

## PROCEEDINGS

A meeting of the Lancaster City Council was held in the Town Hall, Morecambe, at 6.00 p.m. on Wednesday, 1 February 2017, when the following Members were present:-

Robert Redfern (Mayor)	Carla Brayshaw (Deputy Mayor)
Jon Barry	Sam Armstrong
June Ashworth	Lucy Atkinson
Alan Biddulph	Eileen Blamire
Dave Brookes	Tracy Brown
Abbott Bryning	Nathan Burns
Susie Charles	Darren Clifford
Ian Clift	Claire Cozler
Sheila Denwood	Rob Devey
Charlie Edwards	Andrew Gardiner
Nigel Goodrich	Mel Guilding
Janet Hall	Tim Hamilton-Cox
Janice Hanson	Colin Hartley
Brendan Hughes	Caroline Jackson
Joan Jackson	Andrew Kay
Ronnie Kershaw	James Leyshon
Karen Leytham	Roger Mace
Terrie Metcalfe	Abi Mills
Rebecca Novell	Jane Parkinson
Margaret Pattison	John Reynolds
Sylvia Rogerson	Ron Sands
Elizabeth Scott	Roger Sherlock
Susan Sykes	Oscar Thynne
David Whitaker	Anne Whitehead
John Wild	Nicholas Wilkinson
Peter Williamson	Phillippa Williamson
Paul Woodruff	Peter Yates

**81 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Stuart Bateson, Brett Cooper, Helen Helme, Geoff Knight, Malcolm Thomas and Andrew Warriner.

**82 MINUTES**

The minutes of the meeting held on 14 December 2016 were signed by the Mayor as a correct record.

**83 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

There were no declarations of interest made at this stage.

**84 ANNOUNCEMENTS**

The Mayor advised that the Co-op had kindly offered to host a Wine Tasting evening on Wednesday 22<sup>nd</sup> February, the proceeds of which would be going to the Mayor's Charity. Tickets were available from the Mayor's Office.

The Chief Executive advised Councillors that the Mayor intended to re-order the agenda slightly, to take item 11 first, the Report of the Independent Remuneration Panel, to allow Panel Members to be heard first.

**85 QUESTIONS FROM THE PUBLIC UNDER COUNCIL PROCEDURE RULE 11**

The Mayor advised that no questions had been received from members of the public in accordance with the provisions of Council Procedure Rule 11.

**86 PETITIONS AND ADDRESSES**

The Mayor informed Members that no petitions or requests to address Council had been received from members of the public.

**87 MEMBERS' ALLOWANCES SCHEME - REPORT OF THE INDEPENDENT REMUNERATION PANEL**

The Chairman of the Independent Remuneration Panel, Kirsten McAteer, presented a report detailing the recommendations of the Independent Remuneration Panel regarding members' allowances for 2017/18. Harsha Shukla, MBE, a member of the Panel, also attended for this item. The Panel recommended that there be no change to the scheme.

Councillor Blamire proposed, seconded by Councillor Peter Williamson:

"That Council agrees with the Independent Remuneration Panel's recommendation not to change the members' allowance scheme for 2017/18."

By way of an amendment (which was accepted as a friendly amendment by the proposer of the recommendation but not by the seconder), Councillor Barry proposed:

"That the basic allowance for members be increased by 1% for 2017/18."

Councillor Caroline Jackson seconded the amendment.

After a brief debate a vote was taken on the amendment which was clearly carried with 41 Members in favour, 11 Members against and 1 abstention.

Members then voted on the substantive motion. 42 Members voted in favour of the substantive motion which was clearly carried.

***Resolved:***

- (1) That the basic allowance for members be increased by 1% for 2017/18.

## **88 LEADER'S REPORT**

The Leader presented her report updating Members on various issues since her last report to Council. She then responded to a number of questions from Councillors.

***Resolved:***

- (1) That the report be noted.

## **89 BUDGET UPDATE 2017/18 TO 2020/21**

Councillor Whitehead, the Cabinet Member for Finance, presented a report of Cabinet to update Council and gain its feedback on the latest position regarding the development of the budget and policy framework for 2017/18 to 2020/21 and in that context, to seek approval of the level of council tax increase for 2017/18 together with targets for subsequent years, subject to local referendum thresholds.

The Chief Executive advised Members that, in accordance with the Local Authorities (Standing Orders) (England) (Amendment) Regulations 2014 and Council Procedure Rule 19.7, a recorded vote would need to be taken in respect of the second part of the recommendation in the report, as this would be a 'budget decision' within the terms of the regulations.

