

CABINET

10.00 A.M.

27TH JULY 2010

PRESENT:- Councillors Stuart Langhorn (Chairman), June Ashworth, Jon Barry, Eileen Blamire, Abbott Bryning, David Kerr and Peter Robinson.

Apologies for Absence:-

Councillor Jane Fletcher

Officers in attendance:-

Mark Cullinan	Chief Executive
Peter Loker	Corporate Director (Community Services)
Roger Muckle	Corporate Director (Finance and Performance)
Nadine Muschamp	Head of Financial Services and Section 151 Officer
Graham Cox	Head of Property Services (part)
Mark Davies	Head of Environmental Services (part)
Richard Tulej	Head of Community Engagement (part)
Bill Kindon	Principal Economic Development Officer (part)
Debbie Chambers	Principal Democratic Support Officer

22 MINUTES

The minutes of the meeting held on Tuesday 22 June 2010 were approved as a correct record.

23 ITEMS OF URGENT BUSINESS AUTHORISED BY THE LEADER

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

24 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

No declarations were made at this point.

25 PUBLIC SPEAKING

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

26 REVIEW OF WINTER MAINTENANCE

(Cabinet Member with Special Responsibility Councillor Barry)

Cabinet received a report from the Head of Environmental Services to give Cabinet the necessary information to provide a response to inform Lancashire County Council's review of winter service provisions.

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

Option 1- to develop a response to each of six issues raised by the County Council as detailed in the report. This option will allow Cabinet the opportunity to inform the County Council's winter maintenance review.

Option 2- to decide not to provide a response to the issues raised by the County Council as detailed in the report. This will mean that Cabinet chooses not to inform County Council's winter maintenance review.

The officer preferred option is Option 1. Winter maintenance has a huge impact on people who live, work in and visit the District. Resources are finite, however, responding to this review gives the City and County Council the opportunity to use them more efficiently and effectively.

Councillor Barry proposed, seconded by Councillor Blamire:-

- “(1) That Cabinet requests that the City Council be given the opportunity to contribute at an early stage to the 2011/12 planning of best routes.
- (2) That Cabinet requests that the County Council's area based officers be given discretion to divert resources to primary secondary routes if necessary.
- (3) That Cabinet agrees in principle that space could be allocated at the White Lund depot for the rock salt/grit mixture supplied by the County Council.
- (4) That Cabinet broadly supports this proposal but recognises that the involvement of the City Council needs to be clearly defined with the City Council deciding when this involvement starts and concludes.
- (5) That Cabinet supports the principle of provision of mutual aid to clear/treat snow/ice when district services are unable to carry out district functions due to weather conditions.
- (6) That Cabinet supports the City Council's involvement in handling customer calls but would expect to be compensated if this involves additional work and resource requirements.”

Councillors then voted:-

Resolved:

(6 Members (Councillors Ashworth, Barry, Blamire, Bryning, Langhorn and Robinson) voted in favour and 1 Member (Councillor Kerr) voted against.

- (1) That Cabinet requests that the City Council be given the opportunity to contribute at an early stage to the 2011/12 planning of best routes.
- (2) That Cabinet requests that the County Council's area based officers be given discretion to divert resources to primary secondary routes if necessary.
- (3) That Cabinet agrees in principle that space could be allocated at the White Lund depot for the rock salt/grit mixture supplied by the County Council.

- (4) That Cabinet broadly supports this proposal but recognises that the involvement of the City Council needs to be clearly defined with the City Council deciding when this involvement starts and concludes.
- (5) That Cabinet supports the principle of provision of mutual aid to clear/treat snow/ice when district services are unable to carry out district functions due to weather conditions.
- (6) That Cabinet supports the City Council's involvement in handling customer calls but would expect to be compensated if this involves additional work and resource requirements.

Officers responsible for effecting the decision:

Corporate Director (Community Services)
Head of Environmental Services

Reasons for making the decision:

The decision will ensure that Cabinet has the opportunity to inform the County Council's winter maintenance review, it is in line with the recommendations of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee and will enable officers to consider and report back on the implications of this change in policy.

