

PROCEEDINGS

A meeting of the Lancaster City Council was held in the Town Hall, Morecambe, at 6.00 p.m. on Wednesday, 25 September 2019, when the following Members were present:-

David Whitaker (Mayor)

Tony Anderson

Stephie Barber

Victoria Boyd-Power

Abbott Bryning

Darren Clifford

Roger Dennison

Merv Evans

Kevin Frea

Mike Greenall

Mandy King

Erica Lewis

Jack O'Dwyer-Henry

Joyce Pritchard

Michael Smith

Sandra Thornberry

David Whitworth

Jason Wood

Mel Guilding

Janice Hanson

Caroline Jackson

Geoff Knight

Jean Parr

John Reynolds

Anne Whitehead

Alan Biddulph (Deputy Mayor)

Mandy Bannon

Phillip Black

Dave Brookes

Roger Cleet

Lucie Carrington

Adrian Duggan

Jason Firth

Jake Goodwin

Tricia Heath

Sarah Knight

Michael Mumford

Faye Penny

Stewart Scothern

Paul Stubbins

Katie Whearty

John Wild

Joanna Young

Tim Hamilton-Cox

Colin Hartley

Joan Jackson

Abi Mills

Robert Redfern

Oliver Robinson

Peter Yates

55 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Paul Anderton, Richard Austen-Baker, Keith Budden, Tim Dant, Gina Dowding, June Greenwell, Debbie Jenkins, Cary Matthews, Alistair Sinclair and Malcolm Thomas.

56 MINUTES

The minutes of the meeting held on 17 July 2019 were signed by the Mayor as a correct record.

57 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Members advised of the following interests at this stage:

Councillor Geoff Knight declared an interest – of the category of ‘other interest, prejudicial’ in relation to the motion on notice regarding no deal Brexit (minute 70 refers) in view of his membership of the EU Committee of the Regions.

Councillor Dennison declared an interest – of the category ‘other interest’ which he believed to be prejudicial - in relation to the motion on notice regarding a fully funded, proper pay rise for council workers as a lifetime member of Unison. He announced his intention to withdraw from the Chamber during consideration of that item. Councillor Parr declared an interest - of the category ‘other interest, non-prejudicial’ in the same motion as a retired member of Unison (minute 71 refers).

58 ANNOUNCEMENT - HONORARY ALDERMAN ROGER MACE

The Mayor reported the sad death of Honorary Alderman Roger Mace at the weekend in St John’s Hospice, following a period of illness.

Roger was first elected to the Council in May 1999 and represented Over Kellet ward for twenty years. He served as Leader of the Council from May 2007 to February 2009 and held the office of Mayor in 2017/18. Roger was admitted to the roll of Honorary Aldermen in May 2019 in recognition of his eminent service to the district as a past Member of the Council.

The thoughts of the Council were with Roger’s wife, Joyce, and their three children.

The funeral would be held on Thursday 3 October. A service would be held at the Priory Church at 12pm, followed by a private burial. Any donations should be made to St John’s Hospice.

Members stood in a minute’s silence in his memory.

59 ANNOUNCEMENT - CHARITY EVENTS

The Mayor thanked Councillors for attending his Charity Quiz Night which had raised over £600 for his chosen charity.

He informed Members that he would be hosting a Christmas Party on Friday 13 December in the Banqueting Suite at Lancaster Town Hall. Tickets would be going on sale shortly from the Mayor’s office, costing £12.50 each, which would include a hot supper.

The Mayor then reminded all Councillors not to talk to each other whilst a Member was making a speech, as a matter of courtesy. Councillors were also asked to use the microphones when called upon to speak, to ensure that their voice was picked up on the digital audio recording.

In, relation to the agenda, the Mayor announced that he was re-ordering the items to take items 14-17 directly after item 9.

Before closing the item of business, the Mayor gave permission for Councillor Mumford, the ward Councillor for Kellet ward, to give a speech. Councillor Mumford paid tribute to the former Councillor for Kellet ward, Honorary Alderman Roger Mace, who had recently passed away.

60 QUESTIONS FROM THE PUBLIC UNDER COUNCIL PROCEDURE RULE 11 (Pages 17 - 20)

The Mayor advised that three questions had been received from members of the public in accordance with Council Procedure Rule 11. The first had been submitted by Honorary Alderman Mr Roger Mace to the Leader of the Council regarding disposal of furniture. Roger's family had requested that the answer to the question be provided to them and the Mayor had therefore asked Democratic Services to make sure that it was supplied.