Members asked a number of questions, which Councillor Whitehead and Chief Officers responded to. In response to a question from Councillor Barry regarding the hours worked and 'double time' overtime figures for last year and those proposed for next year for street cleansers, the Chief Officer (Environment) confirmed that he would provide further information.

Councillor Whitehead, seconded by Councillor Blamire proposed:

"That the revised budget for 2016/17 be approved with the net overspending of £39K reducing the in-year contribution to Balances from £56K to £17K."

During the course of the debate several issues were raised to provide feedback to Cabinet. These were:

- Further details regarding the £500K economic growth reserve.
- A request for realistic savings as many proposed savings did not come to fruition last year.
- That Cabinet consider reappraising the Solar Farm, Middleton.

At the end of the debate Members voted on the proposition. 39 Members voted in favour, 14 against with 1 abstention and the Chairman declared the proposition to be carried.

Councillor Whitehead proposed, seconded by Councillor Blamire:

“That a City Council tax increase of £5 for 2017/18, together with a year on year target of £5 for future years, subject to local referendum thresholds, be approved.”

The Mayor called for a recorded vote on the proposition, which was carried, with the votes recorded as follows:

36 Members voted for the proposition (Councillors Armstrong, Ashworth, Atkinson, Biddulph, Blamire, Brayshaw, Brookes, Brown, Bryning, Burns, Clifford, Clift, Cozler, Denwood, Devey, Hall, Hamilton-Cox, Hanson, Hartley, Hughes, Caroline Jackson, Kay, Kershaw, Leyshon, Leytham, Metcalfe, Mills, Pattison, Redfern, Reynolds, Sands, Scott, Sherlock, Thynne, Whitaker and Whitehead).

17 Members voted against the proposition (Councillors Barry, Charles, Edwards, Gardiner, Goodrich, Guilding, Joan Jackson, Mace, Novell, Parkinson, Rogerson, Sykes, Wild, Wilkinson, Peter Williamson, Phillippa Williamson and Yates).

1 Member abstained (Councillor Woodruff).

**Resolved:**

- (1) That the revised budget for 2016/17 be approved with the net overspending of £39K reducing the in-year contribution to Balances from £56K to £17K.
- (2) That a City Council tax increase of £5 for 2017/18, together with a year on year target of £5 for future years, subject to local referendum thresholds, be approved.

**Feedback to Cabinet:**

- Further details regarding the £500K economic growth reserve.
- A request for realistic savings as many proposed savings did not come to fruition last year.
- That Cabinet consider reappraising the Solar Farm, Middleton.

***The meeting adjourned at 8.30pm and reconvened at 8.50pm.***

**90 ARRANGEMENTS FOR THE FUTURE APPOINTMENT OF AN EXTERNAL AUDITOR**

The Chief Officer (Resources) submitted a report which sought Council's approval for proposals relating to the future appointment of an external auditor to the Authority, as required by the Local Audit and Accountability Act 2014.

The report was presented by Councillor Bryning, who, seconded by Councillor Hartley, proposed:

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

There was no debate and a vote was taken which was clearly carried.

**Resolved:**

- (1) That full Council approves the proposal that this Council opts in to the appointing person arrangements made by Public Sector Audit appointments (PSAA) for the future appointment of external auditors.

**91 ALLOCATION OF SEATS TO POLITICAL GROUPS**

Council considered a report of the Chief Executive which advised 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 a recent by-election.

It was reported that, as a result of the re-calculation, some adjustments were necessary to the Overview and Scrutiny grouping. The regulatory and other standing committee groupings remained unchanged.

Councillor Armstrong proposed, seconded by Councillor Reynolds:

"That recommendations (1) & (2) as set out in the report, be approved and that Councillor Burns replace Councillor Clift on the Audit Committee."

There was no debate and when put to the vote recommendations (1) & (2) and the Labour group change to the Audit Committee were clearly carried.

In accordance with recommendation (3) of the report, Councillor Phillippa Williamson advised that the Conservative Group would pass a place on the Budget and Performance Panel to the Green Group. Councillor Phillippa Williamson would be replaced by Councillor Hamilton-Cox.

Councillor Charles proposed, seconded by Councillor Armstrong:

"That the Conservative Group pass a place on the Budget and Performance Panel to the Green Group with Councillor Phillippa Williamson being replaced by Councillor Hamilton-Cox."