27 LANCASTER MARKET

(Cabinet Member with Special Responsibility Councillor Barry)

Cabinet received an update on the work of the Lancaster Market Cabinet Liaison Group from the Cabinet Member with Special Responsibility for Markets, Councillor Barry.

Councillor Barry provided Members with an update regarding the short term, medium term and long term improvements that were currently being considered to improve the market. He informed Cabinet that the Liaison Group members and substitutes would be visiting several other indoor markets in the North West on Tuesday 10 August 2010.

Councillor Barry responded to Cabinet Members' questions, following which Cabinet:-

Resolved unanimously:

- (1) That the oral report be noted.

Officers responsible for effecting the decision:

Corporate Director (Regeneration)
Head of Property Services

Reasons for making the decision:

The terms of reference of the Lancaster Market Cabinet Liaison Group stipulate regular reports to Cabinet.

28 WILLIAMSON PARK PROGRESS REPORT**(Cabinet Member with Special Responsibility Councillor Ashworth)**

Cabinet received a report from the Corporate Director (Regeneration) updating Members on the transfer process of Williamson Park to the City Council. The report included an update on financial performance and a request for Members to consider establishing a Parks Cabinet Liaison Group.

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

Option 1: Members note the contents of the report and approve the general future direction being suggested including the establishment of a Williamson Park Cabinet Liaison Group.

Option 2: Members do not approve the recommendations set out in the report .

Option one is the officer preferred option, as this will enable an effective transfer to take place. It offers the opportunity to offer further improvement and strengthens member and community involvement in helping to shape the future of the Park.

Councillor Ashworth proposed, seconded by Councillor Kerr:-

- “(1) That progress on the transfer of Williamson Park to the City Council be noted.
- (2) That it be noted that further work is being carried out with regard to both Williamson Park and the management of all parks across the district aimed at identifying and delivering efficiency savings.
- (3) That a Parks Cabinet Liaison Group be established and terms of reference brought back to Cabinet for consideration.”

Councillors then voted:-

Resolved:

(6 Members (Councillors Ashworth, Barry, Blamire, Bryning, Kerr and Langhorn) voted in favour and 1 Member (Councillor Robinson) abstained.)

- (1) That progress on the transfer of Williamson Park to City Council be noted.
- (2) That it be noted that further work is being carried out with regard to both Williamson Park and the management of all parks across the district aimed at identifying and delivering efficiency savings.
- (3) That a Parks Cabinet Liaison Group be established and terms of reference brought back to Cabinet for consideration.

Officers responsible for effecting the decision:

Corporate Director (Regeneration)
Head of Community Engagement

Reasons for making the decision:

The decision offers the opportunity for officers to further improve the management of parks generally upon transfer by exploring additional efficiencies and reporting more detail to members prior to implementation.

29 ANNUAL TREASURY MANAGEMENT REPORT 2009/10

(Cabinet Member with Special Responsibility Councillor Langhorn)

Cabinet received a report from the Head of Financial Services setting out the performance of the Council in respect of Treasury Management for 2009/10 and giving details of the activities undertaken during the year.

There were no options listed in the report, as options were not available to Members as such; reporting of activities to both Cabinet and Council being an activity required under the Treasury Management Code of Practice and reflected in the Council's Strategy.

Councillor Langhorn proposed, seconded by Councillor Kerr:-

“(1) That the report be noted and referred on to Council for information.”

Councillors then voted:-

Resolved unanimously:

(1) That the report be noted and referred on to Council for information.

Officers responsible for effecting the decision:

Corporate Director (Finance and Performance)
Head of Financial Services

Reasons for making the decision:

Reporting of treasury management to both Cabinet and Council is required under the Treasury Management Code of Practice and reflected in the Council's Strategy.

30 PROVISIONAL REVENUE AND CAPITAL OUTTURN 2009/10

(Cabinet Member with Special Responsibility Councillor Langhorn)

Cabinet received a report from the Head of Financial Services providing summary information regarding the provisional outturn for 2009/10 and the timetable for completion of the closure of accounts process. The report also set out information regarding the carry forward of underspent/overspent revenue budgets and capital slippage for Members' consideration, and sought approval of various Prudential Indicators for last year for referral on to Council.

