

CABINET

6.00 P.M.

6TH DECEMBER 2016

PRESENT:- Councillors Eileen Blamire (Chairman), Janice Hanson (Vice-Chairman), Darren Clifford, Brendan Hughes, James Leyshon, Karen Leytham, Margaret Pattison and Anne Whitehead

Officers in attendance:-

Susan Parsonage	Chief Executive
Nadine Muschamp	Chief Officer (Resources) and Section 151 Officer
Mark Davies	Chief Officer (Environment)
Andrew Dobson	Chief Officer (Regeneration and Planning)
Suzanne Lodge	Chief Officer (Health and Housing)
Liz Bateson	Principal Democratic Support Officer

34 MINUTES

The minutes of the meeting held on Wednesday 2nd November 2016 were approved as a correct record.

35 ITEMS OF URGENT BUSINESS AUTHORISED BY THE LEADER

The Chairman advised that there was one item of urgent business. This was with regard to the Lancashire ESIF Project (Minute 41 refers).

36 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

No declarations were made at this point.

37 PUBLIC SPEAKING

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

38 HEYSHAM GATEWAY

(Cabinet Members with Special Responsibility Councillors Hanson and Leytham)

Cabinet received a joint report from the Chief Officers (Regeneration) and (Resources) to enable consideration and agreement of an overall strategy for the development of Heysham Gateway to guide future decisions affecting council assets in the area.

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

Heysham Gateway Development Principles

	Option A1: Do not agree development principles for the	Option A2: Agree principles for Heysham Gateway (as set out in section	Option A3: Develop an alternative set of principles for Heysham Gateway

	area and deal with enquiries on a reactive basis	3.6 of the report) as the main guide for future Council decisions affecting the area (planning policy, site development, marketing and funding bids etc)	
Advantages	Provides maximum flexibility and allows for the widest possible range of potential end uses.	Provides certainty and guidance for planning, development, land disposal and infrastructure decisions. Provides opportunity to co-ordinate development with environmental improvements. Provides vehicle for bringing on board partners and stakeholders to jointly promote regeneration of Heysham Gateway.	Could widen the range of uses deemed appropriate for the site and provide more flexibility in terms of utilising assets.
Disadvantages	Does not provide guidance or certainty for potential developers and the local community. No real basis for determining development proposals / land disposals. Makes marketing the area and attracting investment and/or grant funding more difficult. Difficult to co-ordinate investment in infrastructure.	Would limit the type of uses deemed appropriate for the area and potentially miss out on investment. Restricts options for land disposals.	Would require more time and could delay planning and land decisions. Would create period of uncertainty. Difficult to market area without clear agreed principles.

Risks	Increase possibility of proposals for inappropriate uses. Would prejudice opportunity to promote a comprehensive redevelopment of the area including environmental improvements.	May not be possible to get all parties to agree principles. Decisions could be delayed and opportunities lost if this is not secured quickly. May restrict options for land disposals with associated risks in achieving best consideration.	Risks losing momentum and potentially urgent enquiries / offers. Could also restrict options for land disposals with associated risks in achieving best consideration.
-------	--	--	--

Use of Council assets at the Heysham Gateway

	Option B1: Do nothing further – continue to hold land for the time being	Option B2: Dispose of land drawing on principles at section 4.11 of the report, using the preliminary ground and ecology survey work to assess value.	Option B3: Look to develop necessary infrastructure and undertake development on a design and build basis subject to securing pre-let / sales	Option B4: Look to develop necessary infrastructure and develop units on a speculative basis
Advantages	Retains the site in Council ownership – could be some other (currently unforeseeable) use found at a later date.	Brings an underutilised asset back into use Delivers a capital receipt with knock on savings for revenue budget Regeneration and job creation / retention De-risking contributes to obtaining best consideration A long lease would retain	Aims to bring an underutilised asset back into use Should deliver capital receipt / revenue savings. Regeneration and job creation / retention. Retains a high level of control over the design of the development	Aims to bring an underutilised asset back into use Should deliver capital receipts / revenue savings. Regeneration and job creation / retention. Retains a high level of control over the design of the development