There was no debate and on being put to the vote the proposition was clearly carried.

**Resolved:**

- (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 Appendices B and C of the report.
- (2) That the adjustments required to the Overview and Scrutiny Grouping of committees, detailed in paragraph 3 and Appendix C of the report, be approved.
- (3) That Councillor Burns replace Councillor Clift on the Audit Committee.
- (4) That the Conservative Group pass a place on the Budget and Performance Panel to the Green Group with Councillor Phillippa Williamson being replaced by Councillor Hamilton-Cox.

**92 DESIGNATION OF MONITORING OFFICER**

***The Monitoring Officer and interim Legal Services Manager left the meeting prior to the consideration of the following item.***

The Chief Executive presented a report to enable Council to designate an officer to be the Monitoring Officer with effect from 1<sup>st</sup> March 2017.

The Chief Executive responded to a question.

Councillor Atkinson proposed, seconded by Councillor Peter Williamson:

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

There was no debate and on being put to the vote the recommendation was clearly carried.

***Resolved:***

- (1) That the interim Legal Services Manager, Anne Streeter, be designated as the Council’s Monitoring Officer with effect from 1<sup>st</sup> March 2017.

***The Monitoring Officer and Interim Legal Services Manager returned to the meeting at this point.***

**93 APPOINTMENTS TO OUTSIDE BODIES – LANCASTER UNIVERSITY COURT AND THE BOARD OF TRUSTEES OF THE LANCASTER CHARITY**

Council considered a report submitted by the Chief Executive. Two vacancies had arisen on outside bodies. These were for the Lancaster University Court and the Board of Trustees of the Lancaster Charity.

The Chairman called for a proposition regarding the Lancaster University Court first. Councillor Burns was nominated by Councillor Armstrong and seconded by Atkinson and Councillor Joan Jackson was nominated by Councillor Peter Williamson and seconded by Councillor Charles. On being put to the vote 33 members voted for Councillor Burns whereupon Councillor Burns was appointed.

Nominations were then taken for the vacancy on the Board of Trustees of Lancaster Charity. Councillor Thynne was nominated by Councillor Armstrong and seconded by Councillor Atkinson and Councillor Charles was nominated by Councillor Peter Williamson and seconded by Councillor Parkinson. On being put to the vote 32 members voted for Councillor Thynne whereupon Councillor Thynne was appointed.

***Resolved:***

- (1) That Councillor Burns be appointed to the Lancaster University Court.
- (2) That Councillor Thynne be appointed to the Board of Trustees of the Lancaster Charity.

**94 QUESTIONS UNDER COUNCIL PROCEDURE RULE 12 (Pages 9 - 15)**

The Mayor advised that 11 questions had been received by the Chief Executive in accordance with Council Procedure Rules as follows:

- (1) Councillor Barry to Councillor Clifford regarding charging points for electric vehicles.
- (2) Councillor Mace to Councillor Whitehead regarding new homes.
- (3) Councillor Mace to Councillor Blamire regarding prosperity and economic growth.
- (4) Councillor Edwards to Councillor Whitehead regarding business rates.
- (5) Councillor Edwards to Councillor Hanson regarding bidding for economic development funding.
- (6) Councillor Caroline Jackson to Councillor Leytham regarding council provided funerals.
- (7) Councillor Caroline Jackson to Councillor Leytham regarding dog on dog attacks.
- (8) Councillor Gardiner to Councillor Blamire regarding alternative options to combined authorities.
- (9) Councillor Gardiner to Councillor Blamire regarding a mayor for Lancashire.
- (10) Councillor Hamilton-Cox to Councillor Whitehead regarding Preston CC's work on community health building.
- (11) Councillor Hamilton-Cox to Councillor Hanson regarding Canal Corridor North progress negotiations.

Councillors Barry, Mace, Edwards and Hamilton-Cox agreed to receive a written response to their questions. The responding Cabinet members agreed to provide written responses to any supplementary questions which might arise from the written responses, within a reasonable period of time.

Councillor Leytham and Councillor Blamire responded to Councillor Caroline Jackson's questions and Councillor Gardiner's questions at the meeting.

Details of the questions and answers together with any supplementary questions and responses are appended to the minutes.

## 95 MINUTES OF CABINET

Council considered the Cabinet minutes of the meetings held on 6<sup>th</sup> December 2016 and 17<sup>th</sup> January 2017.

### ***Resolved:***

- (1) That the minutes be noted.

