



**Committee:** COUNCIL BUSINESS COMMITTEE

**Date:** THURSDAY, 12 OCTOBER 2023

**Venue:** MORECAMBE TOWN HALL

**Time:** 6.00 P.M.

## A G E N D A

1. **Apologies for Absence**

2. **Minutes**

Minutes of meeting held on 31 August 2023 (previously circulated).

3. **Items of urgent business authorised by the Chair**

4. **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.

5. **Response to Government Consultation on Reforms to Plan-Making (Pages 3 - 22)**

Report of Chief Officer, Planning and Climate Change.

6. **Re-dedication of the War Memorial and Garden of Remembrance Lancaster (Pages 23 - 26)**

Report of the Senior Manager, Democratic Support and Elections.

7. **Mid-Year Changes to the Committee Timetable (Pages 27 - 28)**

Report of the Monitoring Officer.

8. **Committee Timetable 2024/2025** (Pages 29 - 33)

Report of the Senior Manager, Democratic Support and Elections.

9. **Notification of Decision Taken Under the Urgent Business Procedure** (Pages 34 - 35)

Report of the Senior Manager, Democratic Support and Elections.

**ADMINISTRATIVE ARRANGEMENTS**

**(i) Membership**

Councillors David Whitaker (Chair), Paul Stubbins (Vice-Chair), Suhir Abuhajar, Matthew Black, John Livermore, Sarah McGowan and Jean Parr

**(ii) Substitute Membership**

Councillors Gina Dowding (Substitute), Prof Chris Harris (Substitute), Joyce Pritchard (Substitute) and Jason Wood (Substitute)

**(iii) Queries regarding this Agenda**

Please contact Phillip Abel, Democratic Services - email [pabel@lancaster.gov.uk](mailto:pabel@lancaster.gov.uk).

**(iv) Changes to Membership, substitutions or apologies**

Please contact Democratic Support, telephone 582000, or alternatively email [democracy@lancaster.gov.uk](mailto:democracy@lancaster.gov.uk).

MARK DAVIES,  
CHIEF EXECUTIVE,  
TOWN HALL,  
DALTON SQUARE,  
LANCASTER, LA1 1PJ

Published on 4 October 2023.

**Council Business Committee****Response to Government Consultation on Reforms to  
Plan-Making  
12<sup>th</sup> October 2023****Report of Chief Officer – Planning and Climate Change****PURPOSE OF REPORT**

To inform members of the national consultation regarding proposed reforms to the plan-making system within England and to consider the draft response at Appendix 1 as the formal response from Lancaster City Council on this matter.

The Department for Levelling Up, Housing and Communities has published a series of proposed reforms to the way that local planning authorities are to prepare Local Plans to shape future development in their areas. The reforms which have been proposed are seeking to speed up the time which is taken to prepare local plans to make them more responsive to local changes, greater embrace the role of digital innovation and seek to encourage a greater participatory role for all interested parties in the plan-making process, particularly greater input from a wider cross-section of our communities.

The Government consultation is seeking responses on the general principles of these reforms and whether they will achieve the Governments ambitions about plan-making, as summarised above. The reforms, if advanced, will require the publication of further detailed guidance on their implementation, likely through future revisions to both the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) and its associated planning practice guidance.

The response, as set out in Appendix 1, is required to be submitted to Government prior to the closure of the consultation period which is on Wednesday 18<sup>th</sup> October 2023.

**This report is public.**

**RECOMMENDATIONS**

- (1) That the draft response at Appendix 1 of this report is submitted to the Department for Levelling Up, Housing and Communities as the formal response from Lancaster City Council.**

**1.0 Introduction**

- 1.1 On the 25<sup>th</sup> July 2023, the Department for Levelling Up, Housing and Communities (DLUHC) published a consultation paper on proposed reforms to the plan-making system (i.e. the process to which local planning authorities prepare their statutory local plans). The Government are currently seeking views on these proposed reforms.

