and options analysis (including risk assessment) were contained within a report to be found in the exempt part of the agenda.

It was moved by Councillor Roger Mace and seconded by Councillor Shirley Burns:-

"That the report be noted."

**Resolved:**

***(9 Members voted in favour (Councillors Archer, Barry, Blamire, Bryning, Burns, Charles, Gilbert, Kerr and Mace) and 1 Member (Councillor Fletcher) abstained.***

(1) That the content of the public report be noted.

It was moved by Councillor Roger Mace and seconded by Councillor Shirley Burns:-

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

Members then voted as follows:

**Resolved:**

***(7 Members voted in favour (Councillors Archer, Bryning, Burns, Charles, Gilbert, Kerr and Mace) and 3 Members abstained (Councillors Barry, Blamire and Fletcher).***

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

It was proposed by Councillor Evelyn Archer and seconded by Councillor David Kerr:-

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

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

"That the City Council does not agree to sell the land at this stage and that future use of the land be referred to the Local Development Framework (LDF) process."

Upon being put to the vote, 2 Members voted in favour of the amendment (Councillors Barry and Fletcher) 7 Members voted against (Councillors Archer, Bryning, Burns, Charles, Gilbert, Kerr and Mace) and 1 Member (Councillor Blamire) abstained from voting, whereupon the Chairman declared the amendment to be lost.

Members then voted as follows on the original proposition:-

**Resolved:**

***(7 Members voted in favour (Councillors Archer, Bryning, Burns, Charles, Gilbert, Kerr and Mace) 2 Members voted against (Councillors Barry and Fletcher) and 1 Member abstained (Councillor Blamire).***

- (1) That the sale of land to EH Booth and Co Ltd, as outlined in Option 2 of the exempt report, be approved.
- (2) That the proposal to designate the footpath in the Council's retained land as a permissive right of way or a public footpath be included in the proposals for the overall development and if this cannot be achieved then Officers pursue such designation directly with the County Council.

**Officers responsible for effecting the decision:**

Corporate Director (Regeneration).

**Reason for making the decision:**

The reasons for making the decision were as a result of a full option appraisal process, the details of which were as set out in the public and exempt reports.

---

Chairman

(The meeting ended at 1.55 p.m.)

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

**MINUTE PUBLISHED ON FRIDAY 11<sup>th</sup> JULY 2008.**

**EFFECTIVE DATE FOR IMPLEMENTING THE DECISIONS CONTAINED IN THESE MINUTES:  
MONDAY, 21<sup>st</sup> JULY 2008.**