---

Mayor

(The meeting finished at 9.20 p.m.)

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

**AGENDA ITEM 15 – QUESTIONS FROM MEMBERS OF COUNCIL**

***NB: Questions 6, 7, 8 and 9 were answered at the meeting. The other answers were provided after the meeting as written responses.***

**1. Question from Councillor Jon Barry to Councillor Darren Clifford**

*Given that the City Council did not manage to install charging points for electric vehicles in its car parks during 2016/17, can the cabinet member give me a timetable for when the work will be done in 2017/18?*

**ANSWER**

The County Council is working on a project to install charging points to on street parking locations. In order to avoid replication of effort and benefit from economies of scale, we piggy backed onto this project for our off street car parks. Due to some technical issues with procurement, County advised that we could no longer proceed in this way but once they had secured a preferred supplier we would be able to purchase charging points from their framework contract, which would still be beneficial.

The delay has actually been useful because in this area technology is moving very rapidly. Officers recently received advice from an expert in this field. Car manufacturers will shortly be producing electric cars with batteries that have a range of 350+ miles. This means that, on the one hand, sales of electric cars are likely to increase but on the other hand, people will be less reliant on an extensive infrastructure of charging points- as they will be able to get there and back to home for most journeys. Experience from other Cities and towns has also shown the fitting of one or two charging points in off street car parks merely means that just one car takes up the space for a protracted period- often beyond the amount of time it takes to charge the vehicle.

Work is currently taking place to establish what the best way forward will be for the City Council, and we are looking at other options. A particular focus will be on providing a charging infrastructure for our own fleet so that we can shift over to some electric vehicles in the future. We expect that in the first half of 2017 /18 we will install charging points at White Lund Depot and on the car park where our pool cars park behind Palatine Hall. We will also be looking at what the possible options for multi car charging points on off street car parks are and, given the improvements in battery technology, what the likely future demand will be.

**2. Question from Councillor Roger Mace to Councillor Anne Whitehead**

*The Local Plan now out for consultation is anticipating (in round figures) between 13000 and 14000 new homes this district between now and 2031. Some of these new homes will be built during the period from now until 2020.*

*How is the financial impact on the Council from these new homes brought into account in the budgeted figures being presented to Council this year for "council tax receipts" and the "New Homes Bonus" in the period 2017/18 to 2020/21?*



### **ANSWER**

Currently the Council's tax base projections assume annual net growth of 600 Band D properties per year, drawing on recent experience. Officers from Finance, Revenues and Planning services liaised to inform those estimates. The tax base is monitored during the course of the year, and forecasts will continue to be reviewed and updated as necessary as part of the annual budget process. As the Local Plan progresses, and as more information becomes available on the likely timescales for new housing developments being completed, then that information will be factored into subsequent tax base reviews. At this stage, we cannot be any more precise.

In terms of New Homes Bonus (NHB), for 2017/18 the budgeted grant income is based on actual council tax base information to around October last year. For future years projections, as reported to Cabinet in January, these are based on figures (in £ terms) provided by Government through the settlement, but at present we cannot yet tell what housing growth assumptions sit behind them. As Government is changing the NHB scheme, unfortunately there is no better basis on which to forecast at this time, but the position will be kept under review as part of our financial monitoring and budgeting arrangements.

It is important too not to forget the service and therefore cost pressures that also come with housing growth. Again, as far as possible these are monitored to ensure budgets are adequate but it is not an exact science. Such pressures are kept under review and at some stage, budgets will inevitably need to be updated.

### **3. Question from Councillor Roger Mace to Councillor Eileen Blamire**

*Hansard on 25 January 2017 quotes the Prime Minister as saying "how sad it is that Labour councils are not willing to put forward proposals to increase the prosperity and economic growth in their areas"*

*Without making reference to actions that have already failed or are already in progress, what new positive action is our Council Leader proposing to put forward for our District in the next four months to demonstrate that the Prime Minister may be mistaken in her view of Labour Councils?*

### **ANSWER**

The first and most significant action was to make the bold decision in the face of severe Government spending restraints to continue to operate an economic development and regeneration function in the 2015 and 2016 budget rounds. Both these non-statutory functions were options for service withdrawal yet the Cabinet supported them continuing and were not prepared to consign the council's economic development activities to become a thing of the past.

In the forthcoming budget round I propose to create a reserve to enhance our decision to keep economic development by enabling the council to invest in a return to proactively promoting the district targeting inward investment and skills.