1.2 The Levelling Up and Regeneration Bill (the Bill) seeks to reform the existing planning system which it believes currently are too onerous, too inefficient and does not allow for genuine engagement with local communities on issues which are critical to their local area. The reforms which have been identified as part of the consultation are, the Government believes, opportunities to address these issues in the plan making process and achieve a modernisation of the planning process in this country. In particular, the reforms will focus on the following matters:

- Making the role and content of plans clearer.
- Speeding up the process of preparing Local Plans
- Ensuring Local Communities are engaged
- Dealing with the current complexity of the plan-making system
- Making the most of digital technology
- Introducing the role of Supplementary Plans and Community Land Auctions

1.3 The reforms which have been set out in this consultation paper have been informed by responses to the 2020 Planning for the Future White Paper. The council's response to the White Paper was considered on the 15<sup>th</sup> October 2020.

1.4 The recommendation from officers is that Lancaster City Council (the Council) submit a formal response to the consultation on plan-making reforms. The draft response is attached at Appendix 1 of this report.

## **2.0 Proposal Details**

2.1 The Government's consultation on their proposed reforms to the plan-making process address a wide range of matters that seek to make the preparation of local plans more efficient and more include for all those interested in shaping the content of plans. To summarise the key issues of the consultation:

- Review the timescales for preparing local plans and seeking to introduce a 30-month time period for their preparation.
- To boost the role of standardisation and digitalisation within the plan-making process to improve efficiency and consistency through the preparation of plans.
- To reduce the burden of evidence preparation on local plans, to ensure that the evidence prepared to support a local plan is proportionate to its content.
- To introduce the role of 'Gateway Assessments' into the plan-making process which will provide the opportunity for the local planning authority to receive advice and guidance on the direction of plans for outside, independent assessors.
- To boost the role of public participation in plan-making, particularly in the early stages of the process to ensure that local communities can help shape the content of plans. This is to be achieved through a greater role of digitisations and more engaging methods of consultation.

- To introduce the role of Supplementary Plans which are designed to replace the current Supplementary Planning Documents (SPDs) that assist local planning authorities in providing more detail on how local planning policies can be implemented.
- To introduce the role of 'Community Land Auctions' which are designed to address issues around securing land for development at a reasonable price and remove the challenges faced around development viability.

### The Content of Local Plans

- 2.2 The reforms seek to slim down the content of Local Plans and remove their reputation of being lengthy and challenging documents to read and understand, particularly for local communities who try to understand the implications of local plans on their local area.
- 2.3 It is expected that local plans in the future will become more standardised and consistent in terms of the issues they seek to address and the way that information is presented to provide a more clear and understandable system for users. In achieving this, the Government see a key role in the adoption of new digital systems and tools to make the planning system more inclusive and interactive for the users.
- 2.4 The reforms make clear that local plans will need to include a concise and locally specific vision which sets out the aims and ambitions of the plan. Coupled with this will be a series of core principles which clearly set out how such a vision will be achieved through the course of the plan period. Such principles will be expected to be tangible, including targets which can be monitored to ensure they deliver the vision identified.

### Timescales for Plan-Making

- 2.5 Through the consultation document, the Government consider the length of time it takes to prepare local plans to be too long. They indicate that the average local plan takes 7 years to prepare from its initial scoping stage through to its formal adoption.
- 2.6 The Government believe this to be too long, meaning that it creates uncertainty over the scale and location of new development and addressing local ambitions around planning.
- 2.7 It is therefore the intention of these reforms to speed up the planning process, increasing efficiencies – such as the reduction in the level of evidence needed to support plans and either removing or slimming down some stages of the preparation process, for example the spending up of Public Examinations into the Plan itself.
- 2.8 It is the ambition of Government to see plans being prepared across a period of 30-months from start to finish. It is anticipated through regular reviews and monitoring that local planning authorities seek to stick to these timeframes with potential penalties (albeit not specified in this consultation) being applied to any authorities who significantly alter from the 30-month preparation period.

### Great Role for Public Participation

- 2.10 The reforms seek to address the perennial challenge of seeking greater engagement in the plan-making process so that its content and direction has sufficient support from local communities. The government wish to see such participation from an early stage in the plan-making process in order to shape the vision and principles which have already been described.
- 2.11 The reforms lack any detail on this engagement will be achieved, however the Government do see a great role for digital engagement with local communities,

particularly around the role of mapping which can provide a greater visual stimulus for local communities to participate.

