



**LANCASTER**  
**CITY COUNCIL**

*Promoting City, Coast & Countryside*

# COUNCIL MEETING

**Wednesday, 29 September 2021 -  
6.00 p.m.  
Morecambe Town Hall**

*Lancaster City Council welcomes members of the public to watch meetings. However, we have been streaming meetings since the return to face-to-face meetings in May, and we would recommend that members of the public watch remotely using MS teams as space to attend in person is quite limited. A link to the meeting will be put [HERE](#) a few days before the meeting. If you wish to attend in person to speak or ask a question at the meeting, please email [democracy@lancaster.gov.uk](mailto:democracy@lancaster.gov.uk) before midday on Friday 24 September with a copy of your speech or question.*

Kieran Keane,  
Chief Executive,  
Town Hall,  
Dalton Square,  
LANCASTER,  
LA1 1PJ



# LANCASTER CITY COUNCIL

*Promoting City, Coast & Countryside*

Sir/Madam,

You are hereby summoned to attend a meeting of the Lancaster City Council to be held in the Town Hall, Morecambe on Wednesday, 29 September 2021 commencing at 6.00 p.m. for the following purposes:

1. **APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**

2. **MINUTES**

To receive as a correct record the Minutes of the Meetings of the City Council held on 28 July 2021 and 25 August 2021 (previously circulated).

3. **DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

To receive declarations by Councillors of interests in respect of items on this Agenda.

Councillors are reminded that, in accordance with the Localism Act 2011, they are required to declare any disclosable pecuniary interests which have not already been declared in the Council's Register of Interests. (It is a criminal offence not to declare a disclosable pecuniary interest either in the Register or at the meeting).

Whilst not a legal requirement, in accordance with Council Procedure Rule 9 and in the interests of clarity and transparency, Councillors should declare any disclosable pecuniary interests which they have already declared in the Register, at this point in the meeting.

In accordance with Part B Section 2 of the Code of Conduct, Councillors are required to declare the existence and nature of any other interests as defined in paragraphs 8(1) or 9(2) of the Code of Conduct.

4. **ITEMS OF URGENT BUSINESS**

5. **ANNOUNCEMENTS**

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

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

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

7. **PETITIONS AND ADDRESSES**

To receive any petitions and/or addresses from members of the public which have been notified to the Chief Executive in accordance with the Council's Constitution.

8. **LEADER'S REPORT** (Pages 5 - 8)

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

**REPORTS REFERRED FROM CABINET, COMMITTEES OR OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY**

**MOTIONS ON NOTICE**

9. **MOTION ON NOTICE - PRIMARY CARE PATIENTS IN LANCASTER** (Pages 9 - 11)

To consider a motion on notice submitted by Councillor Austen-Baker. Seconders are Councillors De La Mare and Joan Jackson.

The motion is enclosed with the officer briefing note. *The briefing note was marked 'to follow' and was published on 23 September 2021.*

10. **MOTION ON NOTICE - ARMED FORCES** (Pages 12 - 16)

To consider a motion on notice submitted by Councillor Dennison. Seconders are Councillors Heath and Knight.

The motion is enclosed with the officer briefing note. *The briefing note was marked 'to follow' and was published on 23 September 2021.*

11. **MOTION ON NOTICE - ETHICAL AND SUSTAINABLE APPROACH TO INVESTMENT** (Pages 17 - 20)

To consider a motion on notice submitted by Councillors Erica Lewis, Caroline Jackson, Cary Matthews, Richard Austen-Baker, Merv Evans, Anne Whitehead, Sandra Thornberry, Oliver Robinson, Jason Wood, Jean Parr, Mandy King, Tim Hamilton-Cox, Dave Brookes, Adrian De La Mare and Tricia Heath.

The motion is enclosed with an officer briefing note. *The officer briefing note was marked 'to follow' and was published on 24 September 2021.*

**OTHER BUSINESS**

12. **APPOINTMENT OF THE ELECTORAL REGISTRATION OFFICER** (Pages 21 - 22)

Report of the Head of Democratic Services.

13. **APPOINTMENTS AND CHANGES TO COMMITTEE MEMBERSHIP**

To report any changes to Committee Membership.

14. **QUESTIONS UNDER COUNCIL PROCEDURE RULE 12**

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

the question to the Chief Executive.

15. **MINUTES OF CABINET** (Pages 23 - 34)

To receive the Minutes of Meeting of Cabinet held 13 July 2021.



.....  
Chief Executive

Town Hall,  
Dalton Square,  
LANCASTER,  
LA1 1PJ

Published on 22 September 2021.



## Leader's Report

**29 September 2021**

### Report of the Leader of the Council

#### PURPOSE OF REPORT

To present the Leader's report to Council.

This report is public.

#### RECOMMENDATIONS

To receive the report of the Leader of Council.

#### REPORT

##### 1.0 Cabinet

Information on Cabinet matters is provided in the minutes from the Cabinet meeting held on 13 July 2021 and the minutes of the meeting of the 14 September will be considered at the November Council meeting.

##### 2.0 Decisions required to be taken urgently

No urgent Cabinet decisions have been taken in this period.

##### 3.0 Leader's Comments

3.1 Since July, despite the holiday season, normal council business has been intense, with a blend of face to face and online meetings as we feel our way forward to the best and the safest form of communication for different purposes.

##### 3.2 Covid 19 Work

The rapid rise in infections has continued although Lancaster District is about average for the country. This means continued work at county and local level to ensure communities are best protected. The return of schools and universities will have some effect on Covid levels but the rapid roll out of the vaccination

programme should also have a positive effect. The situation in which people use their own judgement on mask wearing has not caused any particular difficulties so far but we are considering how to develop our own messaging as a district

### **3.3 Support for staff**

Staff are continuing to progress the Working Well project in order to best create a new working arrangement that will suit both our overriding need to be the best possible service to residents and the need to create an effective working arrangement for both departments and the individuals within them. A large number of staff continue to be working from home. We recognise the great work that goes on within our staff networks and really support all their efforts to ensure the success of the council.

### **3.4 Major Decisions**

### **3.5 The Bay Unitary**

We were very disappointed to receive the news that the unitary proposed by Lancaster District, South Lakeland and Barrow-in-Furness was rejected, despite it clearly having the most clearly expressed resident support and a well prepared geographical and economic strategy. The more formal arrangement to work together with Barrow and South Lakes has been stepped down but we continue to have informal contact and some cross district projects.

### **3.6 Eden**

The Eden project team have worked hard to ensure the planning permission submission has been delivered according to schedule. This resulted in some very positive press coverage. As a set of council leaders, we are putting out joint publicity to show both our support and excitement. The project is now even more "shovel-ready". MP David Morris was unwilling to meet with us unfortunately, but we do hope to draw his attention to the Eden curriculum which is being followed within our schools and has great potential to improve pupil's engagement and achievement.