The two remaining questions were:

- 1) Ms Wendy Haslam to Councillor Frea regarding education about climate change.
- 2) Mr Tony Haslam to Councillor Frea regarding taking action on climate change.

The Mayor informed Councillors that the questioners were not able to be present to ask their questions in person and he had therefore asked for written answers to be provided to them.

The wording of all the questions from the public are appended to the minutes.

61 PETITIONS AND ADDRESSES

The Mayor invited Ms Marianne Birkby to address Council on embracing the local energy revolution, on behalf of Radiation Free Lakeland. A copy of the speech had been previously circulated.

The Mayor thanked Ms Birkby for speaking to Council and asked the Deputy Leader, whose portfolio included the response to the Climate Change Emergency, if he would like to respond.

Councillor Frea thanked Ms Birkby for delivering the address to Councillors and advised her of the work that the Council was already undertaking in the areas of Climate Change and locally owned energy.

62 LEADER'S REPORT

The Leader presented her report updating Members on various issues since her last report to Council.

Resolved:

That the report be noted.

63 EXECUTIVE ARRANGEMENTS

Council noted a report of the Leader, informing Members that Rule 20 of the Cabinet Procedure Rules had been amended to reflect the new structure of Advisory Groups.

64 APPOINTMENT OF THE RETURNING OFFICER AND ELECTORAL REGISTRATION OFFICER

The Chief Executive and Director of Corporate Services left the Chamber before this item commenced.

The Democratic Services Manager submitted a report asking Council to consider appointing the City Council's Chief Executive, Mr Kieran Keane, as the Council's Returning Officer and Electoral Registration Officer with immediate effect.

Councillor Hanson put forward the recommendation, as set out in the report, seconded by Councillor Lewis

There was no debate and the proposal was clearly carried when put to the vote.

Resolved:

That Mr Kieran Keane, Chief Executive of Lancaster City Council, be appointed to the roles of Returning Officer and Electoral Registration Officer with immediate effect.

The Chief Executive and Director of Corporate Services returned to the Chamber at this point.

65 REVIEW OF POLLING DISTRICTS AND POLLING PLACES 2019

The Chief Executive submitted a report to enable Council to consider arrangements for determining the outcome of the review of polling districts and polling places in the Parliamentary Constituencies of Morecambe and Lunesdale and Lancaster and Fleetwood. Proposals for amendments to polling districts and polling places were set out in Appendix B of the report.

The Elections Manager responded to questions from Councillors. Rather than deal with proposals for changes individually at the meeting, it was confirmed that this could be done after the meeting. Any Ward Councillors who wished to discuss changes should contact the Elections Manager.

Councillor Hanson, seconded by Councillor Hartley, proposed the recommendations as set out in the report.

There was no debate. A vote was taken and the proposal was clearly carried.

Resolved:

- (1) That consideration be given to amendments to polling districts and polling places in the Morecambe and Lunesdale and Lancaster and Fleetwood Parliamentary Constituencies as outlined in Appendix B to the report.
- (2) That delegated authority be given to the Returning Officer in consultation with the relevant ward Councillors, to make any necessary changes to polling places that

may arise other than as part of a review.

66 APPOINTMENTS TO OUTSIDE BODIES

Council considered a report submitted by the Democratic Services Manager. The report noted that a vacancy had arisen on the Board of the North Lancashire Citizens Advice Bureau (CAB), due the resignation of Councillor Biddulph from that body. There was also a place available on the Fylde, Lancaster and Wyre Children's Board.

The Mayor called for nominations to the North Lancashire CAB Board first. Councillor O'Dwyer-Henry nominated Councillor Hartley, seconded by Councillor Wood, and Councillor Geoff Knight nominated Councillor Anderson, seconded by Councillor Dennison.

The Mayor called for a vote. There were 30 votes for Councillor Hartley and 17 votes for Councillor Anderson. Councillor Hartley was duly appointed.

The Mayor asked for nominations to the seat on the Fylde, Lancaster and Wyre Children's Board. Councillor O'Dwyer-Henry, seconded by Councillor Wood, nominated Councillor King.