- 2.12 The Government want to see the plan-making process simplified for to provide more certainty and clarity into the process for local communities.

### Increasing Standardisation

- 2.13 In terms of boosting engagement and efficiencies in the plan-making process, the Government strongly advocate the role of standardisation. It is anticipated that standardising some elements of the plan-making process, for instance the preparation of supporting documents such as a the local plan timetable (the Local Development Scheme) and the standardisation of how interested parties can respond to planning consultations should result in a speedier process of plan-making and give certainty to how people can input into the process.

### Introduction of Gateway Assessments

- 2.14 A key component of the proposed reforms is the introduction of Gateway Assessments as mandatory stages of the plan-making process. It is anticipated that three assessment will be required as a local plan is prepared, the first being at the very outset of its preparation to ensure that the plan is heading in the right direction and covering the necessary issues. The second being to consider the content and direction of the draft Plan in terms of its policy direction and allocations made to meet identified needs. And the final assessment coming immediately prior to the local planning authority submitting the plan for examination.
- 2.15 The purpose of these assessments will be to monitor that the plan is progress to the 30-month timescales described, that the plans (in terms of their content and direction) are progressing in accordance with national planning policy and that they are being prepared with sufficient participation from key stakeholders, including the local community.
- 2.16 The outcomes of the assessments, which will be undertaken by independent assessors from the Planning Inspectorate, will include a series of recommendations on how the plans can and should be evolved. The recommendations from the first to assessments would be advisory to the local planning authority, however the final assessment – prior to the plans submission – would contain a series of binding recommendations which the local planning authority would have to act upon prior to any submission of the plan to Government for Examination.

### Supplementary Plans

- 2.17 There has been significant discussion since the publication of the 2020 Planning for the Future White Paper over the future of Supplementary Planning Documents (SPDs). It had been anticipated that the Government may seek to remove the right for local planning authorities to prepare SPDs however, through these reforms the Government are suggesting that the role of SPDs are replaced by the preparation of Supplementary Plans.
- 2.18 The content of Supplementary Plans, and their relationship to the Local Plan appear to remain relatively unchanged. However, the reforms suggest that an extra stage to the preparation process will be added to include the requirement for Examination of its content.
- 2.19 At present SPDs, whilst needing to go through a number of stages of public consultation are not subject to the lengthy process of examination – meaning that they

allow for interim guidance to be published to react to short term planning issues. However, the reforms will change that role of supplementary planning, lengthening the time it takes to prepare such documents. Whilst the length of time taken to prepare such supplementary documents will increase, the strength of its content will also increase as it will now be subject to the rigours of examination, thus affording it more weight in planning terms.

## Community Land Auctions

- 2.20 The consultation document describes the concept of 'Community Land Auctions' as a potential method of capturing the uplift in land values which are associated with new development. This concept is being considered as a pilot at this stage with a number of authorities within England being asked to participate.
- 2.21 The consultation does not have significant detail on how Community Land Auctions will work, however it seems to indicate that it will seek local landowners to 'bid' to have their land included in the Local Plan by stating what price they would willingly sell their land for. This offer (if the land was assessed as being suitable and advanced with the Plan) would become a legally binding offer of land sale on the landowner with the land price fixed at the early stage of plan-making.
- 2.22 The purpose of 'Community Land Auctions' is intended to provide greater clarity over the respective value of land which is being identified for development in the plan and seek to overcome the issues on development viability which comes later on in the planning process – generally when a planning application is made.
- 2.23 Whilst it recognises a challenging issue in the planning system (i.e. the capture of uplift in land values) more detail will be required on how such an approach will work and how effective it would be in addressing this issue.

## Transitioning to the Proposed New System

- 2.24 As with all reforms, the Government recognise that such changes to the plan-making system cannot be introduced overnight and therefore propose a transitional period where local planning authorities can continue to prepare plans under the current system.
- 2.25 The Government have set out a timescale for this transitional period. They have suggested that local planning authorities will have until 30 June 2025 to submit local plans for independent public examination under the existing legal framework and that any plans adopted under the current system must have been done by 31 December 2026.
- 2.26 Should plans not meet the deadlines outlined above, local plans would have to be withdrawn and restarted using the new system and associated legal framework.