		some limited control over the site.		
Disadvantages	<p>Retains the ongoing management costs of this currently underutilised asset.</p> <p>Would miss the opportunity to deliver a timely capital receipt with knock on savings for revenue budget</p>	Loss of full control over site.	<p>Higher level of initial investment required – may prevent other investment priorities.</p> <p>Requires further appraisal and would take much longer to implement.</p> <p>Very uncertain financial outcome.</p>	<p>Much higher level of initial investment required – may prevent other investment opportunities.</p> <p>Requirements further appraisal and would take much longer to implement.</p> <p>Very uncertain financial outcome.</p>
Risks	<p>Could be seen a missed opportunity by not taking advantage of the publicity and increased demand created by the completion of the M6 link road.</p>	<p>Risk in finding the balance between the levels of up-front investment in de-risking (survey work) required to obtain best consideration for a particular plot.</p> <p>In the future potentially there could potentially be greater opportunity for the land – missed opportunity.</p>	<p>Potentially less attractive to those who would wish to develop the site themselves.</p> <p>Higher financial risk exposure – though potentially lost opportunity to reap greater financial benefits.</p> <p>Harder to deliver – skills and capacity risk.</p>	<p>Potentially less attractive to those who would wish to develop the site themselves</p> <p>Lack of demand for the units provided – with resulting in much higher financial risk exposure.</p> <p>Harder to deliver – skills and capacity risk.</p>

With regards to the development principles for Heysham Gateway the Officer preferred option is to approve Option A2 i.e. to agree development principles for Heysham Gateway as the main guide for future Council decisions affecting the area, as this presents an informed and clear way forward, drawing on the views of other key stakeholders. If approved, Cabinet is requested to authorise Officers to incorporate the agreed principles into a joint marketing prospectus for Heysham Gateway and to work with the other main stakeholders in promoting the area for high quality sustainable regeneration.

With regards to the use of council assets the Officer preferred option is to approve Option B2, i.e. to dispose of land in line with the principles at section 4.11 of the report, using the preliminary ground and ecology survey work to assess value. If approved, Cabinet is requested to recognise that land is surplus to its own operational requirements. In terms of the other options, it is considered that there is little point in simply holding on to the land (option B1). In terms of Options B3 and B4, as referred to in paragraph 4.9 of the report, these options are not considered to be worth the risk, and this has already been accepted in principle by the County Council.

Officers consider their preferred options would provide a clear guide for future strategic development of the Heysham Gateway site, achieving financial benefits from disposal through long leasehold but still retaining some limited control over its current landholdings.

Councillor Hanson proposed, seconded by Councillor Leyshon:-

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

Councillors then voted:-

Resolved unanimously:

- (1) That the development principles for Heysham Gateway (in line with Option A2 and as set out in paragraph 3.6 of the report) be approved as the main guide for future Council decisions affecting the area.
- (2) That Officers be authorised to incorporate the agreed principles into a joint marketing prospectus for Heysham Gateway and to work with the other main stakeholders in promoting the area for high quality sustainable regeneration.
- (3) That approval be given to dispose of City Council land at Heysham Gateway (in line with option B2 and the principles at section 4.11 of the report) using the preliminary ground and ecology survey work to assess value and in support of this:
 - a. the City Council land shown edged in red on the plan attached to the report (Appendix A) be declared surplus to requirements;
 - b. Cabinet authorises Officers to negotiate with interested parties and report back to Cabinet with the results of the negotiations on any parcel of relevant land owned by the City Council to obtain final approval for any disposal.

Officers responsible for effecting the decision:

Chief Officer (Resources)
Chief Officer (Regeneration & Planning)

Reasons for making the decision:

Sustainable Economic Growth is one of the Council's four priorities and Heysham

Gateway is identified as a Regeneration Priority in the Core Strategy and emerging Local Plan. The development principles agreed will provide the basis for actions in the immediate future by the Council, its partners and other stakeholders seeking to capitalise in a sustainable way on the opportunities presented by the opening of the Bay Gateway. Beyond these and building on the effects of inward investments both on development sites, and within the Port itself, work will continue on formulating an ambitious and high profile vision for Heysham Gateway over the next decade.

39 LANCASTER CITY CENTRE PUBLIC SPACES PROTECTION ORDER

(Cabinet Member with Special Responsibility Councillor Hughes)

Cabinet received a report from the Chief Officer (Environment) which sought approval to make a Public Spaces Protection Order covering the Lancaster City Centre.