Councillor Caroline Jackson raised a point of order with the Mayor, that the basis of appointment for the seat on the Fylde, Lancaster and Wyre Children's Board had not been determined before a nomination had been taken. The Mayor took advice. The assumption was that, since a nomination had been put forward, this implied that the basis would be by nomination and voting at Council. To make sure this was the case, the Mayor asked if there were any objections to the basis of appointment being by way of nomination and voting at Council. No objections were stated and no further nominations were made, therefore Councillor King was declared appointed to the Fylde, Lancaster and Wyre Children's Board.

Resolved:

- (1) That Councillor Hartley be appointed to the vacancy on the North Lancashire CAB Board.
- (2) That, the basis of appointment being confirmed as by nomination and voting at Council, Councillor King be appointed to the Fylde, Lancaster and Wyre Children's Board.

67 APPOINTMENTS AND CHANGES TO COMMITTEE MEMBERSHIP

No appointments or changes to committee memberships were reported.

68 MOTION ON NOTICE - VOTER ID PILOTS

The following motion of which notice had been given to the Chief Executive in accordance with Council Procedure Rule 15 was moved by Councillor O'Dwyer-Henry and seconded by Councillor Lewis:-

"This Council notes that:

- *Of the 44.6 million votes cast in UK elections in 2017, there was just one conviction resulting from the 28 allegations of in-person voter fraud.*

- *After the May 2018 Voter ID pilots, the Electoral Reform Society concluded that the introduction of Voter ID is “a sledge hammer to crack a nut”.*
- *In 2018, Electoral Commission research found that about 7.5% of the electorate do not have access to any form of photo ID.*
- *That young people, older people, people with disabilities, trans people, BAME communities and the homeless would especially be negatively impacted by a requirement to produce photo ID to cast a vote.*
- *Over 1,100 people have been denied a vote in local government elections due to the 2018 and 2019 Voter ID pilots.*

This Council believes that introducing mandatory Voter ID would undermine our democracy.

Therefore, this Council resolves to not participate in any Voter ID pilots for any elections in our District.

And this Council further resolves to instruct the Chief Executive to write to the Cabinet Office to express this Council’s opposition to the introduction of mandatory Voter ID in any UK elections.”

Background information was supplied in an officer briefing note which had been published with the agenda.

There were no questions to the proposer of the motion. Debate was underway when Councillor Barber proposed an amendment to the motion “that Lancaster District be put forward as an ideal place for a pilot scheme for Voter ID”. Councillor Black raised a point of order, informing the Mayor that the effect of Councillor Barber’s wording was to negate the motion and could not be accepted as a valid amendment. The Mayor confirmed this was the case, and Councillor Barber withdrew the wording.

There was further debate. Councillor Dennison then proposed an amendment:

“That anyone entitled to vote who does not have identification should be supplied with it by the government.”

Councillor Gilding seconded the amendment, however, the Deputy Monitoring Officer queried whether this was being proposed to replace the motion (opposing the introduction of mandatory ID), or as an addition to the motion (in which case it would appear to be a wrecking amendment, lacking relevance to the course of action proposed by the motion). Councillor Dennison confirmed that his wording was intended as an addition to the motion, not a replacement. After receiving advice from the Deputy Monitoring Officer, the Mayor ruled that Councillor Dennison’s amendment was not relevant to the motion, as required by Council procedure rule 17.6 (a), and Councillor Dennison withdrew it.

Debate was concluded, a vote was taken and the motion was clearly carried.

Resolved:-

This Council notes that:

- Of the 44.6 million votes cast in UK elections in 2017, there was just one conviction resulting from the 28 allegations of in-person voter fraud.

- After the May 2018 Voter ID pilots, the Electoral Reform Society concluded that the introduction of Voter ID is “a sledge hammer to crack a nut”.
- In 2018, Electoral Commission research found that about 7.5% of the electorate do not have access to any form of photo ID.
- That young people, older people, people with disabilities, trans people, BAME communities and the homeless would especially be negatively impacted by a requirement to produce photo ID to cast a vote.
- Over 1,100 people have been denied a vote in local government elections due to the 2018 and 2019 Voter ID pilots.

This Council believes that introducing mandatory Voter ID would undermine our democracy.

Therefore, this Council resolves to not participate in any Voter ID pilots for any elections in our District.

And this Council further resolves to instruct the Chief Executive to write to the Cabinet Office to express this Council’s opposition to the introduction of mandatory Voter ID in any UK elections.