### **3.7 Housing Infrastructure Fund**

Council agreed to go forward with the Collaboration Agreement with Lancashire County Council in August council. This is now in the very final review stages before being signed and returned to the county council. Whilst we accept this decision was disputed, moving forward we need to implement in the most efficient and consultative possible way.

### **3.8 Lancashire County Council**

The government has announced it is interested in setting up county deals which will potentially offer all the devolved powers that metro mayors receive. The new county council leader, Cllr Philippa Williamson, spoke with Lancashire Leaders in September, following our input in July, to look at the areas on which we might co-operate more broadly.

### **3.9 Various Building Projects**

The Mainway Hub is now reopened, and social and information opportunities are being offered to residents. A fun day was run at Mellishaw in August in order to engage residents and begin the process of refurbishment of the site. This was very successful in its aims. The opening of the Caton Road Flood Defences is scheduled for 1st October and a number of councillors will be there to celebrate the event.

### **3.10 Community and Partnership Work**

There have been a number of developments in this area. The situation in Afghanistan led us to offer to support five families in addition to the five we had already agreed to in March. We had been unable to take more than one family due to intense pressure on rented accommodation. However, following my appearances on national television and Global Link's media inputs to local and northwest radio and television we received enough offers of accommodation to begin the process of accepting more Afghan refugees. The generosity and understanding of Lancaster District residents has been really heart-warming.

Morecambe Vision has begun a process of reviewing all the major requirements of a strategy to enhance the economic and community welfare of the area. There has been considerable support for Cllr Heath in undertaking very regular meetings and working through the programme. Highest Point Festival in Williamson Park went off very successfully. I attended on the Sunday and was very impressed by the organiser's safety requirements, the organisation of stages and stalls and the fantastic background work done by a team of city council staff drawn from departments across the council. There are always learning points and I know thorough review is standard to big events which is why we do them so well.

The Mayor and a number of councillors attended the 999 Emergency Services Day on 9th September. This was led by Canon Leah Vasey-Saunders the new vicar at the Priory. Her induction was at a well-attended service the night before. It was good to be able to speak to her at length and find she has experience of, and an interest in, support for homeless people.

The Community Safety Partnership met for its quarterly meeting, and I was elected as Chair. The new priorities for the partnership are being worked out with the help of police statistics. However, we are aware that anti-social behaviour is a high-level concern at the moment and has been picked up by the new Police and Crime Commissioner. We are consulting at the moment (see our KeepConnected website) on the reintroduction of PSPOs as one tool and expect this to be one element of next year's work.

### **3.11 Budget Preparations**

Cabinet has revisited plan 2030 priorities and the outcomes stated in our corporate plan. It has further met with officers to review budget situation. There have been initial discussions about how we achieve a balanced budget over the next two years and beyond through creating affordable priorities. We are particularly

concerned to ensure that revenue matches outgoings so directors are beginning the process of Outcomes Based Resourcing. However, this will not have progressed far enough to affect this year's budget decisions. In the interim officers and members are looking to create the most efficient possible running of priority services whilst supporting overall priorities.

I recently attended Overview and Scrutiny at their request and the financial position was an important element of the lively discussion. I expect that Budget and Performance Scrutiny in particular will have a role to play in our ongoing discussions of this year's budget.

#### 4.0 Decisions

The following Decisions were taken by Cabinet on 14 September 2021:

1. To endorse the City Council's 2021-2022 strategy in respect of the High-Speed Rail 2 Project.
2. Lancaster City District Heating Feasibility
3. Economic Re-opening, Recovery and Renewal Framework
4. PSDS Funding Decarbonisation Projects
5. Delivering Our Priorities

No Officer Delegated Key Decision has been taken since the last Leader's report.

The following Individual Cabinet Member Decisions were taken since the last Leader's report:

ICMD5	Funding For Set Up Of Housing Companies - More Homes For The Bay	Councillor Matthews 29.07.2021
ICMD6	Referral to Council – Collaboration Agreement	Cllr Caroline Jackson 20.8.21 (Not subject to call-in)
ICMD7	Green Homes Grant	Councillor Matthews 25.08.21

#### Background Papers

Cabinet agenda 13 July 2021, 14 September 2021

**BRIEFING NOTE****MOTION:**

"Whereas there is some disquiet among residents at the service provided to primary care patients since the merger into one of several hitherto independent primary medical practices in Lancaster.

And whereas the Council is involved in the anticipated development of large numbers of new residential units to the south of the city, which, if realized, is likely to add significantly to demand for primary medical care in the district.

And whereas plans being developed by the Council, with partners, also anticipate the development of new primary medical care facilities, **it is hereby resolved that:**

- (1) The Council, by its Cabinet and its executive officers, will take all such steps, working with its partners, as are lawful and practicable, to bring about (or facilitate the bringing about of) the establishment of new primary medical care facilities for NHS patients within a new practice, independent of existing practices within the Lancaster district; and
- (2) The Council, by its Cabinet and its executive officers, will take a proactive approach, so far as lawful and practicable, to attracting to the area provision of primary medical care services ("general practice") for private patients within the Lancaster district."

**PROPOSERS:**

Cllr Richard Austen Baker (proposer). Cllr Joan Jackson and Cllr Adrian De La Mare.

**OFFICER BRIEFING NOTE**

As a strategic partner we regularly meet with the Primary Care community in a range of settings, including at formal meetings as well as local partnerships and would be able to express the views of the Council in those. However we have no direct or indirect powers on these matters.

Health provision and requirements are one of the key considerations for the Planning Authority, factored in to development planning, from the Local Plan through to individual significant developments.

However it is generally not a matter that would result in the use of planning gain (e.g. section 151) and any lack of sufficient provision rarely outweighs the more general need for additional housing in making a balanced planning decision. The NHS have their own arrangements in place with regard to using and understanding population forecasts and likely service pressures, in order to plan and put in place adequate provision based on agreed Plans and their population impacts. However, as with education, highways, flooding and other public sector development duties, responsible bodies are rarely fully funded to deliver on any duty

they may have, and therefore the quality, scale and timing of the delivery of infrastructure and amenities is funding dependent.

Some Unitary and upper tier Authorities have, in the past, used Public Health funding and duties to create programmes which incentivise primary care growth, or have co-developed integrated projects with the primary care sector around public health and adult social care. Generally, the district authorities have the opportunity to input into the shaping of proposals with the County. As a district Authority, we do not have these duties or powers and so engagement with Lancashire County Council on these matters may be relevant. This already happens with regard to any projects likely to take place in Lancaster.