**4. Question from Councillor Charlie Edwards to Councillor Anne Whitehead**

*Since the Government announced that Councils will keep all business rates back in 2015, does the Council know what proportion it will receive of this fund, and what proportion will go to other organisations (Lancashire Enterprise Partnership, Lancashire County Council, Lancashire Fire and Rescue Authority and Lancashire Police & Crime Commissioner).*

**ANSWER**

No the Council does not yet know (and every other authority is in the same position).

Although Government announced its headline intentions regarding 100% business rates retention some time ago, it still has much work to do to develop how the scheme will actually work, and it is not yet clear in which year the changes will be implemented. Government aims to introduce full business rates retention within this parliament, but that could mean implementation in 2019/20 or 2020/21 – or it could slip. Much more progress needs to be made before councils can make informed estimates of what the financial impact will be.

In the meantime, the Council has responded to Government consultation on business rates retention and it will continue to monitor developments and factor them into its financial forecasting and planning. More Government consultations are expected over the next couple of years. The Local Government Association also has an important role in helping to shape future proposals, for what is a very complex subject, and the Council contributes through such forums as far as it can.

**5. Question from Councillor Charlie Edwards to Councillor Janice Hanson**

*What efforts by the Council have been made to bid for central government funding for economic development in the District?*

**ANSWER**

The list is extensive over the years. There has been a continuous process of bidding for and accessing external funding despite the downsizing of the Council's Economic Development activities in 2010. Examples of projects progressed with external funding are the Chatsworth Gardens housing regeneration, the Square Routes public realm schemes in Lancaster and Morecambe, and both the Light up Lancaster and Vintage by the Sea festivals which now have national recognition.

**6. Question from Councillor Caroline Jackson to Councillor Karen Leytham**

*Funeral poverty has been in the news recently. Increasing numbers of people are encountering large debts or inability to pay for funeral costs. Could the cabinet member give us the numbers and % rise in public health (Council provided) funerals 2014-15 and 2015-16 and the cost to the council each year.*

**Councillor Leytham replied:**

The council has a duty under the Public Health (Control of Disease) Act to coordinate the burials of people who die without the financial means for their own burial (and where no family member can be found to take on this responsibility). We do this at minimum cost, with sound and efficient arrangements in place, whilst at the same time doing everything we can to limit this impact on the council's finances. Although the numbers are relatively low there is evidence of a rising trend. Recent figures are as follows:

- In 2014/15, 9 public burials at a total cost of £ 9,393.92 (no monies could be recouped from the affairs of the deceased so that was the net cost).
- In 2015/16, 14 public burials at a total cost of £13,935 (a small amount has been recovered already and to date the net cost was £12,839 - however another £2,000 in cost recovery is anticipated once several property sales are completed).
- ( For further information, in the year 2016/17 to date 15 public burials have been arranged at a total cost of £16,003. A further one is pending. Work is ongoing to recover funds where possible for example by tracing deceased people's bank accounts.)

It is not straightforward to calculate percentage increases in number of cases but the three-year average has risen from 25 to 35 and now (including this year to date) 39 public burial cases running over three consecutive years. Officers periodically put public burial provision out to competitive tender in order to minimise the cost. The Public Funeral contract is due for renewal on 1st April 2017 and an increase in the charges per funeral is anticipated.

**Councillor Caroline Jackson raised a supplementary question:**

*Are there any plans to counter the situation?*

Councillor Leytham replied that it was difficult as the council was obliged to provide funerals. This was going out to tender shortly and the costs were expected to rise.

**7. Question from Councillor Caroline Jackson to Councillor Karen Leytham**

*We have had a number of complaints by residents of dog on dog attacks which have caused injury to a dog and high vet bills. In each case the attacking dog was in a public place and not on a lead. Could you tell us what is being done to reinforce the message that dogs must be on leads and kept under control?*

**ANSWER**

Whilst there can be some cross-over with the Police, in the Lancaster district dog-on-person attacks are investigated by the Police, whilst dog-on-dog attacks are investigated by the council. This is something we take very seriously. Over the last four years the council's Dog Warden Service has received and investigated on average 88 complaints a year regarding dog attacks. It's not always the case that

dogs are off leads – in some cases the dogs were on leads at the time of attack and in a couple of cases were they were even at the other side of a gate.