69 MOTION ON NOTICE - SKERTON COMMUNITY HIGH SCHOOL

Councillor Thornberry proposed the following motion having given the required notice to the Chief Executive in accordance with Council Procedure Rule 15:-

“As the 5 year anniversary of the closure of Skerton Community High School passes, Council reflects on the continued dispossession and dereliction of these premises in the heart of our urban community.

Skerton Community High School had offered a site for education and a focal point for the community in north Lancaster since the mid 1930’s. The High School was closed and has stood empty since 31st August 2014. The buildings are becoming increasingly dilapidated and are understood to contain hazardous materials such as asbestos.

The land and buildings in question are owned and managed by Lancashire County Council, who have been unwilling or unable to indicate their intentions for the future of the site.

This Council believes that the site has massive potential to be used once again primarily for educational purposes, and possibly also as a hub for the community, to promote health and wellbeing, sports, environment, and provide a local economic boost for residents in North of Lancaster.

Council therefore resolves to;

- (1) *Call upon Lancashire County Council to bring the site back into regular use, possibly for a plurality of uses, but certainly education again as soon as possible.*
- (2) *To actively seek out, and support potential partners/occupiers of the site in their dealings with Lancashire County Council.*
- (3) *To liaise with Lancashire County Council in trying to identify potential partners and uses for the site, such as provision for children with EHCP’s (Education and Health Care Plan), a city centre campus for a university, a technical college, a community*

- centre, woodland or town green.*
- (4) *To liaise with Lancashire County Council (or other 3rd parties utilising the site) to ensure any renovations or developments comply with our 'ambitions', in particular in terms of local procurement, employment standards and the climate emergency declaration."*

Councillor Redfern seconded the motion.

An amendment to the motion, in the form of an addendum, was moved by Councillor Bannon and seconded by Councillor Caroline Jackson:

"5. To instruct officers to investigate with Lancashire County Council, the availability of the site for acquisition within the City Council Capital Strategy as a potential investment, with a view to the extensive site providing affordable/social housing and generating funding for the creation of the community facilities."

Councillor Thornberry spoke to say that she would not accept this as a friendly amendment as it did not reflect the motion's emphasis on keeping education as the primary use for the site.

At this point, the Mayor asked the Deputy Monitoring Officer to speak. She provided clarification about the validity of the amendment with regard to the Constitution, explaining that it was not relevant to the motion being debated. The amendment proposed a radically different course of action to the one outlined in the motion. Council did not have supporting factual information about the resource implications which investigating acquiring and developing the land might entail, which would normally have been provided in the form of a briefing note, as required by Council Procedure Rule 15.3. In view of this advice, the Mayor ruled that the amendment could not be taken forward and debate should continue on the original motion. When that debate ended, a recorded vote was called for in accordance with Council Procedure Rule 19.4.

The votes were recorded as follows:-

Votes 'for' the motion:-

Councillors Anderson, Bannon, Barber, Biddulph, Black, Boyd-Power, Brookes, Bryning, Carrington, Cleet, Clifford, Dennison, Duggan, Evans, Firth, Frea, Goodwin, Greenall, Greenwell, Guilding, Hamilton-Cox, Hanson, Hartley, Heath, Caroline Jackson, Joan Jackson, King, Geoff Knight, Sarah Knight, Lewis, Mills, Mumford, O'Dwyer-Henry, Parr, Penny, Pritchard, Redfern, Reynolds, Robinson, Scothern, Smith, Stubbins, Thornberry, Whearty, Whitaker, Whitehead, Whitworth, Wild, Wood, Yates and Young.

There were no votes against the motion and no abstentions.

Resolved unanimously:-

As the 5 year anniversary of the closure of Skerton Community High School passes, Council reflects on the continued dispossession and dereliction of these premises in the heart of our urban community.

Skerton Community High School had offered a site for education and a focal point for the community in north Lancaster since the mid 1930's. The High School was closed and has stood empty since 31st August 2014. The buildings are becoming increasingly dilapidated and are understood to contain hazardous materials such as asbestos.

The land and buildings in question are owned and managed by Lancashire County Council, who have been unwilling or unable to indicate their intentions for the future of the site.

This Council believes that the site has massive potential to be used once again primarily for educational purposes, and possibly also as a hub for the community, to promote health and wellbeing, sports, environment, and provide a local economic boost for residents in North of Lancaster.