Regarding mergers and growth of existing providers, we would not normally seek to intervene in the nature of provision on matters such as whether services are expanded or extended, or whether new providers may come in to the area. These are subject to commissioning and competition aspects that are outside the remit of the Council and subject to fair competition rules that commissioning bodies are expected to abide by. It is also important to bear in mind that there is a general skills and capacity shortage in Primary care, with challenges recruiting to and retaining funded services.

With regard to point 1) If the Council decides to agree one or both parts of this motion, should the expectation be that we would simply include the views of the Council as expressed above in our routine engagement with the sector, then there would be little budgetary impact on the authority. We understand the purpose of this motion is to agree that Council should use its influence in the relevant meetings and engagements to encourage an increase in primary care provision in the areas of significant housing growth and express a preference for a diversity in offer and number of practices, rather than a further consolidation. If this is its purpose, then there would be limited implications with regard to finances, legal or equalities.

On 2) With regard to private provision, that would be a policy matter for Council to determine. Should it determine that growth in private provision of primary care is an important priority for the Council.

With regard to points 1 and 2, if more specific engagement is proposed, and / or the redrafting of planning or other policy requirements, and / or any monitoring or reporting requirements, this could have significant budgetary impacts, in terms of reassigning officer time to do engagement activities and redraft and consult on new policy and also potentially needing to reallocate or reprioritise planning gain or other funding from other objectives.

**IMPACT ASSESSMENT**

**(including Health & Safety, Equality & Diversity, Human Rights, Community Safety, Sustainability and Rural Proofing):**

A desire to improve primary care provision could have positive benefits for health and wellbeing in our communities.

We would need to ensure that any implementation activities of this motion were in accordance with the Equality Act 2010, including the public sector equality duty.

**LEGAL IMPLICATIONS**

As outlined in this briefing note, the Council does not have any statutory obligations or powers to provide primary care. The Authority may, for the benefit of its area or persons resident or present in its area assist in the facilitation of such care using its general power of competence

pursuant to s1 of the Localism Act 2011.

**FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS**

There are no direct financial implications arising from this briefing note alone. As detailed above, the use of officer and member time may be required should the decision to support either of the proposals is taken. It is worthwhile reiterating the point that this is not a statutory function for the Council and subsequently that any future expenditure which is then identified that sits outside of the budget framework should be reported to and approved by Cabinet as appropriate, prior to going ahead.

**OTHER RESOURCE IMPLICATIONS, such as Human Resources, Information Services, Property, Open Spaces**

None identified.

**SECTION 151 OFFICER'S COMMENTS**

The s151 officer has been consulted and has no further comments to add to those provided with the report and accompanying legal and financial implication

**MONITORING OFFICER'S COMMENTS**

The Monitoring Officer has no further comments to add.

**BRIEFING NOTE****MOTION:**

“This Council recognises the sacrifices both physical and mental suffered by our armed forces in serving our nation both locally and internationally.

To show our commitment to them all; Serving, Reserves and Veterans, I ask that Lancaster City Council commit itself to achieving COVENANT GOLD STATUS as an employer by the end of 2022.”

**PROPOSER:** Councillor Dennison. Seconders Councillors Heath and Knight (Geoff)

**OFFICER BRIEFING NOTE**

Ensuring that all parts of our Community have the opportunity to reach their full potential and secure positive employment with the Council is a key motivation for the Employee recognition Scheme and these Covenant awards. The Council has already secured a Silver Award under the Armed Forces Covenant. This has entailed adjustment to a wide range of policies and processes, and strengthening of relationships with the sector. Some of these steps are still in the process of being implemented.

There are around 2.4 million veterans in the UK, and around 40% of these are under the age of 60. 79% of working age veterans are employed; this is the same proportion as for the general population. Other statistics around health, home ownership, skills and qualifications are also broadly similar to the general working population.

However, there is a slightly higher proportion of armed forces veterans present in information and surveys on homelessness, extreme mental health (e.g. PTSD) and some evidence of differences from the general population in some crime and prison statistics.

UK Housing Law prioritises armed forces veterans for access to accommodation. In England the NHS provides two dedicated veteran specific mental health services. The Transition, Intervention and Liaison Service (TILS), that provides a range of treatment from recognising early signs of mental health problems and access to support to providing therapeutic treatment for complex mental health difficulties. This service is complemented by the Veterans Mental Health Complex Treatment Service (VMH TILS), which provides intensive care and treatment for veterans with the most complex needs, offering holistic support for the whole person and their family.

The Silver Award status held by the Council means that we have demonstrated provision of the following:

Silver award holders:

- must have signed the Armed Forces Covenant
- the employer must have already stated their intent to be supportive by using the ERS website to register at the Bronze level
- the employer must proactively demonstrate that service personnel/armed forces community are not unfairly disadvantaged as part of their recruiting and selection processes
- employers should employ at least one individual from the AFC category that the nomination emphasises. For example, an employer nominated for support to the

Reserves must employ at least one Reservist. In exceptional circumstances where there is outstanding generic support for the Armed Forces community and/or the size or business model of the organisation makes employment of such an individual impossible, the organisation can be considered for the award where they do not employ someone from the AFC category

- the employer must actively ensure that their workforce is aware of their positive policies towards defence people issues. For example, an employer nominated for support to the Reserves must have an internally publicised and positive HR policy on Reserves
- within the context of Reserves the employer must have demonstrated support to mobilisations or have a framework in place. They must demonstrate support to training by providing at least 5 days' additional unpaid/paid leave (wherever possible not to Reservist employees' financial disadvantage)
- the employer must not have been the subject of any negative PR or media activity

The work entailed in securing this, including the ongoing work to update and review policies required an estimated combined use of resources and capacity of around £50,000 over a long period of time, mainly comprising direct and indirect officer time, but also additional costs of enhanced leave, etc.

The Gold Award proposed in this motion requires the following further actions:

Gold award holders:

- must have signed the [Armed Forces Covenant](#)
- employers must have an existing relationship with their National Account Manager/REED/appropriate defence representative
- the employer must already be demonstrating support by holding a valid ERS Silver Award. Employers that do not hold a valid ERS Silver Award cannot progress to the Gold level
- the employer must proactively demonstrate their forces-friendly credentials as part of their recruiting and selection processes. Where possible, they should be engaged with [Career Transition Partnership](#) (CTP) in the recruitment of service leavers and have registered for the [Forces Families Jobs](#) (FFJ) portal
- employers should employ at least one individual from the AFC category that the nomination emphasises. For example, an employer nominated for support to the Reserves must employ at least one Reservist. In exceptional circumstances where there is outstanding generic support for the Armed Forces community and/or the size or business model of the organisation makes employment of such an individual impossible, the organisation can be considered for the award where they do not employ someone from the AFC category
- the employer must actively ensure that their workforce is aware of their positive policies towards defence people issues. For example, an employer nominated for support to the Reserves must have an internally publicised and positive human resources policy on Reserves
- the employer must be an exemplar within their market sector, advocating support to defence people issues to partner organisations, suppliers and customers with tangible positive results
- within the context of Reserves the employer must have demonstrated support to mobilisations or have a framework in place. They must provide at least 10 days' additional leave for training, fully paid, to the Reservist employee
- the employer must not have been the subject of any negative public relations or media activity.