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

	Option 1: To approve the introduction of a Public Spaces Protection Order covering Lancaster City Centre	Option 2: To take no action
Advantages	The introduction of a PSPO will provide a clear message about the type of behaviour which is not acceptable within the City Centre, and will provide additional powers to tackle any anti-social behaviour as described in the Order. The introduction of an Order responds to public concerns about behaviour within the City Centre. Reinforces the council's commitment to partnership working.	None
Disadvantages	Raises public expectation. The PSPO is a tool that can be used by authorised officers. However there is no additional staff resource being allocated to this.	<p>The current City Centre no outside drinking rules will no longer be able to be enforced as the DPPO expires in 2017.</p> <p>The Police has requested that as partners in the CSP we take out a PSPO. To taken no action would demonstrate a lack of support.</p> <p>Does not demonstrate the council's commitment to community safety and addressing residents'</p>

		legitimate concerns.
--	--	----------------------

Option 1 is the preferred officer option, and has the support of the Community Safety Partnership and the local community.

Councillor Hughes proposed, seconded by Councillor Clifford:-

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

Councillors then voted:-

Resolved unanimously:

- (1) That the making of a Public Spaces Protection Order covering the designated area of Lancaster City Centre, as set out in Appendix A to the report, be approved.

Officer responsible for effecting the decision:

Chief Officer (Environment)

Reasons for making the decision:

The decision supports the Council's priorities of Clean, Green and Safe Places and Community Leadership. The making of a Public Spaces Protection Order covering the designated area of Lancaster City Centre should enable the better policing of this public space and bring relief to local residents.

40 BUDGET AND POLICY FRAMEWORK UPDATE 2017 TO 2021

(Cabinet Member with Special Responsibility Councillor Whitehead)

Cabinet received a report from the Chief Officer (Resources) which sought approval for the 2017/21 budget strategy and timetable, and provided an update on the Council's financial position to help inform development of Cabinet's planning and budget proposals.

In term of the actual budget position, the report was primarily for information, to assist Cabinet in its budget deliberations. No specific decisions were sought at this time.

Regarding the budget strategy and timetable, Cabinet may approve the proposals as set out in the report, or require changes to be made to the suggested approach. The overriding aim of any budget setting process is to approve a balanced budget by statutory deadlines, allocating resources to help ensure delivery of the Council's corporate and service objectives. The proposed approach is in line with that broad aim, drawing on the time and other resources available to the Council, to help ensure a robust approach. Any changes that Cabinet puts forward should also be framed in that context.

The Council remains well placed to address future financial challenges, but the scale of those challenges will be influenced by forthcoming Government announcements and future policy. Budget work has progressed well to date, and the outlook for next year means that the Council has time to focus on more strategic planning and its future direction ahead of the 2018/19 budget, and reassessing its resource needs accordingly.

Councillor Whitehead proposed, seconded by Councillor Leytham:-

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

Councillors then voted:-

Resolved unanimously:

- (1) That Cabinet approves the budget strategy and timetable as summarised in Appendices A and B to the report.
- (2) That the draft budgetary position for current and future years be noted, accepting that this is an interim update, but taking account of Government’s confirmation of the 4-year Settlement up to 2019/20.
- (3) That for the next Cabinet meeting in January, Cabinet determines its initial draft budget proposals for 2017/18 onwards, drawing on information from this report, any budget options currently being developed by Officers, and Government’s announcements regarding the Spending Review and the Settlement.

Officer responsible for effecting the decision:

Chief Officer (Resources)

Reasons for making the decision:

Draft budget proposals will be considered by Cabinet on 17th January and presented to the Budget and Performance Panel on 24th January 2017.

41 ITEM OF URGENT BUSINESS - LANCASHIRE ESIF PROJECT - MORE POSITIVE TOGETHER

(Cabinet Member with Special Responsibility Councillor Leytham)

In accordance with Part 4, Section 7, Urgent Business Procedure Rules and S100B(4) of the Local Government Act 1972, Cabinet received a report from the Chief Officer (Health & Housing) to approve the Council’s participation in a bid for European Structural and Investment Funds being made by Lancashire Sport and for the Council to act as a ‘cluster lead’ to support the More Positive Together tackling worklessness project within social housing in the district. An urgent decision was required to enable the Council to assess the ESIF funding.