Council therefore resolves to;

- (1) Call upon Lancashire County Council to bring the site back into regular use, possibly for a plurality of uses, but certainly education again as soon as possible.
- (2) To actively seek out, and support potential partners/occupiers of the site in their dealings with Lancashire County Council.
- (3) To liaise with Lancashire County Council in trying to identify potential partners and uses for the site, such as provision for children with EHCP's (Education and Health Care Plan), a city centre campus for a university, a technical college, a community centre, woodland or town green.
- (4) To liaise with Lancashire County Council (or other 3rd parties utilising the site) to ensure any renovations or developments comply with our 'ambitions', in particular in terms of local procurement, employment standards and the climate emergency declaration.

70 MOTION ON NOTICE - NO DEAL BREXIT

Having previously declared an interest, Councillor Geoff Knight left the Council chamber for the duration of the following item.

The following motion had been submitted to the Chief Executive, in accordance with Council Procedure Rule 15, by Councillor Black (proposer), and Councillors Robinson, O'Dwyer-Henry, Parr and Thornberry (seconders).

The proposer of the motion and the Leader of the Council both responded to questions about the motion from Members, before it was moved by Councillor Black and seconded by Councillor Robinson:-

"This council notes that;

The UK is scheduled to leave the European Union on 31st of October 2019.

Parliamentary legislation has been passed that seeks to diminish the likelihood of a No-Deal Brexit.

Despite this the Government is determined that we should exit the EU by any means, regardless of consequences, therefore a No-Deal Brexit remains a very real possibility.

Preparations for the impact of a No-Deal Brexit in this authority area are being conducted by the disaster and emergency planning body – the Lancashire Resilience Forum.

According to The Institute for Government, advice from the Local Government Association, and crucially the Government's own publicly available guidance papers - residents in our district can anticipate difficulty and disruption affecting:

- *Heysham Port (as part of the UK border, customs and movement of people)*
- *Higher Education Institutions (research funding, income from EU students' fees)*
- *Nuclear Power Stations (importing plutonium & uranium radioactive fuel products)*
- *NHS Services (availability of medicines, staffing and waiting times for procedures)*
- *Businesses in the following sectors: Food and Drink (including school meals), Manufacturing, Farming, Agriculture, Animals, Fisheries, Forestry, Legal & Professional Services, Charities & Voluntary Organisations, Construction, Environmental, Defence, Energy, Entertainment, Arts, Culture & Heritage, Finance, Insurance, Real Estate, Health & Social Care, Telecoms and Information Services, Chemicals, Mining, Public Administration, Retail, Tourism & Hospitality, Couriers and Shipping Services. Especially where these businesses import/export, hire staff from the EU or have employees who need to travel or work in the EU.*

This Council believes that;

Taken as a whole, and based on the Government's own advice papers, it reasonable to infer that a No-Deal Brexit will have a detrimental impact on our authority district, its businesses, communities and residents.

A No-Deal Brexit is highly likely to expose the Council to additional challenges, costs and pressures.

Opposing a No-Deal Brexit is the right and proper stance for this authority to adopt.

The Government should respect the will of Parliament and rule out the possibility of a no-deal Brexit.

This Council resolves that;

The Chief Executive of the Council will write to the Brexit Minister, the Minister for Local Government and the Prime Minister. The letter will outline our concerns, explain our position and call for the Government to take whatever steps are necessary to categorically rule out the possibility of a No-Deal Brexit."

An officer briefing note had been supplied with the agenda.

A lengthy debate followed.

Councillor Caroline Jackson proposed moving to the vote. This procedural motion was seconded by Councillor Mumford and was carried when the Mayor called for a vote.

A recorded vote on the motion was called for in accordance with Council Procedure Rule 19.4.

Votes 'for' the motion were recorded as follows:

Councillors Bannon, Biddulph, Black, Brookes, Bryning, Carrington, Clifford, Frea, Hamilton-Cox, Hanson, Hartley, Caroline Jackson, King, Lewis, Mills, Mumford, O'Dwyer-Henry, Parr, Penny, Pritchard, Redfern, Reynolds, Robinson, Stubbins, Thornberry, Whearty, Whitaker, Whitehead, Yates and Young (30).

Votes 'against':

Councillors Barber, Boyd-Power, Cleet, Evans, Firth, Guilding, Heath, Joan Jackson, Scothern, Smith, Whitworth, Wild and Wood (13).

Abstentions:

Councillors Anderson, Dennison, Duggan, Goodwin, Greenall and Sarah Knight (6).

Resolved:-

This council notes that;

The UK is scheduled to leave the European Union on 31st of October 2019.