There are three main differences between Silver and Gold which affect Council policies, processes and finances.

- The provision of 10 days additional paid leave to cadets and reservists. While the

additional cost of this for the current workforce is relatively low, future costs will depend on the number and grades of cadets and reservists in the workforce;

- The requirement to plan and execute meetings, engagement and campaigning activity, with the sector, including securing further signatories to the Covenant. This needs to be considered as part of the wider priorities of the Council, in terms of the likely officer time and capacity required. This would require project officer and potentially a range of other staff time, however the positive relationships we already hold with a range of local employers (Calico homes etc) would suggest that this is achievable if seen as a priority.
- The additional recruitment and training support, including the Guaranteed Interview Scheme and interview preparation support. Also to update and change policies and processes to reflect the new requirements. This would have impacts on capacity within our HR services. Changes may also be required to our existing provision of employee counselling and support, however use of our Occupational Health referrals and plans may enable the level of support proposed in the Covenant.

The Council currently employs a significant number of people who also act as unpaid volunteers in a variety of capacities, including mental health charities and counselling, schools, children's groups and organisations, police, victims, health (e.g. blood riders, first responders) and community support, homelessness, environmental and other areas which provide essential support infrastructure in our communities. We currently do not routinely offer paid or unpaid leave for this work. A volunteering policy to recognise and support this sort of work is at the advanced stages of development to be brought forward for decision, however the current draft does not propose support at the levels of the Gold (or silver) covenant. These volunteers may consider the levels of support being offered to armed forces volunteers to be out of balance with the societal contribution they are also making via formal volunteering.

Active campaigning on particular issues and participation in meetings and programmes uses staff time and hence, council resources. There are many causes and campaigns which would like to see the Council go further and faster, showing leadership on a wide range of issues, and there are standards and certifications that can be secured on these, that the Council does not currently possess. These relate to LGBTQ+, refugee support, mental health, and a wide range of formally protected characteristics and other issues. Representatives of these communities may consider that seeking to secure the highest certification or standards in one particular theme, while maintaining only basic standards in other themes to be out of balance with other forms of disadvantage and our relative performance as a Council and society in addressing these.

The same issues could be raised with regard to offering guaranteed interviews and the update of policies and procedures.

Given the issues raised above, and that there is no provision within the current year's budget for this work and its impacts, should Council be minded to approve the motion, they may wish to consider whether the time-scales are feasible for the work that would be needed, and also to ensure that provision is made in the budget setting and agreement process for FY 22/23.

Some issues for Council to consider in this motion may therefore include:

- The available finances and resources of the Council and the relative priorities.
- The support being offered relative to support that may be available to other members of our Community
- Whether the support on matters such as paid leave for volunteering may be negatively perceived by those who volunteer for other positive causes which do not relate to the armed forces.

Should the Council be generally in favour of the motion being explored by the Council, it could request further work of Officers to identify more detailed feasibility and impact information to be prepared over coming months, to then agree to pursue Gold Status in line with available capacity, resources and impacts. This would enable the pursuit of Gold status to be brought forward as a fully formed proposition with the relevant policy, process and cost implications as well as an Equalities Impact Assessment for a Council decision to be made.

Lancashire County Council has recently undertaken work to secure Gold Status and has offered to meet with Officers next month to share knowledge and information on the more detailed steps and costs involved in securing Gold Status.

**IMPACT ASSESSMENT**

**(including Health & Safety, Equality & Diversity, Human Rights, Community Safety, Sustainability and Rural Proofing):**

The motivation for the Covenant is to ensure that Armed Forces veterans are positively treated in recognition for their Service to our country.

We would need to ensure that any implementation activities of this motion were in accordance with the Equality Act 2010, including the public sector equality duty.

Some issues relevant to the Act are discussed above.

The basic elements of the armed forces covenant are currently under consideration to be enshrined by law in a 'duty to have due regard' similar to the public sector equality duty.

Should it come into force this could potentially provide protection in the future against positive discrimination claims.

An Equality Impact Assessment will need to be completed.

**LEGAL IMPLICATIONS**

There may be issues relevant to both Employment Law and the Equalities Act which will require legal advice.

**FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS**

As detailed in the briefing note, the financial consequences related to supporting this proposal generally arise through the utilisation of officer time and subsequent leave requirements. These are difficult to substantiate at this juncture but it is expected to be in the region of £50,000 over a long period of time, depending on the number of officers it wishes to support. These crude estimates will need be reviewed and considered as part of the ongoing process should the gold status be attained.

**OTHER RESOURCE IMPLICATIONS, such as Human Resources, Information Services, Property, Open Spaces**

The impacts are discussed in the body of the report above. Changes would be required to HR policies, processes and activities and some of these may be required to be subject to staff consultation.

**SECTION 151 OFFICER'S COMMENTS**

Whilst undoubtedly a worthy cause, Members will need to have regard to the fact that the pursuit and potential attainment of gold status will not be free and will need to be consider both the financial implications and officer capacity, at a time when the Council's finances are

increasingly under pressure.

**MONITORING OFFICER'S COMMENTS**

It is within the Terms of Reference of Personnel Committee to develop and review Council policy in respect of staff and conditions of service.

**BRIEFING NOTE****MOTION:**

The Council notes that:

1. it has previously discussed the need to take an ethical and sustainable approach to investment of Lancaster City Council funds to support our priorities and to ask the same of those who manage our officers' pensions through the Lancashire Pensions Fund and Local Pensions Partnership;
2. increasingly pension funds are large investors who are being asked to take an ethical and sustainable approach to investment including considerations of workers' condition in properties owned by funds, and where these funds have a geographic link, to support community wealth building;
3. many of the Sustainable Development Goals speak to the importance of investment as a driver for securing fundamental human rights, building resilience within communities and meeting the challenge of the climate emergency;
4. it is preferable to take a comprehensive approach to an ethical and sustainable investment policy rather than addressing it on a topic-by-topic basis;
5. taking the time to develop a comprehensive approach will strengthen the policy, give the council one reference point for full council's position on ethical and sustainable investment, and allow for one set of new investment instructions to be made, reducing development and implementation costs.
6. bringing together a comprehensive ethical and sustainable investment policy is a significant piece of work that should involve consultation with a range of stakeholders as well as taking expert advice;
7. undertaking this process via an overview and scrutiny task group will allow councillors to explore what are often complex ethical issues in a more discursive environment and with the benefits of expert advice and a mechanism to listen to community perspectives;
8. almost by definition ethical issues are rarely clear cut and there are often reasonable competing perspectives.
9. it is important we conduct a careful and respectful debate and reaffirm our commitment to this district being a place that supports everyone to know, claim and enjoy their human rights, and to be strong allies to everyone who faces discrimination and structural oppression in all its forms.
10. consistently with the obligation in section 149 of the Equality Act 2010, the development of the policy must have due regard to the need to foster good relations between persons of different nationalities, ethnicities and religions.