## **3.0 Details of Consultation**

- 3.1 Following the publication of the proposed reforms in July 2023, Officers have drafted a response to the questions posed in the consultation document. The draft response (as attached in Appendix 1) has been refined following its presentation to Members at Local Plan Review Group on the 20<sup>th</sup> September. It is anticipated that, subject to any further comments from Business Committee Members, this version will be the formal response submitted to Government.

#### 4.0 Options and Options Analysis (including risk assessment)

	<b>Option 1: To formally respond to the Consultation with the draft at Appendix 1 of this report.</b>	<b>Option 2: To amend the draft response at Appendix 1 and submit the amendments as the formal response to the Consultation.</b>	<b>Option 3: To provide no response to this consultation</b>
<b>Advantages</b>	The view of the council will be considered when the government proceeds with reforms to the plan-making system.	The view of the council will be considered when the government proceeds with reforms to the plan-making system.	No Advantages
<b>Disadvantages</b>	The response may not result in the issues raised being dealt with in the final preparation of any reforms.	The response may not result in the issues raised being dealt with in the final preparation of any reforms.	The views of the council will not be taken into account.
<b>Risks</b>	The final outcomes of the reforms may not address the issues raised by the council.	The final outcomes of the reforms may not address the issues raised by the council.	The views of the council will not be taken into account and future opportunities to feed into the process may be lost.

#### 5.0 Officer Preferred Option (and comments)

5.1 Option 1 is the preferred option. This option will ensure that the Council provides views on the proposed reforms to the plan-making system. A further opportunity to comment is anticipated through changes to the National Planning Policy Framework.

#### 6.0 Conclusion

6.1 It is recommended that the proposed response set out in Appendix 1 is submitted as the Council's formal response to this consultation.

#### **RELATIONSHIP TO POLICY FRAMEWORK**

The councils Corporate Policies (Jan 2022) include securing investment for the district, transitioning to an accessible and inclusive low-carbon and active transport system, supporting flood resilience and developing housing to ensure people of all incomes are comfortable, warm and able to maintain their independence.

The Lancaster District Local Plan includes a range of policies which seek to deliver sustainable development which mitigates the impacts on infrastructure and provides affordable homes.

The consultation relates to how the plan-making system can become more efficient and responsive to local issues such as those described. The reforms are also seeking boost the participation of local people in the shaping of plans.

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



Responding to the Consultation provides the council with the best opportunity to raise any issues relating to these matters.

The Government will consider all responses received from the consultation as they seek to progress and refine their reforms to the plan-making system which will subsequently be implemented by the Council using the direction given through national regulation and policy around impact assessments.

**LEGAL IMPLICATIONS**

None identified.

**FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS**

Responding to the consultation required officer time that has been absorbed within existing resources. There are no further financial implications at this stage.

**OTHER RESOURCE IMPLICATIONS**

**Human Resources:**  
None Identified.

**Information Services:**  
None identified.

**Property:**  
None Identified.

**Open Spaces:**  
None Identified.

**SECTION 151 OFFICER'S COMMENTS**

The s151 Officer has been consulted and has no comments to add.

**MONITORING OFFICER'S COMMENTS**

The Monitoring Officer has been consulted and has no comments to add.

**BACKGROUND PAPERS**

The consultation document can be found here:

[Levelling-up and Regeneration Bill: consultation on implementation of plan-making reforms - GOV.UK \(www.gov.uk\)](http://www.gov.uk)

**Contact Officer:** Paul Hatch

**Telephone:** 01524 582329

**Email:** [phatch@lancaster.gov.uk](mailto:phatch@lancaster.gov.uk)

## **Response to Consultation:**

### *Levelling-Up and Regeneration Bill: Implementation of Plan-Making Reforms*

#### **Introduction**

Lancaster City Council welcomes the opportunity to respond to the Government's consultation on plan-making reforms. This response represents the views of Lancaster City Council.

The Council recognises the importance of Local Plans in providing certainty to all over the ambitions in the Council around sustainably, the protection and enhancement of natural and historic assets, meeting the needs of our communities but also the ability to delivery on the range of ambitions of the Council, for instance seeking to address the Climate Emergency.