Parliamentary legislation has been passed that seeks to diminish the likelihood of a No-Deal Brexit.

Despite this the Government is determined that we should exit the EU by any means, regardless of consequences, therefore a No-Deal Brexit remains a very real possibility.

Preparations for the impact of a No-Deal Brexit in this authority area are being conducted by the disaster and emergency planning body – the Lancashire Resilience Forum.

According to The Institute for Government, advice from the Local Government Association, and crucially the Government's own publicly available guidance papers - residents in our district can anticipate difficulty and disruption affecting:

- Heysham Port (as part of the UK border, customs and movement of people)
- Higher Education Institutions (research funding, income from EU students' fees)
- Nuclear Power Stations (importing plutonium & uranium radioactive fuel products)
- NHS Services (availability of medicines, staffing and waiting times for procedures)
- Businesses in the following sectors: Food and Drink (including school meals), Manufacturing, Farming, Agriculture, Animals, Fisheries, Forestry, Legal & Professional Services, Charities & Voluntary Organisations, Construction, Environmental, Defence, Energy, Entertainment, Arts, Culture & Heritage, Finance, Insurance, Real Estate, Health & Social Care, Telecoms and Information Services, Chemicals, Mining, Public Administration, Retail, Tourism & Hospitality, Couriers and Shipping Services. Especially where these businesses import/export, hire staff from the EU or have employees who need to travel or work in the EU.

This Council believes that;

Taken as a whole, and based on the Government's own advice papers, it reasonable to infer that a No-Deal Brexit will have a detrimental impact on our authority district, its businesses, communities and residents.

A No-Deal Brexit is highly likely to expose the Council to additional challenges, costs and pressures.

Opposing a No-Deal Brexit is the right and proper stance for this authority to adopt.

The Government should respect the will of Parliament and rule out the possibility of a no-deal Brexit.

This Council resolves that;

The Chief Executive of the Council will write to the Brexit Minister, the Minister for Local Government and the Prime Minister. The letter will outline our concerns, explain our position and call for the Government to take whatever steps are necessary to categorically rule out the possibility of a No-Deal Brexit

71 MOTION ON NOTICE - A FULLY FUNDED, PROPER PAY RISE FOR COUNCIL WORKERS

Having previously declared an interest which he felt required him to leave the meeting, Councillor Dennison left the council chamber for the duration of the following item.

The required notice of the following motion had been given to the Chief Executive in accordance with Council Procedure Rule 15 by Councillors Wood, Lewis, O'Dwyer-Henry, Redfern and Penny.

After responding to questions from Councillors, Councillor Wood proposed the following motion. In accordance with Council Procedure Rule 17.7 he added the word 'national', for clarification, into the first resolution, to change "pay claim" to "national pay claim".

"Lancaster City Council notes:

- (1) Local Government overall has endured central government funding cuts of nearly 50% since 2010.*
- (2) Between 2010 and 2020, Lancaster City Council will have lost 54p out of every £1 they have received from central government.*
- (3) The 2019 Local Government Association (LGA) survey of council finances found that 1 in 3 councils fear they will run out of funding to provide even their statutory, legal duties by 2022/23. This number rises to almost two thirds of councils by 2024/2025 or later.*
- (4) The LGA estimates councils will face a funding gap of £8 billion by 2025.*
- (5) Faced with these cuts from central government, the local government workforce has endured years of pay restraint with the majority of pay points losing 22 per cent of their value since 2009/10.*
- (6) At the same time as seeing their pay go down in real terms, workers experience ever increasing workloads and persistent job insecurity. Across the UK, an estimated 876,000 jobs have been lost in local government since June 2010 – a reduction of 30 per cent. Local government has arguably been hit by more severe job losses than any other part of the public sector.*
- (7) There has been a disproportionate impact on women, with women making up more than three quarters of the local government workforce.*

Lancaster City Council believes:

- (1) Our public service workers are a valuable resource. They keep our communities clean, look after those in need and keep our towns and cities running.*
- (2) Without the professionalism and dedication of our staff, the council services our residents rely on would not be deliverable.*
- (3) Government funding has been cut to such an extent that a proper pay rise could result in a reduction in local government services.*
- (4) The government needs to take responsibility and fully fund increases in pay; it should not put the burden on local authorities whose funding been cut to the bone.*

Lancaster City Council resolves to:

- (1) Support the national pay claim submitted by GMB UNISON and Unite on behalf of council workers for a:*

- a) *£10 per hour minimum wage and a 10 per cent uplift across all other pay points in 2020/21,*
 - b) *one day increase to the minimum paid annual leave entitlement set out in the Green Book,*
 - c) *two hour reduction in the standard working week as set out in the Green Book, and*
 - d) *comprehensive joint national review of the workplace causes of stress and mental ill-health throughout local authorities*
- (2) *Call on the Local Government Association to make urgent representations to central government to fund the NJC pay claim*
 - (3) *Request the Council Chief Executive write to the Chancellor and Secretary of State to call for a pay increase for local government workers to be funded with new money from central government.*
 - (4) *Request the Cabinet member for Resources meets with local NJC union representatives to convey support for the pay claim.*
 - (5) *Encourage all local government workers across the district to join a union."*

Councillor Lewis seconded the motion.

An officer briefing note had been circulated before the meeting.

An amendment to the motion was moved by Councillor Stubbins. He asked that two changes be considered:-

- "(1) to add "conditional on it being funded by central government" to resolution (1) after the words "national pay claim".
- (2) to add an additional resolution, to read "In the event that any settlement does not include provision for a £10 per hour minimum wage, officers should be instructed to explore costs and implications of the City Council implementing this."

Councillor Hamilton-Cox seconded this amendment.

The first part of the amendment was accepted as a friendly amendment by Councillor Wood and his seconder, however the second part, regarding the minimum wage, was not.

The Mayor then asked for debate on the second part of the amendment.

At the conclusion of the debate a vote was taken on the amendment. It was carried with 25 Members voting 'for'; 20 voting 'against' and one abstention.

The amended wording then became the substantive motion and the Mayor called for a vote again. The motion was clearly carried.

Resolved:-

Lancaster City Council notes:

- (1) Local Government overall has endured central government funding cuts of nearly 50% since 2010.
- (2) Between 2010 and 2020, Lancaster City Council will have lost 54p out of every £1 they have received from central government.
- (3) The 2019 Local Government Association (LGA) survey of council finances found that 1 in 3 councils fear they will run out of funding to provide even their statutory,

legal duties by 2022/23. This number rises to almost two thirds of councils by 2024/2025 or later.

- (4) The LGA estimates councils will face a funding gap of £8 billion by 2025.
- (5) Faced with these cuts from central government, the local government workforce has endured years of pay restraint with the majority of pay points losing 22 per cent of their value since 2009/10.
- (6) At the same time as seeing their pay go down in real terms, workers experience ever increasing workloads and persistent job insecurity. Across the UK, an estimated 876,000 jobs have been lost in local government since June 2010 – a reduction of 30 per cent. Local government has arguably been hit by more severe job losses than any other part of the public sector.
- (7) There has been a disproportionate impact on women, with women making up more than three quarters of the local government workforce.

Lancaster City Council believes:

- (1) Our public service workers are a valuable resource. They keep our communities clean, look after those in need and keep our towns and cities running.
- (2) Without the professionalism and dedication of our staff, the council services our residents rely on would not be deliverable.
- (3) Government funding has been cut to such an extent that a proper pay rise could result in a reduction in local government services.
- (4) The government needs to take responsibility and fully fund increases in pay; it should not put the burden on local authorities whose funding been cut to the bone.

Lancaster City Council resolves to:

- (1) Support the national pay claim, conditional on it being funded by central government, submitted by GMB UNISON and Unite on behalf of council workers for a:
 - a) £10 per hour minimum wage and a 10 per cent uplift across all other pay points in 2020/21,
 - b) one day increase to the minimum paid annual leave entitlement set out in the Green Book,
 - c) two hour reduction in the standard working week as set out in the Green Book, and
 - d) comprehensive joint national review of the workplace causes of stress and mental ill-health throughout local authorities
- (2) Call on the Local Government Association to make urgent representations to central government to fund the NJC pay claim
- (3) Request the Council Chief Executive write to the Chancellor and Secretary of State to call for a pay increase for local government workers to be funded with new money from central government.
- (4) Request the Cabinet member for Resources meets with local NJC union representatives to convey support for the pay claim.
- (5) Encourage all local government workers across the district to join a union.
- (6) In the event that any settlement does not include provision for a £10 per hour minimum wage, officers should be instructed to explore costs and implications of the City Council implementing this.