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

The City Council has a legal requirement to ensure that its expenditure is fully funded and to produce a Statement of Accounts in accordance with proper accounting practice. In addition, the Prudential Indicators are a statutory requirement linked to the budgetary framework. For these aspects, therefore, there are no alternative options for Cabinet to consider. Members are being asked to endorse certain actions taken by the Head of Financial Services, however. Cabinet should consider whether it has sufficient information to do so or whether it requires any further justification. With regard to reserves contributions, there will be opportunities for these to be amended during the current financial year, as part of the usual arrangements.

The report requests Cabinet to consider a number of revenue budget carry forward matters and capital slippage. The framework for considering these is set out in the report but basically Cabinet may:

- Approve any number of the items / requests, in full or part.
- Refuse any number of the requests and if commitments have already been incurred, require alternative funding options to be identified. Cabinet should note, however, that this may impact on other areas of service delivery.
- Request further information regarding them, if appropriate. Cabinet is asked to bear in mind any work required against the value of the individual bids.

Officer recommendations regarding any carry forward of overspendings are set out in Appendix F of the report. Where there are alternative options for other aspects of the outturn, in view of the comments made above there are no specific officer preferred options put forward.

Councillor Langhorn proposed, seconded by Councillor Kerr:-

- “(1) That the provisional outturn for 2009/10 be noted.
- (2) That Cabinet notes the transfers to provisions and reserves actioned by the Head of Financial Services as set out in section 3 of the report.
- (3) That Cabinet approves the recommendations regarding carry forward of overspendings as set out at Appendix F of the report, and that:
- (4) Cabinet portfolio holders ensure that the necessary budget savings are achieved during the current year, with monitoring through Performance Review Team (PRT) meetings;
- (5) Budget and Performance Panel be requested to include a review of the Housing Revenue Account responsive repairs overspending within their work programme for 2010/11.
- (6) That Cabinet approves the requests for carry forward of underspent General Fund revenue budgets as set out at Appendix G of the report with one amendment, in that the request for Democratic Services be approved as £1,500 not £5,200, with requests being referred on to Council where appropriate.

- (7) That the Council Housing requests for carry forwards be deferred, pending consideration of the capital financing position and any implications arising.
- (8) That in order to strengthen current and future years' budget forecasting, Cabinet portfolio holders review all outturn variances, through Quarter 1 PRT meetings where possible, and that the outcome of this be included in the Corporate Financial Monitoring and Medium Term Financial Strategy mid-year update reports for Cabinet's later consideration.
- (9) That the requests for capital slippage as set out in Appendix J of the report be approved.
- (10) That the timetable for completion and reporting of the closure of accounts be noted, as set out in section 8 of the report.
- (11) That the Prudential Indicators as at 31 March 2010 as set out at Appendix K of the report be approved for referral on to Council, as part of the Annual Treasury Management Report for 2009/10."

Councillors then voted:-

Resolved unanimously:

- (1) That the provisional outturn for 2009/10 be noted.
- (2) That Cabinet notes the transfers to provisions and reserves actioned by the Head of Financial Services as set out in section 3 of the report.
- (3) That Cabinet approves the recommendations regarding carry forward of overspendings as set out at Appendix F of the report, and that:
- (4) Cabinet portfolio holders ensure that the necessary budget savings are achieved during the current year, with monitoring through Performance Review Team (PRT) meetings;
- (5) Budget and Performance Panel be requested to include a review of the Housing Revenue Account responsive repairs overspending within their work programme for 2010/11.
- (6) That Cabinet approves the requests for carry forward of underspent General Fund revenue budgets as set out at Appendix G of the report with one amendment, in that the request for Democratic Services be approved as £1,500 not £5,200, with requests being referred on to Council where appropriate.
- (7) That the Council Housing requests for carry forwards be deferred, pending consideration of the capital financing position and any implications arising.
- (8) That in order to strengthen current and future years' budget forecasting, Cabinet portfolio holders review all outturn variances, through Quarter 1 PRT meetings where possible, and that the outcome of this be included in the Corporate Financial Monitoring and Medium Term Financial Strategy mid-year update

reports for Cabinet's later consideration.