The Council, whilst welcoming some aspects of the reforms proposed, do not see sufficient clarity from the Government in how it will effectively balance the competing demands of securing more effective engagement with stakeholders while at the same time delivering a speedier and more efficient process. With many of the proposals set out there needs to be further guidance and detail before a clear position can be established.

There is also concern that some of the proposed changes to the plan-making process will result in a greater level of centralisation, particularly the role of gateway assessments, which has the opportunity to stifle local democracy and local input into shaping a plan which local people want. It is felt that the consequence of some of these reforms will see a reduction in democratic input into the preparation of local plans which is directly contrary to the Governments stated ambitions of opening up the planning system for all those who have an interest to participate in the process.

Furthermore, the Council are disappointed to see that a number of the proposed reforms are not reforms to the planning system and are simply reflective of what local planning authorities already do – for instance the use of core principles and vision. These are matters which are already addressed with the existing planning system and so the Council feels that a number of the proposals within this consultation do not express new ideas or new thinking.

The Council would recognise the value of effective and transparent consultation, and would welcome the opportunity to engage further on these proposed reforms as further details and guidance emerge. It is important that the Government take account of local planning authorities perspective on these matters as they can provide beneficial, real world, input into the effectiveness of the reforms proposed.

**Question 1: Do you agree with the core principles for plan content? Do you think there are other principles that could be included?**

Regarding the core principles set out in paragraph 22 of the consultation document, the Council would agree that these represent the key elements of a Local Plan. The expectation that a Plan looks to contain a vision, a development strategy, a series of key policies (strategic or non-strategic) which look to address that vision and a specific monitoring framework is no different to the existing plan making process. Indeed, all these core components are contained within the 2020 Lancaster District Local Plan.

Consequently, it is not clear how this 'new' approach is any different from the existing approach, if that is the case then it is not clear what the purpose of the reform is in this regard. It just seeks to add a further layer of guidance which will add confusion within the planning system.

Reforms to the system need to be distinctly different to those approaches which have gone before, and it should be clear why the existing approach have either succeeded or failed. That is not the case here (and with many of the proposed 'changes' to the system).

One minor change is the use of the term 'beautiful'. The Council would re-iterate their concerns (as many other organisations have already) regarding the use of subjective terminology such as 'beautiful'. The use of the term 'beautiful' is different to different people and the use of the term, without any sort of definition, is not helpful. It is already intrinsic to the planning system. The planning system seeks to deliver development which is of a high standard and quality, securing design which is sympathetic to its surroundings. The use of the term 'beautiful' does not assist this matter.

Either the Government define what is meant by the term 'beautiful' or it should be removed from future national guidance.

**Question 2: Do you agree that plans should contain a vision, and with our proposed principles preparing the vision? Do you think there are other principles that could be included?**

Local Plans already include a vision which sets out the ambitions of the local planning authority over what it is seeking to achieve across the plan period. These should be locally specific to the area (and therefore standardisation would not be appropriate) and be reflected across the wider plan with policies which have measurable standards (for instance a specific housing requirement).

This is standard practice within the existing planning system and is reflected in paragraph 15 of the current NPPF. Again, reforms to the system need to be distinctly different to those approaches which have gone before, and it should be clear why the existing approach have either succeeded or failed.

**Question 3: Do you agree with the proposed framework for local development management policies?**

The Council would agree that any Development Management policies should be locally specific and address issues which are locally important. They should not include policies which seek to duplicate national planning policy, nor should they include policies which could be described as unnecessary or burdensome.

However, the role of local DM policies should be a matter for the local planning authority and scoped out through engagement with key stakeholders, including the local community. The proposed approach in paragraph 32 of the consultation document suggests that the Government are seeking to set a high bar in terms of locally specific DM policies, and it is not clear what is meant by 'appropriate justification'. Does this mean the need to evidentially justify any approach (which seems contrary to the Governments stated ambitions around reducing the burden on authorities to produce evidence)?

The Council would agree that the policies, DM or otherwise should link back to the wider ambitions of the Council in terms of what is set out in the Vision and Development Strategy of the Plan.