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

	Option 1: Not accept the bid and funding being sought by Lancashire Sport for European Structural and Investment Funds and not to	Option 2: To accept the bid and funding being sought by Lancashire Sport for European Structural and Investment Funds and to act as a “cluster lead” for
--	--	---

	act as a “cluster lead” for the More Positive Together programme within this district.	the More Positive Together programme within this district.
Advantages	Any internal resources released through not participating in the programme could be deployed on other activities	Additional outside funding would be made available in this district to assist in reducing worklessness. Social housing tenants would be provided with the opportunity to enhance their employability, and potentially reduce the need for welfare benefits.
Disadvantages	Additional outside funding would not be made available in this district to assist in reducing worklessness.	Accessing ESIF funding presents organisational and bureaucratic demands.
Risks	Reputational risk of not being part of a pan-Lancashire funding programme.	Reputational risk though possible inability to bring together a programme to be delivered through delivery partners. Financial risk of ESIF claims not being accepted.

The Officer preferred option was for Cabinet to accept the bid and funding being sought by Lancashire Sport for European Structural and Investment Funds and to act as a “cluster lead” for the More Positive Together programme within this district.

Councillor Leytham proposed, seconded by Councillor Pattison:-

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

Councillors then voted:-

Resolved unanimously:

- (1) That approval is given to the Council’s participation in a bid for European Structural and Investment Funds being made by Lancashire Sport, and for the Council to act as a “cluster lead” to support the More Positive Together tackling worklessness project within social housing in this district.

Officer responsible for effecting the decision:

Chief Officer (Health & Housing)

Reasons for making the decision:

Supporting the bid is compatible with the Council’s core purposes to:

- “bring communities and agencies together to work in partnership to address the major issues affecting the district”, and

- “maintain a sustainable and cohesive community by ensuring we understand the needs of our communities and provide equality of access to our services and employment opportunities.”

If the bid is successful the funding will enable the Council to support households with multiple and complex barriers to participation in work and to address the underlying issues to enable them move closer to or into the labour market.

42 EXCLUSION OF THE PRESS AND PUBLIC

The Chairman asked for any further declarations of interest from Cabinet Members regarding the exempt report.

It was moved by Councillor Clifford and seconded by Councillor Blamire:-

“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 paragraphs 1 and 2 of Schedule 12A of that Act.”

Members then voted as follows:-

Resolved unanimously:

- (1) That, in accordance with Section 100A(4) of the Local Government Act 1972, the press and public be excluded from the meeting for the following item of business, on the grounds that it could involve the possible disclosure of exempt information as defined in paragraphs 1 and 2 of Schedule 12A of that Act.

43 SERVICE REVIEW – COUNCIL HOUSING

(Cabinet Member with Special Responsibility Councillor Leytham)

Cabinet received a report from the Chief Officer (Health & Housing) which sought approval for proposals to restructure the housing management service of the Council and for the budgetary provision to support the proposed restructure. The report was exempt from publication by virtue of paragraphs 1 and 2 of Schedule 12a of the Local Government Act 1972.

The options, options analysis, including risk assessment and officer preferred option, were set out in the exempt report.

Councillor Leytham proposed, seconded by Councillor Clifford:-

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

Councillors then voted:-

Resolved unanimously:

- (1) That subject to consultation and (2) below, the proposed approach, as set out in Option 1 in the exempt report, be approved and implementation of the specific

restructure proposals are reported to Personnel Committee for approval as appropriate.

- (2) That implementation of the above is subject to the required funding being identified and ensuring that it fits in with the overall 30 Year HRA Business Plan and Medium Term Financial Strategy (MTFS), for approval as part of the 2017/21 Budget Process.

Officers responsible for effecting the decision:

Chief Officer (Health & Housing)

Chief Officer (Resources)

Reasons for making the decision:

The decision will enable the Council to provide a modern, high quality and improved housing management service to tenants and leaseholders and is consistent with the Council's core purposes to:

- bring communities and agencies together to work in partnership to address the major issues affecting the district.
- provide a range of customer-focussed services that deliver our statutory responsibilities, offer value for money and meet the needs of people who live in, work in and visit the district.
- maintain a sustainable and cohesive community by ensuring we understand the needs of our communities and provide equality of access to our services and employment opportunities.

Chairman

(The meeting ended at 6.28 p.m.)

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

MINUTES PUBLISHED ON FRIDAY 9TH DECEMBER, 2016.

**EFFECTIVE DATE FOR IMPLEMENTING THE DECISIONS CONTAINED IN THESE MINUTES:
MONDAY 19TH DECEMBER, 2016.**