- (9) That the requests for capital slippage as set out in Appendix J of the report be approved.
- (10) That the timetable for completion and reporting of the closure of accounts be noted, as set out in section 8 of the report.
- (11) That the Prudential Indicators as at 31 March 2010 as set out at Appendix K of the report be approved for referral on to Council, as part of the Annual Treasury Management Report for 2009/10.

Officers responsible for effecting the decision:

Corporate Director (Finance and Performance)
Head of Financial Services

Reasons for making the decision:

The City Council has a legal requirement to ensure that its expenditure is fully funded and to produce a Statement of Accounts in accordance with proper accounting practice. In addition, the Prudential Indicators are a statutory requirement linked to the budgetary framework.

31 BUDGET AND POLICY FRAMEWORK

(Cabinet Member with Special Responsibility Councillor Langhorn)

Cabinet received a joint report from the Corporate Director (Finance and Performance) and the Head of Financial Services to agree a process for reviewing the Council's Budget and Policy Framework.

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

Option 1: To approve the proposals and timetable set out in the report for reviewing and revising the Council's Budget and Policy Framework and for bringing forward options for savings/efficiencies.

Option 2: To approve an amended version of the proposals

The preferred option is option 1, as it sets out a structured approach for Cabinet to review the existing Budget and Policy Framework, identify savings/efficiency options, and for it to bring forward its budget and policy framework proposals for 2011/12 and beyond within the statutory timescales.

Councillor Langhorn proposed, seconded by Councillor Barry:-

- "(1) That the process outlined in the report and timetabled in Appendix A of the report for reviewing the Corporate Plan, Budget/Medium Term Financial Strategy, and preparing the 2011/12 Budget be approved.

- (2) That the arrangements in place for reviewing and updating the other Policy Framework documents referred to in section 3 of the report be noted.”

Councillors then voted:-

Resolved unanimously:

- (1) That the process outlined in the report and timetabled in Appendix A of the report for reviewing the Corporate Plan, Budget/Medium Term Financial Strategy, and preparing the 2011/12 Budget be approved.
- (2) That the arrangements in place for reviewing and updating the other Policy Framework documents referred to in section 3 of the report be noted.

Note: Councillor Kerr was absent when the vote was taken.

Officers responsible for effecting the decision:

Corporate Director (Finance and Performance)
Head of Financial Services

Reasons for making the decision:

The decision will ensure that Cabinet has a structured approach to review the existing Budget and Policy Framework, identify savings/efficiency options, and to bring forward its budget and policy framework proposals for 2011/12 and beyond within the statutory timescales.

32 BUDGET COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT

(Cabinet Member with Special Responsibility Councillor Langhorn)

Cabinet received a report from the Corporate Director (Regeneration) seeking Cabinet's views on the budget community engagement proposals to inform the 2011/12 budget process.

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

Option 1

Provide all the opportunities for local people to have a say as highlighted in the report:

- Community listening/have your say days
- Consultation document
- Interactive budget meetings
- Online engagement
- Suggestions scheme
- Snapshot surveys

Option 2

Provide some of the opportunities for local people to have a say as highlighted in the report and outlined above in option 1.

Option 1 is the officer preferred option, as this provides increased opportunities for local people to engage in the process, assisting the council in its decision making process

Councillor Langhorn proposed, seconded by Councillor Kerr:-

- “(1) That the budget community 2011/12 engagement plan be built into the budget and policy framework timetable.
- (2) That the budget community 2011/12 engagement plan as delivered as outlined in the report.
- (3) That community listening/have your say days be held at the end of September/early October 2010 in order to inform the priority setting process.
- (4) That a Total Place approach, as set out in the report, be supported where possible.”

By way of amendment, Councillor Robinson proposed:-

“That any less than 1,000 responses be disregarded”.

However, it was noted that there was no seconder to the amendment and, therefore, the amendment was deemed to have fallen.