**Question 4: Would templates make it easier for local planning authorities to prepare local plans? Which parts of the local plan would benefit from consistency?**

The Council would agree that the use of templates for specific elements of the plan making process would be useful in terms of consistencies across LPA areas and could make understanding the content and direction of Local Plan's simpler for users, particularly the local community.

However, templates by their very nature are prescribed and inflexible – unable to adapt to local situations and circumstances – and therefore their application should be carefully managed to fully understand their implications.

The role of templates – for instance in the presentation of mapping – would be beneficial. The use of templates to dictate how policies should be worded would not.

**Question 5: Do you think templates for new style minerals and waste plans would need to differ from local plans? If so, how?**

As Lancaster City Council is not a Waste and Minerals Authority, we have no comment to make on this matter.

**Question 6: Do you agree with the proposal to set out in policy that planning authorities should adopt their plan, at the latest, 30 months after the plan preparation process begins?**

No. The Council would re-iterate their concerns from previous consultations on this matter that the inflexibility of a 30-month period for plan making is simply not realistic given the complexities of planning and the often conflicting opinions of stakeholders. The Government's stated ambition is to involve the local community in the plan-making process, the reality of this is that genuine engagement and consultation with the public to secure tangible outcomes takes time. The 30-month timeframe proposed does not realistically take account for opportunities for genuine engagement. It simply encourages LPAs to rush through the plan-making process.

Notwithstanding this, a recommended timeframe to focus LPAs is not seen as a bad idea. However, experience off preparing a recently adopted Local Plan would indicate that the preparation of a sound and inclusive plan would take longer than the 30 months currently identified.

**Question 7: Do you agree that a Project Initiation Document will help define the scope of the plan and be a useful tool throughout the plan making process?**

The Council agree that in principle the use of a 'Project Initiation Document' would help to define the scope of the plan and how it will be prepared. However, further guidance will be required to set out the detail of these documents and their wider role in the plan-making process. As it currently stands there is insufficient information to judge their benefits.

**Question 8: What information produced during plan-making do you think would most benefit from data standardisation, and/or being openly published?**

It would be beneficial for Councils to publish information on all key strategic policies and strategic sites (for instance housing and employment sites) via an interactive web map and also have the data readily available to be downloaded by the public in various formats (e.g. shapefile, OGC WMS web service, OGC WFS web service, API).

**Question 9: Do you recognise and agree that these are some of the challenges faced as part of plan preparation which could benefit from digitalisation? Are there any others you would like to add and tell us about?**

The Council are aware of the challenges which are identified in the consultation document and have heard of other Councils who have experienced other challenges. Additionally, the lack of inclusion of UPRNs (Unique Property Reference Numbers) in datasets and inconsistency in site boundaries being drawn to Ordnance Survey Master Map can be a challenge a part of the plan preparation. The addition of UPRNs where possible in Local Plan datasets can enable multiple layers of data to be combined and analysed more effectively in the future (i.e. for monitoring purposes). Not all historic Local Plan data may have been drawn against Ordnance Survey Master Map so levels of accuracy of layers may differ. Also, the production of data in different formats can be challenging if the format does not naturally join to a shapefile. For example, certain formatting must be followed for an Excel document to join a shapefile or feature class.

**Question 10: Do you agree with the opportunities identified? Can you tell us about other examples of digital innovation or best practice that should also be considered?**

Yes. The opportunities identified are valid and it would be beneficial if each were improved in the future. Another opportunity for digital plan-making brings is the chance to integrate the latest technologies to aid those visually impaired / colour-blind. For example, using open-source software Color Brewer and ColorOracle, as well as the latest colour blind feature in ArcGIS Pro, are great ways improve digital inclusion.

**Question 11: What innovations or changes would you like to see prioritised to deliver efficiencies in how plans are prepared and used, both now and in the future?**

It would be beneficial if digital local plans were accessible to all (e.g. those colour blind). If local plans datasets were easily downloadable and had a standard formatting for the columns in all shapefile attribute tables, this would aid efficiency.

**Question 12: Do you agree with our proposals on the milestones to be reported on in the local plan timetable and minerals and waste timetable, and our proposals surrounding when timetables must be updated?**

As Lancaster City Council is not a Waste and Minerals Authority, we have no comment to make on this matter.