The Council hereby resolves to:

- (a) Recommend that Overview and Scrutiny Committee establish a formal task group to consult on and develop a comprehensive ethical and sustainable investment policy for consideration by Cabinet;

- (b) To amend Council's previous resolution of 23 June 2021 (in respect of the Boycott, Divestment and Sanctions movement motion) to have the effect of not making or requesting any investment changes until a comprehensive ethical and sustainability policy is agreed by Council and that any future requests be made in accordance with that policy.

**PROPOSERS:**

Cllrs Erica Lewis, Caroline Jackson, Cary Matthews, Richard Austen-Baker, Merv Evans, Anne Whitehead, Sandra Thornberry, Oliver Robinson, Jason Wood, Jean Parr, Mandy King, Tim Hamilton-Cox, Dave Brookes, Adrian De La Mare, Tricia Heath.

**OFFICER BRIEFING NOTE**

1. As set out in the Motion, it is proposed that the Council's approach to ethical and sustainable investment should be taken comprehensively through an establish policy rather than on a topic-by-topic basis. The benefits of this approach are set out in the Motion.
2. The Council and Councillors will be concerned to ensure that its actions, policies and expressed views, demonstrate, and affirm the Council's commitment to equality, diversity and human rights. Practically, this includes discharging functions in accordance with s149 Equality Act 2010 (the Act) and in doing so having regard to the need to:
  - a. eliminate discrimination, harassment, victimisation and any other conduct that is prohibited by or under this Act;
  - b. advance equality of opportunity between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it;
  - c. foster good relations between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it.
3. The creation of a task group to consult and development a comprehensive ethical and sustainable policy, will create the opportunity for officers and Councillors to carefully consider the impact of the policy on persons with protected characteristics and upon the residents of the district as whole.
4. The task group's mandate to 'consult' on the policy, should enable officers and councillors to hear from affected individuals and groups within the community. This will better inform the creation of the policy and will assist in the Council's discharge of its s149 duty.
5. Failure to comply with the Equality Act 2010, and specifically the Council's duty under s149 of the Act, may undermine public confidence and may result in legal challenge (by judicial review). A legal challenge may result in a decision being quashed and the Authority being ordered to pay considerable costs.
6. The Council's section 149 duty applies to resolutions of Full Council and to decisions of the kind made on 23 June 2021 (see *Jewish Rights Watch v Leicester City Council* [2018] EWCA Civ 1551. At is a mandatory duty and one that the Council must perform in the exercise of its duties.

7. The amendment to the resolution made on 23 June 2021, will ensure that the Council's approach to investments in the future is informed by a comprehensive policy. Moreover, it will greatly assist the Council with regards to its s149 duty under the 2010 Act.

**IMPACT ASSESSMENT**

**(including Health & Safety, Equality & Diversity, Human Rights, Community Safety, Sustainability and Rural Proofing):**

The creation of an ethical and sustainable investment policy can raise significant issues around human rights, equality, and diversity. These issues may impact on a wide range of persons within our communities.

The creation of a task group to consult on and develop the policy will assist the Council in ensuring that it takes an informed approach to the policy bearing in mind its duties under the Equality Act legislation. The modification of the previous resolution of 23 June 2021 will ensure that any future approach to the Lancashire Pensions Fund and Local Pensions Partnership will be taken in accordance with the comprehensive policy on ethical investment.

**LEGAL IMPLICATIONS**

The legal obligations concerning the Equality Act 2010 and the consequences of failing to comply with the Act are set out in the briefing note above.

**FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS**

The development of an ethical and sustainable investment policy will inevitably require additional support from both officers as well as the need to engage specific external expertise. Until the task group and project scope have been established it is not possible provide a reliable estimate of cost.

**OTHER RESOURCE IMPLICATIONS, such as Human Resources, Information Services, Property, Open Spaces**

None identified.

**SECTION 151 OFFICER'S COMMENTS**

The s151 officer has been consulted and has would remind Members that there needs to be a degree of caution as failure to comply with the Equality Act 2010 may result on the Council being subject to Judicial Review proceedings. it would be potentially exposed to significant costs.

**MONITORING OFFICER'S COMMENTS**

Motions must be about matters for which the Council has a responsibility or which affect the area or residents, workers or visitors to the District and must not:

- (a) be potentially defamatory, vexatious, frivolous or offensive;
- (b) refer to applications for, or objections to, planning permission or any licence, notice or

order issued, served or made by the Council; or

(c) relate to individual staffing matters or the personal information of Councillors or Officers or be ruled out of order by the Chief Executive for other reasons.

Furthermore, members should note that Section 5 of the Local Government and Housing Act 1989 requires the Monitoring Officer to report to the council where it appears to them the authority has done, or is about to do, anything which would contravene the law or which would constitute maladministration.

The legal obligations are set out above. As Monitoring Officer I am satisfied that the above motion addresses the need for the Council to consider its public sector equality duty.

**COUNCIL****Appointment of the  
Electoral Registration Officer****29 September 2021****Report of the Head of Democratic Services****PURPOSE OF REPORT**

For Council to consider appointing Mr Mark Davies, currently the City Council's Returning Officer and Director for Communities and the Environment to the additional role of Electoral Registration Officer with immediate effect.

**This report is public**

**RECOMMENDATION**

- (1) That Mr Mark Davies, the City Council's Returning Officer and Director for Communities and the Environment, be appointed to the additional role of Electoral Registration Officer with immediate effect.**

**1.0 Background**

1.1 On 25 September 2019, Council formally appointed the current Chief Executive, Mr Kieran Keane, to the roles of Returning Officer (RO) and Electoral Registration Officer (ERO). On 16 December 2020 Mr Mark Davies was appointed to the role of RO, to allow him to carry out those duties at elections scheduled to be held in May 2021, when the Chief Executive would not be available. The current position is that Mr Davies is still the City Council's RO and Mr Keane is the City Council's ERO.