Councillors then voted:-

Resolved:

(5 Members (Councillors Barry, Blamire, Bryning, Kerr and Langhorn) voted in favour, 1 Member (Councillor Robinson) voted against and 1 Member (Councillor Ashworth) abstained.)

- (1) That the budget community 2011/12 engagement plan be built into the budget and policy framework timetable.
- (2) That the budget community 2011/12 engagement plan as delivered as outlined in the report.
- (3) That community listening/have your say days be held at the end of September/early October 2010 in order to inform the priority setting process.
- (4) That a Total Place approach, as set out in the report, be supported where possible.

Officers responsible for effecting the decision:

Corporate Director (Regeneration)
Head of Community Engagement

Reasons for making the decision:

The decision will ensure that an engaging budget community consultation takes place to ensure that the council is capturing the feedback of its citizens and using this information to inform decisions and service delivery.

33 REVIEW OF CABINET APPOINTMENTS TO OUTSIDE BODIES, PARTNERSHIPS AND BOARDS

Cabinet received a report from the Chief Executive to review Cabinet appointments to a Cabinet Liaison Group, Outside Bodies, Partnerships and Boards following the resignation of the Cabinet Member with special responsibility for Education and Skills, whose portfolio also included rural affairs.

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

Option 1: To appoint an appropriate Cabinet Member to the Cabinet Liaison Group and also as the representative or substitute representative to each of the outside bodies, partnerships and boards.

Option 2: Cabinet could choose not to appoint to the outside bodies, partnerships and Boards. However, this would leave the Council without appropriate representation on those bodies.

Option 3: Another option that may be proposed by Cabinet.

Option 1 is the officer preferred option to ensure that the Council continues to be appropriately represented on the relevant outside bodies, partnerships and boards. It is recommended that appointments be aligned to individual Cabinet Members' portfolios as closely as possible.

It was noted that the Lancashire Rural Partnership, which was listed in the report, had ceased to exist.

As the new Cabinet Member for Education and Skills, it was agreed:-

"That Councillor Robinson be appointed Chairman of the Universities Cabinet Liaison Group."

Nominations were then taken for the vacancies as follows:-

Councillor Langhorn proposed, seconded by Councillor Kerr:-

"That the vacancies on the Arnsdale and Silverdale Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB) Unit Executive Committee and the Forest of Bowland AONB Advisory Committee be referred to full Council."

Councillor Langhorn nominated himself, seconded by Councillor Kerr, for Lancashire Rural Affairs.

Councillor Langhorn nominated himself, seconded by Councillor Barry, for the LGA

Rural Commission.

Councillor Langhorn nominated himself, seconded by Councillor Kerr, for the North West Rural Affairs Forum.

Councillor Langhorn moved, seconded by Councillor Kerr:-

“That Councillor Robinson be appointed to the LDLSP Education, Skills and Opportunities Thematic Group and the Lancaster and District Vision Board’s Business and Knowledge Innovation Steering Group.”

Councillors then voted:-

Resolved unanimously:

- (1) That Councillor Robinson be appointed Chairman of the Universities Cabinet Liaison Group.
- (2) That the vacancies on the Arnside and Silverdale Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB) Unit Executive Committee and the Forest of Bowland AONB Advisory Committee be referred to full Council.
- (3) That Councillor Langhorn be appointed to the Lancashire Rural Affairs; LGA Rural Commission and North West Rural Affairs Forum vacancies.
- (4) That Councillor Robinson be appointed to the LDLSP Education, Skills and Opportunities Thematic Group and the Lancaster and District Vision Board’s Business and Knowledge Innovation Steering Group.

Officers responsible for effecting the decision:

Chief Executive
Head of Democratic Services

Reasons for making the decision:

The decision will ensure that the Council continues to be appropriately represented on the relevant outside bodies, partnerships and boards.

34 PLANNING POLICY CABINET LIAISON GROUP

(Cabinet Member with Special Responsibility Councillor Bryning)

Cabinet received a report from the Chief Executive to consider the chairmanship of the Planning Policy Cabinet Liaison Group.