**Question 13: Are there any key milestones that you think should automatically trigger a review of the local plan timetable and/or minerals and waste plan timetable?**

The Council have no specific comments on this question. However, any key milestones should be linked to tangible indicators which have been set out within the early scoping stages of the plan-making process.

**Question 14: Do you think this direction of travel for national policy and guidance set out in this chapter would provide more clarity on what evidence is expected? Are there other changes you would like to see?**

The Council recognise the challenges and the fine balance in collecting a 'proportionate' evidence base. There has been little guidance provided on what is defined as a 'proportionate' evidence base which leads local planning authorities to over-preparing evidence to limit the risks of a plan not being found sound at Examination. The Council would agree that has led to burdensome levels of evidence which can complicate the plan-making process. The points raised in paragraph 89 of the consultation document are generally supported by the Council as methods where clarification on the levels of evidence could be provided.

The Council would support greater clarity on the levels of evidence which are required for the plan-making process and consequently a lower burden of evidence for the preparation of a Local Plan. However, the information provided within this consultation process is not sufficient to define what 'proportionate' means and further guidance on this matter, preferably within future revisions of the National Planning Policy Framework, will be required.

**Question 15: Do you support the standardisation of evidence requirements for certain topics? What evidence topics do you think would be particularly important or beneficial to standardise and/or have more readily available baseline data?**

The Council would agree that the standardisation of evidence requirements would provide consistency in terms of the suite of evidence which is required. The Government have yet to provide guidance or direction on what they consider to be a 'proportionate' level of evidence and certainty on this matter would be welcomed.

Whilst a standard approach is welcomed as a starting point, there needs to be a degree of pragmatism in terms of proposing a one-size-fits-all approach as it must be recognised that each place is different and will have different dynamics. Therefore, the standardised approach should be the starting point but there needs to be sufficient flexibility to be established to ensure that local circumstances can be addressed.

**Question 16: Do you support the freezing of data or evidence at certain points of the process? If so which approach(es) do you favour?**

The Council agree that at some point the plan-making process must get off the evidence carousel and its content and direction is robustly tested. For many this point arrives at the time of Submission of the Plan (Regulation 22). Again, the proposed reforms set out in this consultation document do not appear to be any different to the currently established approach.

The Council do not object to evidence being 'frozen' at a point in time, but it is imperative that if the Government is proposing such an approach, then it provides direction on when evidence is to be frozen.

For example, the issues described in paragraph 97 of the consultation document regarding the role of data which is 'regularly released' (for instance household projections) when should this data be frozen? Is it at the start of the plan-making process? Is it at the consultation of a draft plan? Is it prior to publication of the final iteration of the plan? The Council would agree from its own experiences that the cut off for the use of new data (particularly housing data) is a hotly contested matter from all spectrums of the debate – from those looking to lower housing numbers but also those seeking to increase them. Therefore, clear direction on this would be beneficial.

Whilst the consultation document highlights a very important issue, it does not provide the detail to understand how such matters will be addressed.

**Question 17: Do you support this proposal to require local planning authorities to submit only supporting documents that are related to the soundness of the plan?**

The Council support the preparation of a proportionate and reasonable level of evidence to support the content and direction of the Local Plan. Over time the level of evidence which has been required has increased which has simply raised the level of burden on local planning authorities and the costs of plan-making.

Whilst the Council wholeheartedly support this, there is no guidance provided by the Government on what represents a 'proportionate and reasonable' level of evidence. There are no checklists provided on what constitutes core components of evidence which a local plan should have.

In this absence of national direction on this matter the default position remains the same and encourages local planning authorities to prepare larger suites of evidence to ensure that risks of the plan falling at Examination are minimised.

**Question 18: Do you agree that these should be the overarching purposes of gateway assessments? Are there other purposes we should consider alongside those set out above?**

The Council can see the merits of gateway assessments in the plan-making process where they are viewed as 'critical friend' advice. These assessments, particularly the first two assessments at the start and mid-way through the process, provide the opportunity to ensure that the plan is progressing in an appropriate and robust fashion.