1.2 Every district council is required to have both a RO and an ERO in place. The ERO has personal responsibility to maintain the register of electors, conduct the annual canvass and encourage electors in the electoral process. Performance standards are set by the Electoral Commission.

**2.0 Reasons for the Appointment**

2.1 It is usual, and most expedient, for the roles of RO and ERO to be held by the same officer because elections, by their nature, use information from the register of electors for the poll.

2.2 The current Chief Executive's fixed term contract with the Council is entering its last six months and it would be prudent to deal with this at an early opportunity. Although the Council is not scheduled to run any major elections in May 2022, by-elections for vacant City and Parish Council seats can be

called at any time and it is good practice for the duties of both RO and ERO to sit with one officer.

**3.0 Conclusion**

3.1 Council is asked to appoint Mr Mark Davies as its ERO with effect from this meeting.

<b>CONCLUSION OF IMPACT ASSESSMENT</b> <b>(including Health &amp; Safety, Equality &amp; Diversity, Human Rights, Community Safety, Sustainability and Rural Proofing)</b> None directly arising from this report.	
<b>LEGAL IMPLICATIONS</b> As set out above in 2.1. The Council must have both a RO and an ERO in place.	
<b>FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS</b> There are no fees payable to the ERO for undertaking the role, so this will not incur any additional costs.	
<b>OTHER RESOURCE IMPLICATIONS</b> None.	
<b>SECTION 151 OFFICER'S COMMENTS</b> The S151 Officer has been consulted and has no comments to add.	
<b>MONITORING OFFICER'S COMMENTS</b> The Monitoring Officer has been consulted and has no comments to add.	
<b>BACKGROUND PAPERS</b>  None	<b>Contact Officer:</b> Debbie Chambers <b>Telephone:</b> 01524 582057 <b>E-mail:</b> dchambers@lancaster.gov.uk <b>Ref:</b>

**CABINET**

5.00 P.M.

13TH JULY 2021

**PRESENT:-** Councillors Caroline Jackson (Chair), Kevin Frea (Vice-Chair), Dave Brookes, Gina Dowding, Tim Hamilton-Cox, Tricia Heath, Erica Lewis, Cary Matthews, Sandra Thornberry and Anne Whitehead

Also in attendance: Iain Gamble (Brabners)

Officers in attendance:-

Kieran Keane	Chief Executive
Mark Davies	Director for Communities and the Environment
Sarah Davies	Director of Corporate Services
Jason Syers	Director for Economic Growth and Regeneration
Paul Thompson	Chief Financial Officer (Head of Finance & Section 151 Officer)
Luke Gorst	Head of Legal Services and Monitoring Officer
Mark Cassidy	Head of Planning and Place
Sally Lowton	Property and Contracts Solicitor
Fiona Clark	Planning Officer (Policy)
Paul Hatch	Senior Planning Policy Officer
Diane Neville	Senior Planning Officer (Policy)
Liz Bateson	Principal Democratic Support Officer, Democratic Services

**12 MINUTES**

The minutes of the meeting held on Tuesday 8 June 2021 were approved as a correct record.

**13 ITEMS OF URGENT BUSINESS AUTHORISED BY THE LEADER**

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

**14 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

No declarations were made at this point.

**15 PUBLIC SPEAKING**

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

**16 PROVISIONAL GENERAL FUND OUTTURN 2020/21**

The Chair informed Members that this item had been deferred. Cabinet would receive a briefing on Outturn before the affordable priorities meeting with a formal report tabled at September Cabinet before being considered by the Budget & Performance Panel.

*At this point the Chair advised the meeting that she intended to re-order the agenda so as*

*not to unduly detain Iain Gamble from Brabners who had been invited to respond to questions in relation to the exempt Eden report.*

## 17 EXCLUSION OF THE PRESS AND PUBLIC

It was moved by Councillor Hamilton-Cox and seconded by Councillor Lewis:-

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

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 paragraph 3 of Schedule 12A of that Act.

## 18 EDEN PROJECT NORTH (Pages 12 - 13)

### **(Cabinet Members with Special Responsibility Councillors Jackson & Hamilton-Cox)**

Cabinet received a report from the Chief Executive which was exempt from publication by virtue of paragraph 3, 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:

It was proposed by Councillor Jackson, seconded by Councillor Hamilton-Cox and:-

### ***Resolved unanimously:***

The resolution is set out in a minute exempt from publication by virtue of paragraph 3 of Schedule 12A of the Local Government Act, 1972.

### **Officer responsible for effecting the decision:**

Chief Executive

### **Reasons for making the decision:**

The decision is consistent with Council priorities. Exactly how the decision fits with Council priorities is set out in the exempt minute.

*Iain Gamble left the meeting and the Chair revised the order of the agenda to enable the two exempt Shared Services reports to be considered at that point.*

**19 SHARED SERVICES AGREEMENT - REVENUES AND BENEFITS****(Cabinet Member with Special Responsibility Councillor Whitehead)**

Cabinet received a report from the Director of Corporate Services which sought approval for the continuation of the existing shared service arrangement with Preston City Council; to establish a Joint Committee of representative members from both authorities and through delegations to that Joint Committee, to provide revenues and benefit functions for both Councils. The report was exempt from publication by virtue of Paragraph 3 of Schedule 12A of the Local Government Act, 1972.

The Chair asked that her thanks be conveyed to the Revenues and Benefits staff for the work undertaken during lockdown with regard to the distribution of grants and benefits.

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

Option 1: To agree the continuation of the shared service arrangements with Preston City Council, in relation to the Council's Revenues and Benefits functions

Advantages: Strong record of business transformation  
Exceeded budget savings targets with further opportunities for economies of scale  
Strong governance arrangements in place  
Continuity of service delivery, Retain local knowledge in a critical service

Disadvantages: None identified

Risks: Government re-organisation could temporarily disrupt the arrangement at any point, but the risk is mitigated by the option of a two year notice period which can be served by either Council at any time.

Option 2: To not agree the continuation of the shared service arrangements with Preston City Council and instead instruct Officers to consider alternative options of service delivery.

Advantages: None identified

Disadvantages: Additional cost elements in unravelling existing arrangements  
No continuity in service delivery  
A break up of the partnership would create uncertainty and insecurity for staff within the shared service with the likelihood of losing key staff to longer term opportunities.

Risks: There are implications for the Council if the arrangement doesn't proceed with the risk of losing key staff and the additional costs in achieving a reduction in HR resources.

The need to increase ICT support, storage capacity and infrastructure to re-establish the revenues and benefits service in the City Council environment.

The officer preferred option is Option 1, as this provides continuity and is considered the most cost effective option, retaining existing staff whilst providing the opportunity for further economies of scale.