72 QUESTIONS UNDER COUNCIL PROCEDURE RULE 12

No questions had been received.

73 MINUTES OF CABINET

Council considered the minutes of the Cabinet meeting held on 6 August 2019 and draft minutes of the Cabinet meeting held on 3 September 2019. No questions were raised.

Resolved:

That the minutes of 6 August 2019 and the draft minutes of 3 September 2019 Cabinet meetings be noted.

Mayor

(The meeting finished at 8.25 p.m.)

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

Question submitted by Honorary Alderman Mr Roger Mace to Councillor Erica Lewis

Some furniture previously stored at St. Leonards House was sold at auction in September 2014. Was the DCMS guidance followed in relation to this disposal as recommended within paragraph g of Recommendation 4 in the Council Assets Task Group report from September 2008?

Supplementary question;

And, do you agree with me that the procedures for the disposal of moveable assets that were approved at Cabinet in 2008 should be reviewed, the report of the Council Assets Task group factually updated and that all the recommendations of minute 62 of the Cabinet meeting on 7th October 2008 should be seen to be implemented?

Question from Ms Wendy Haslam to Councillor Kevin Frea

In a report to COP 23 UNESCO (United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization) stated;

'Education plays a paramount role in raising awareness and promoting behavioural change for climate change mitigation and adaption. It helps increase the climate change mitigation and adaptation capacity of communities by enabling individuals to make informed decisions....education can bring about a fundamental shift in how we think, act, and discharge our responsibilities toward one another and the planet.'

<https://unesdoc.unesco.org/ark:/48223/pf0000260083>

Every respectable scientific body tells us that the present global extreme weather events are nothing compared to what we can expect in the near future. And present observations show that all the predictions of ice melt, sea level rise and rising temperatures are being exceeded.

On the 16th of this month Prof Sir David King, once scientific advisor to the government said he's been scared by the number of extreme events, and he called for the UK to advance its climate targets by 10 years.

<https://www.bbc.co.uk/news/science-environment-49689018>

So I would like to ask the council, in light of the declared climate emergency and the urgent need for action, does the council think it is time to help the general public prepare for more frequent extreme weather events by educating them on the facts of climate change and helping them make decisions on how to act?

Every person who looks at the facts of climate change finds accepting this global emergency very difficult both emotionally and psychologically, but if our leaders do not accept the scientific facts and do not help the public understand the emergency then there will be chaos and a great loss of life.

Question from Mr Tony Haslam to Councillor Kevin Frea

The UK's Committee on Climate Change summary report for this year, states that (see www.theccc.org.uk for full details):

“Global average temperature has already risen by around 1°C since pre-industrial levels and climate risks are increasingly apparent. Annual average temperature in England has also increased by 1°C and will keep increasing – by only 0.5°C by 2100 if the world acts quickly and decisively to cut emissions, but by 4°C+ if current trends continue. We must therefore plan adaptation strategies for a minimum of 2°C and up to 4°C.”

This report implies that not only do we need to do everything we can to mitigate the effects of climate change i.e. act quickly and decisively to reduce greenhouse gas emissions to keep the global temperature rise within a survivable range but we also need to plan adaptation strategies to prepare for the major changes to our living environment already locked in by our not acting sooner.

We are unlikely to be able to stop a rise of at least 2 degrees, therefore, in the UK, we will have to adapt to this, while at the same time taking urgent and extreme measures to mitigate a higher rise to avoid catastrophic damage and loss of life, even in our previously temperate climate.

To bring this into focus - exactly how would 2 degrees to 4 degrees C alter our living environment in Lancaster, Morecambe and Heysham?

Since we are surrounded by tidal coastline we need to become aware of possible sea level rises, as well as flood damage from torrential rain coming down from the hills into our rivers.

The potential effects at various levels of global warming can be viewed online at <https://earthtime.org/explore> and by using their Climate Data Library one can zoom in to see the changes to our local coastline at 1.5 degrees, 2 degrees and 4 degrees.

Even at 1.5 degrees, which is the best case scenario, no matter how urgently we act on mitigation, much of the low lying land between Lancaster and Morecambe will be underwater at high tides. At 2 degrees more is lost and at 4 degrees what is left of Morecambe and Heysham has become a thin strip of island while much of Lancaster's river has widened and engulfed the low lying estates.

My question to the council then is simply this – Is it ready to take the extreme actions necessary to save lives, by moving homes and businesses in the area it is responsible for?”