With this in mind, the council went to great efforts when introducing a Dog Control Order in 2012 requiring dogs to be on leads in a range of places including public highways, car parks and a range of public amenity areas. In addition we also have a Dog Control Order which authorises us to require a dog to be put on a lead in other locations. Contraventions of these legal requirements may lead to issue of a Fixed Penalty Notice or prosecution in the Magistrates Court.

Failure to properly control a dog can be really anti-social. Within the last 12 months council officers have started to use powers under the Anti-social Behaviour, Crime & Policing Act 2014 to deal with dogs which are allowed to roam and behave aggressively. Community Protection Warning letters are issued, and non-compliance leads to further action – ultimately prosecution.

Action can also be taken under the Dogs Act 1871 by applying to the courts for an order requiring that a dog be kept under control. The magistrates can specify any control measures and usually include that a dog be kept on a short lead and muzzled in all public places.

The Dog Warden Service also carries out a range of awareness-raising and educational activities such as school visits and work with the Dogs Trust to promote responsible dog ownership.

### **8. Question from Councillor Andrew Gardiner to Councillor Eileen Blamire**

*As a council all we hear is how wonderful the combined authority will be. However as a council we have not had a full debate with looking at alternative options, when will the full council have the option to debate and vote on this or alternative options?*

#### **Councillor Blamire replied:**

A briefing note will be issued to inform all members of the key information and decisions to be made relating to the Lancashire Combined Authority. It is planned that an update report will be submitted to Budget Council on 1 March on forming a Combined Authority. (The Combined Authority is currently meeting in shadow form.)

Lancaster City Council's options at this initial stage of the Combined Authority's formation are simply

- to become a constituent member of the Combined Authority, with further decisions to be made as the authority progresses, or
- not to become a constituent member

Councillor Blamire urged Members to attend a briefing about the Combined Authority to be held on February 16<sup>th</sup> at 6.30pm at Lancaster Town Hall.

**Councillor Gardiner raised a supplementary question:**

*How much does it cost to be part of the Combined Authority at the present time and how much will it cost over the next 12 months?*

Councillor Blamire replied that there had been no costs. All the work was done voluntarily, mainly by Preston City Council. When the Combined Authority was formed it was anticipated that each authority would contribute a small amount but the actual figure was uncertain, up to £10K.

**9. Question from Councillor Andrew Gardiner to Councillor Eileen Blamire**

*If one of the councils in Lancashire votes against the idea of a Mayor would this end the idea of a combined authority and affect the funding for the area?*

**Councillor Blamire replied:**

The Parliamentary Order to form a Combined Authority at this first stage will not include any commitment to an elected Mayor. The Combined Authority is not dependent on a Mayor. Any Council opposed to an elected Mayor would not therefore affect the formation of the Combined Authority.

Any further progress on devolution negotiations with the Government will be brought to future Council meetings. All Councils will be given the opportunity to debate a devolution proposition at their Council meeting when this has been negotiated with the Government. No devolution deal will be committed to by the Combined Authority without the full consent of all constituent Councils.

**Councillor Gardiner raised a supplementary question:**

*If we vote against a mayor do we lose funding?*

The Chief Executive replied that following the formation of a Combined Authority there would be another debate. In terms of full devolution which is fiscal devolution, a Mayor would be required. A Mayoral Combined Authority requires a further order (another decision). We were not there yet. A decision to enter into a Combined Authority would first come to Council.

**10. Question from Councillor Tim Hamilton-Cox to Councillor Anne Whitehead**

*Quoting from the relevant minute from last full council:*

*'Supplementary: Can Cllr Whitehead contact Preston City Council to talk about the advantages of what they've done?*

*Councillor Whitehead replied that she would look into this.'*

*Can Cllr Whitehead report back on what she has learned of Preston City Council's work on community wealth building?*

**ANSWER**

I haven't contacted Preston City Council yet, as I'm waiting until we get into discussing procurement as part of the strategic review. Options then include discussing with Preston what they do and/or inviting Matt Brown to give a presentation (he gave a public presentation in Lancaster in December).

**11. Question from Councillor Tim Hamilton-Cox to Councillor Hanson**

*Can you provide a progress report on negotiations with British Land and Lancaster University concerning the development of Canal Corridor North?*

**ANSWER**

The Council and the university are in the final stages of completing their due diligence processes to evaluate the British Land proposals both in terms of procurement, state aid, risk and value for money. The Council has taken advice from experienced legal and commercial specialists and officers are in the process of digesting advice only recently finalised before preparing to brief Council. It is hoped that briefings can be arranged in spring.