Councillor Whitehead proposed, seconded by Councillor Lewis:-

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

Councillors then voted:-

***Resolved unanimously:***

- (1) That Cabinet agrees to the continuation of the shared service arrangements with Preston City Council, in relation to the Council’s Revenues and Benefits functions and that a further Shared Revenues and Benefits Service Agreement with Preston City Council be entered into on an outline 10 year basis, underpinned by a rolling 2- year notice period, to commence on 1 July 2021.
- (2) That Cabinet agrees to the following:
  - (i) to establish a Shared Revenue and Benefits Service Joint Committee to carry out the delegated revenues and benefits functions on behalf of Preston City Council and Lancaster City Council;
  - (ii) to agree the Terms of Reference of the Shared Revenue and Benefits Service Joint Committee, as set out in Appendix 1 to the report;
  - (iii) to delegate the revenues and benefits functions to the Shared Revenue and Benefits Service Joint Committee, as set out in Appendix 2 to the report; and
  - (iv) to agree that the Shared Revenue and Benefits Service Joint Committee shall be fixed with two Executive Members from Lancaster City Council and two Executive Members from Preston City Council for the term of the agreement.

**Officer responsible for effecting the decision:**

Director of Corporate Services

**Reasons for making the decision:**

The Shared Service agreement is consistent with the Council’s ambition of creating an “Inclusive and Prosperous Local Economy” in developing policies to help business, and the work undertaken contributes towards a “Healthy and Happy Community” in optimising the access to benefits and related support for those that need it most. Joining up the Revenues and Benefits services of both Councils in 2011 has proven successful and the decision enables the arrangements to be continued following the expiry of the existing agreement on 30 June 2021.

**20 SHARED SERVICES AGREEMENT - FRAUD INVESTIGATION SERVICES**

**(Cabinet Member with Special Responsibility Councillor Whitehead)**

Cabinet received a report from the Director of Corporate Services which sought approval for the continuation of the existing cost sharing arrangement with Preston City Council and Fylde Borough Council to provide a Corporate Enquiry Team, to help prevent and detect fraud in the local authority area. The report was exempt from publication by virtue of Schedule 12A, Paragraph 3 of the Local Government Act 1972.

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

Option 1: To agree the continuation of the cost sharing arrangement with Preston City Council and Fylde Borough Council, in relation to the Council's counter fraud activities

Advantages: Objective for the team to be self-financing Flexibility and responsiveness to changing levels of demand/need within the partner organisations.  
Existing links and collaboration with Internal Audit  
The retention of qualified staff with proven expertise in the fraud environment

Disadvantages: None identified

Risks: Failure to achieve self-financing objective

Option 2: To not agree the continuation of the shared service arrangements with Preston City Council and Fylde Borough Council, and instead instruct Officers to consider alternative options to prevent and detect fraud in the local authority environment.

Advantages: None identified

Disadvantages: Shortage of specialist counter fraud skills within the Council  
Lost opportunity for tackling fraud in a cost-effective, collaborative manner.  
Inevitable disruption No continuity in service delivery  
A break up of the partnership would create uncertainty and insecurity for staff within the shared service with the likelihood of losing key staff.

Risks: There are implications for the Council if the arrangement doesn't proceed with the risk of not having an adequate deterrent in place to prevent fraud if experienced staff are lost, nor the resources in place to investigate fraudulent activity.

The officer preferred option is Option 1. The landscape in which Councils operate has changed as a result of Covid-19; there now being a higher profile regarding fraud and its impact on public funds generally, at a time when Councils and other public bodies are facing huge financial challenges. Continuation of the cost sharing arrangement for counter fraud services ensures the Council is resourced to prevent fraud from occurring, and where prevention is not possible, is resourced to provide a proportionate response, enabling the timely and effective detection, investigation and prosecution of fraudsters.

Councillor Whitehead proposed, seconded by Councillor Brookes:-

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

Councillors then voted:-

**Resolved unanimously:**

- (1) That Cabinet approves the continuation of the cost sharing arrangement with Preston City Council and Fylde Borough Council on an outline 10 year basis underpinned by a rolling 1-year notice period, for services in relation to counter fraud activity.

**Officer responsible for effecting the decision:**

Director of Corporate Services

**Reasons for making the decision:**

The decision is consistent with the corporate priority of being a responsible Council, protecting the public purse, with an ambition to create an “Inclusive and Prosperous Local Economy”. The Council has established a reputation as an authority that takes firm action against fraud and corruption on behalf of the community it serves. The decision enables the successful cost sharing arrangement with Preston City Council and Fylde Borough Council which was set up in 2015 to prevent, detect and investigate corporate (non-benefit) fraud and irregularity to continue.

***With the consent of the meeting, the press and public were re-admitted at this point and the Chair confirmed a further re-order to the agenda with the Climate Emergency Review of the Local Plan brought forward for the convenience of the officers in attendance for that item.***

**21 CLIMATE EMERGENCY REVIEW OF THE LOCAL PLAN FOR LANCASTER DISTRICT - PREPARATION OF A CONSULTATION DRAFT (REGULATION 18)**

**(Cabinet Member with Special Responsibility Councillor Dowding)**

Cabinet received a report from the Director for Economic Growth & Regeneration which set out progress on the preparation of the Climate Emergency Review of the Local Plan (CELPR) following its adoption by Council on the 29th July 2020. The report sought the endorsement of Cabinet for progress made to date in the process of reviewing the content of the Local Plan documents and approval for the publication of the draft documents for a period of consultation under Regulation 18 of the Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012.

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

<b>Option 1: Publish and consult on the draft policies contained in the CELPR.</b>
--

<p><b>Advantages:</b> By publishing the draft revised CELPR documents for consultation under Regulation 18 the Council can make progress with its ambitious timetable for the Local Plan Review and help ensure that better outcomes from development for climate change mitigation and adaptation are achieved as promptly as plan preparation processes permit.</p>
---

**Disadvantages:** None apparent.

**Risks:** None

**Option 2: Do not publish and consult on the draft policies contained in the CELPR.**

**Advantages:** None apparent.

**Disadvantages:** This option would be contrary to the Council's published timetable for preparing the CELPR as set out in the published Local Development Scheme as approved by Council in July 2020 (and subsequently kept up to date). The Council will not make progress on the objective of helping to address the Climate Emergency Declaration promptly by promptly reviewing the adopted Local Plan. Resources, including significant officer time spent on the review to date would not have been usefully deployed.

**Risks:** This option would present several risks including:

- Delays in eventually adopting a revised plan means that development proposals will continue to be determined in the context of the existing adopted policies rather than in the context of policies that take better account of the challenge of climate Change.
- Reputational damage to the Council from not following through with a consultation on a Draft Plan that it has made prior public commitment to undertake.
- Delay in advancing the process may mean that the externally procured evidence may become out of date and will need to be refreshed again; incurring further costs and delays.