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

- (a) For the Cabinet Member for Economy to chair the Planning Policy Cabinet Liaison Group, in line with his portfolio responsibility for Planning.

- (b) To approve the appointment of the Cabinet Member for Safety as the Chairman of the Planning Policy Cabinet Liaison Group, subject to the Cabinet Member for Economy being present at all meetings.
- (c) For the Leader to review the allocation of the portfolio responsibility for Planning.
- (d) To discontinue the Planning Policy Cabinet Liaison Group.

Regarding Option (a), the Council's Constitution states that participation in Cabinet Liaison Groups will be by invitation of the chairman. It is naturally assumed that the chairman will be the relevant portfolio holder. Option 1 accords with the Constitution and provides clarity regarding individual Cabinet Member roles and responsibilities and decision-making.

Option (b) is in accordance with the wishes of the Cabinet Member with responsibility for Planning and has the consent of Councillor Blamire and other members of the Planning Policy Cabinet Liaison Group. Members should also consider the comments of the Monitoring Officer in relation to this option.

Option (c) would be a matter for the Leader. However, Members should also consider the comments of the Monitoring Officer in relation to this option.

Regarding Option (d), the Planning Policy Cabinet Liaison Group has been a useful platform for the Cabinet Member with responsibility in the past. Planning Policy is a complex and important area. Should Cabinet wish to discontinue the Cabinet Liaison Group, some other consultative mechanism would need to be developed to support and inform the relevant Cabinet Member in his/her decision-making role.

Option (a) is the officer preferred option. To fully utilise the Liaison Group mechanism, the most appropriate chairman for any Cabinet Liaison Group will always be the relevant portfolio holder. This also avoids the issues raised by the Monitoring Officer in the report relation to options (b) and (c).

Councillor Bryning proposed, seconded by Councillor Kerr:-

- "(1) That Councillor Blamire be appointed Chairman of the Planning Policy Cabinet Liaison Group."

Councillors then voted:-

Resolved:

(4 Members (Councillors Ashworth, Barry, Bryning and Kerr) voted in favour and 3 Members (Councillors Blamire, Langhorn and Robinson) abstained.)

- (1) That Councillor Blamire be appointed Chairman of the Planning Policy Cabinet Liaison Group.

Officers responsible for effecting the decision:

Chief Executive
Head of Democratic Services

Reasons for making the decision:

The decision reflects the wishes of the Cabinet Member with responsibility for planning not to chair the Planning Policy Cabinet Liaison Group appropriate to his portfolio.

35 SHARED SERVICE - INTEGRATED SUPPORT TEAM MANAGER

Cabinet received a report from the Corporate Director (Regeneration). The report had two purposes:-

- (a) To outline, and seek approval for, proposals for a shared service arrangement with Preston City Council for the management of the Integrated Support Team which currently delivers the Lancaster & Morecambe Worklessness Pilot Project and the Vulnerable Households Project.
- (b) To seek approval for delegated authorisation for extensions to projects delivered through the Integrated Support Team

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

The options for the shared service arrangement are summarised in the table below:

Option	Advantages	Disadvantages	Risks
1. Fill the vacancy by open recruitment	Funder approval not required to fill existing post New manager in post following recruitment period	The limited timescale of committed funding for the projects would: i) make recruitment of a suitably qualified and experienced manager difficult; ii) increase the likelihood that the post would be vacated before projects are completed No reduction in the proportion of project costs for project management (unless offered on a part time basis) Potential recruitment costs	Risk that post not filled. Stability of management function at risk
2. Enter a shared service arrangement with Preston City Council to provide the management role required	Manager role filled on more flexible basis in terms of time commitments than would otherwise be possible leading to reduction in project costs for management function	Funder approval required for the new arrangement. Staff time required to develop shared service arrangement	Without funder approval the proposal could not be implemented, leading to the risk of further delay in

	<p>and possible extension of project timescale</p> <p>Opportunities for service improvements through the application of the combined experience of the two authorities</p> <p>Experience gained related to the potential to extend shared service arrangements in the context of the Mid-Lancashire MAA</p>		<p>provision of the management function</p> <p>Risk of competing demands on manager time between the two authorities (Service Level Agreement to be in place)</p>
--	---	--	---