Councillor Dowding proposed, seconded by Councillor Frea:-

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

Councillors then voted:-

***Resolved unanimously:***

- (1) That the Council undertakes public consultation on the draft revised versions of the Local Plan documents; specifically, Part A: Strategic Policies & Land Allocations DPD and Part B: Development Management DPD; and,
- (2) That the Council publishes the background evidence and supporting material which have informed the Local Plan Review process to date, including Sustainability Appraisal and Habitats Regulation Assessment.

**Officer responsible for effecting the decision:**

Director for Economic Growth & Regeneration

**Reasons for making the decision:**

The purpose of the Climate Emergency Review of the Local Plan was to ensure greater

alignment with the Council's ambitions around Climate Change in recognition of the Council's Climate Emergency Declaration of January 2019. The CELPR will assist with the delivery of many of the Council's corporate priorities, including the creation of a more sustainable district, the provision of an inclusive and prosperous local economy and support for developing healthy and happy communities.

**22 RELEASE OF CAPITAL PROGRAMME – DEVELOPMENT POOL ALLOCATION FOR THE PURCHASE OF AN ELECTRIC VAN FOR THE ENGINEERING TEAM WITHIN PROPERTY, INVESTMENT AND REGENERATION**

**(Cabinet Members with Special Responsibility Councillors Hamilton-Cox & Whitehead)**

Cabinet received a report from the Director for Economic Growth & Regeneration to request the release of £15K of allocated budget within the Capital Programme – Development Pool.

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

Options Analysis Option 1 – Continue with current diesel van hire arrangement (do nothing)

Advantages: Current van is fit for purpose for transportation, maintenance, and monitoring activities.

Disadvantages: Takes no action to tackle climate emergency and the goal of being net zero carbon by 2030.

Risks: The approach is different to that being applied to other fleet/hire vehicles and the Council is not seen to lead by example by switching to EV.

Options Analysis Option 2 – Switch to a EV hire vehicle

Advantages: Helps to achieve the Councils zero carbon priorities

Disadvantages: Hire of like for like EV vehicle would be a substantial increase in current annual hire costs for a diesel vehicle.

Risks: The approach is different to that being applied to other fleet/hire vehicles and the Council is not seen to lead by example by switching to EV.

Options Analysis Option 3 – Purchase a EV hire vehicle from the Council Capital Programme

Advantages: Helps to achieve the Councils zero carbon priorities  
Utilises revenue savings on current contract hire budget within 5 years  
Leaves residual value at the end so more cost effective than hiring

Disadvantages: None

Risks: n/a
------------

The officer preferred option was Option 3.

Councillor Hamilton-Cox proposed, seconded by Councillor Whitehead:-

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

Councillors then voted:-

***Resolved unanimously:***

- (1) That Cabinet approves the release of £15,000 from the development pool section of the general fund capital programme for the purchase of an electric van for the Engineering team and notes that the purchase cost is likely to be in the region of £18,000.
- (2) That the general fund revenue and capital budgets are updated as appropriate, as part of the forthcoming budget exercise.

**Officer responsible for effecting the decision:**

Director for Economic Growth & Regeneration  
Chief Finance Officer

**Reasons for making the decision:**

The decision is consistent with Council Priorities as switching from diesel aligns with the Council's aim towards carbon zero. The engineering team currently have access to a Peugeot Partner diesel van on a long-term hire agreement. Transferring to its electric van equivalent on hire is not cost effective so an allocation was made in the GF Capital Programme Pool of £15,000 to purchase a van outright as part of the council's vehicle capital programme. This will generate annual revenue savings within the coast protection budget area of approximately £3,000 per annum, subsequently leading to a minimal cost over the life expectancy of the vehicle.

**23 RELEASE OF CAPITAL RESERVES FOR THE SOUTH LANCASTER GROWTH CATALYST (HIF PROGRAMME)**

**(Cabinet Member with Special Responsibility Councillor Whitehead)**

Cabinet received a report from the Director for Economic Growth & Regeneration to request the release of the allocated budget of £4.6M from the Capital Programme.

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

Option 1. Do Nothing/ Defer
-----------------------------

Advantages - None
-------------------

Disadvantages - May miss the milestone deadlines contained in the main Grant Determination Agreement (GDA) between Lancashire County Council and Homes England.

Risks - Failure to meet GDA milestones may put at risk the £140M HIF settlement.

Option 2 Approve

Advantages - Governance approvals and funding commitments will be in place in accordance with and subject to the approval of the Collaboration Agreement. It will be compliant with the GDA funding milestones.

Disadvantages - None

Risks - None

Councillor Whitehead proposed, seconded by Councillor Lewis:-

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

Following much discussion and in view of the concern raised by some members regarding the lack of a business case and limited detail within the Budget report, the Chair advised the meeting that she was minded to suggest an amendment that the money be released subject to a full business case. After further consideration the Chair acknowledged that such an amendment was not appropriate.

Councillors then voted:-

**Resolved:**

***(5 Members (Councillors Heath, Lewis, Matthews, Thornberry & Whitehead) voted in favour, 4 Members (Councillors Brookes, Dowding, Hamilton-Cox & Jackson) voted against and 1 Member (Councillor Frea) abstained.)***

- (1) That in order to meet the requirements of the Collaboration Agreement with Lancashire County Council, Cabinet approves the release of the allocated budget of £4.6M from the development pool section of the general fund capital programme, which represents the local match funding element of the Housing Infrastructure Fund for the South Lancaster Growth Catalyst, a partnership with Lancashire County Council and Homes England.

**Officers responsible for effecting the decision:**

Director for Economic Growth & Regeneration  
Chief Finance Officer

**Reasons for making the decision:**

The decision will enable Lancaster City Council, as part of the Collaboration Agreement between the City Council and Lancashire County Council, to demonstrate that it has the

necessary governance and funding approvals in place and that budgets can be committed without the need for further approvals. The decision is a matter of governance and only commits the release of capital reserves once the Collaboration Agreement has been signed and approved by Council.

---

Chair

(The meeting ended at 7.07 p.m.)

**Any queries regarding these Minutes, please contact  
Liz Bateson, Democratic Services - email [ebateson@lancaster.gov.uk](mailto:ebateson@lancaster.gov.uk)**

**MINUTES PUBLISHED ON FRIDAY 16 JULY 2021.**

**EFFECTIVE DATE FOR IMPLEMENTING THE DECISIONS CONTAINED IN THESE MINUTES:  
MONDAY 26 JULY, 2021.**

Document is Restricted