The options for opportunities to extend projects are summarised in the table below:

Option	Advantages	Disadvantages	Risks
1. Do not seek extensions to the projects	None (except in limiting potential redundancy payments)	<p>Projects providing valuable services to deprived individuals terminated at the end of existing contracts.</p> <p>Opportunities for continuing 100% external funding not taken up.</p> <p>Loss of staff experience and expertise in delivering outreach work</p>	
2. Approve extension already offered to December 2010 for the Vulnerable Households project and actively seek extensions to existing projects which are 100% externally funded	<p>Maintains and expands provision of valuable services to local residents, and especially deprived and vulnerable groups and individuals</p> <p>Retains expertise of existing staff pending possible development of Mid-Lancashire MAA worklessness activity</p> <p>Maintains integrity of the Integrated Support Team</p>	<p>Possible increase in redundancy payment liability as existing temporary posts extend beyond two years</p> <p>Some manager time required in reprofiling projects and liaising with external funders</p>	

Option 2 is the officer preferred option as the proposed shared service arrangement offers the best overall solution by providing a more flexible management arrangement, with an appropriately experienced manager.

Councillor Bryning proposed, seconded by Councillor Robinson:-

- “(1) That the proposal for a shared service arrangement with Preston City Council for the management of the Integrated Support Team be approved
- (2) That the Corporate Director (Regeneration) be authorised to finalise any contractual matters to implement the arrangement subject to the prior approval of external project funders
- (3) That the Corporate Director (Regeneration) be authorised to approve extensions to the Supporting People contracts for the Vulnerable Households project and Targeted Intervention Project subject to 100% external funding being secured
- (4) That the Corporate Director (Regeneration) be authorised to approve extensions to the timescale of the Lancaster & Morecambe Worklessness Pilot Project subject to 100% external funding being secured
- (5) That, in the event that a project extension results in redundancy payment liabilities which are not eligible costs for external funding purposes, such payments, as detailed in the report, be met from an appropriate corporate reserve (eg Project Implementation, subject to funding being available) or otherwise from corporate staff turnover savings
- (6) That the Head of Financial Services is authorised to update the General Fund Revenue Budget as appropriate across relevant financial years.”

Councillors then voted:-

Resolved unanimously:

- (1) That the proposal for a shared service arrangement with Preston City Council for the management of the Integrated Support Team be approved
- (2) That the Corporate Director (Regeneration) be authorised to finalise any contractual matters to implement the arrangement subject to the prior approval of external project funders
- (3) That the Corporate Director (Regeneration) be authorised to approve extensions to the Supporting People contracts for the Vulnerable Households project and Targeted Intervention Project subject to 100% external funding being secured
- (4) That the Corporate Director (Regeneration) be authorised to approve extensions to the timescale of the Lancaster & Morecambe Worklessness Pilot Project subject to 100% external funding being secured
- (5) That, in the event that a project extension results in redundancy payment liabilities which are not eligible costs for external funding purposes, such payments, as detailed in the report, be met from an appropriate corporate

reserve (eg Project Implementation, subject to funding being available) or otherwise from corporate staff turnover savings

- (6) That the Head of Financial Services is authorised to update the General Fund Revenue Budget as appropriate across relevant financial years

Officers responsible for effecting the decision:

Corporate Director (Regeneration)
Head of Regeneration and Policy
Head of Financial Services

Reasons for making the decision:

The decision will ensure the best approach for the continued delivery of projects through the Integrated Support Team. It will build on the existing shared service relationship between Lancaster City Council and Preston City Council and provide the opportunity for the existing projects delivered by the Integrated Support Team to be extended.

Chairman

(The meeting ended at 12.45 p.m.)

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

MINUTES PUBLISHED ON THURSDAY 29 JULY 2010.

**EFFECTIVE DATE FOR IMPLEMENTING THE DECISIONS CONTAINED IN THESE MINUTES:
FRIDAY 6 AUGUST 2010.**