The Council would raise some concern over the implications of the third assessment (prior to Submission) which would include binding recommendations on the Council which suggest that the Council cannot advance to Examination unless these recommendations are met. This seems to introduce a pre-examination process which will in itself be subject to public consultation. Again, this

seems to go beyond the stated ambitions of the Government in terms of allowing the wider community to shape the content and direction of the plan.

It is not clear what occurs when the binding recommendations of the third assessment are disputed by the local planning authority. In such cases this would suggest that the Council will be placed in a position of advancing a plan that they do not agree with and will not have recourse to make their case through an Examination process with the involvement of third parties.

This does not seem to be a robust or appropriate outcome and it is recommended that the outcomes of the third assessment reflect the first two in that they are accompanied by non-binding recommendations.

**Question 19: Do you agree with these proposals around the frequency and timing of gateways and who is responsible?**

The Council would agree that the timings of the three assessments (i.e. at the start, mid-point, and pre-submission) represent the most logical points in the plan-making process to undertake these assessments.

The Council would also agree that, subject to their own resources to undertake these, that the Planning Inspectorate represent a logical responsible organisation.

**Question 20: Do you agree with our proposals for the gateway assessment process, and the scope of the key topics? Are there any other topics we should consider?**

The Council would support the key issues identified in paragraph 113 of the consultation document. Guidance could be provided on the 'proportionate' level of evidence which is being prepared to support the Local Plan which is also seen as a key ambition of the Government within this consultation process.

**Question 21: Do you agree with our proposal to charge planning authorities for gateway assessments?**

No. Whilst the Council recognise that the role of gateway assessments may have benefits in terms of ensuring the approaches seek to meet the tests of soundness it is not clear that recommendations would save Local Planning Authorities any money. Therefore, the requirement to the Council to pay for such assessment simply adds further financial burden to the plan-making process at a time where financial resources within local government are tightly stretched.

**Question 22: Do you agree with our proposals to speed up plan examinations? Are there additional changes that we should be considering to enable faster examinations?**

The Council do not object to the speeding up of Local Plan Examinations provided that it does not result in the reducing public confidence in the process or result in key issues within the Plan not being fully explored. It important that the Examination process is seen by all parties as the opportunity for an independent examination of the issues and the opportunity for any outstanding



issues to be heard in an objective and fair manner. Whilst speeding up the process would be of benefit it should not be at the detriment of these key principles.

**Question 23: Do you agree that six months is an adequate time for the pause period, and with the government's expectations around how this would operate?**

The Council do not have a specific view on this proposal, it would however recommend that any 'pause' to an Examination process should be on a case-by-case basis and judged on individual circumstances. It should be for the appointed Inspector(s) to determine the length of time required rather than a prescribed and inflexible time-period.

**Question 24: Do you agree with our proposal that planning authorities should set out their overall approach to engagement as part of their Project Initiation Document? What should this contain?**

The Council would agree that the 'Project Initiation Document' should include an approach to how the LPA intends to engage on the preparation of the Plan. This is very much which is already described in the 'Statement for Community Involvement' which sets out the minimum requirements for engagement throughout the plan-making process and provides opportunity for the authority to go further as and when appropriate to do so. It is anticipated this will be the same approach taken albeit in a different document.

**Question 25: Do you support our proposal to require planning authorities to notify relevant persons and/or bodies and invite participation, prior to commencement of the 30-month process?**

The Council have no objections to formally notifying relevant persons or bodies of the commencement of the plan-making process. Indeed, that is a process which for many, as best practice, already exists to ensure that all parties are clear that a new round of plan-making has commenced.

It is not clear however how 'early participation' as described in the consultation is any different to the current process of 'scoping' which is part of the current plan-making process. As part of scoping it offers opportunity for interested parties to discuss and shape the types of issue which the Local Plan should be seeking to address and enables discussion over high-level visions and objectives for plan making moving forward.

Reading through paras 142 – 148 it is not clear how the new approach is distinctly different to the existing approach and on that basis it does not appear to be productive to introduce new terminology to replace the well-understood scoping stage of plan-making.

**Question 26: Should early participation inform the Project Initiation Document? What sorts of approaches might help to facilitate positive early participation in plan-preparation?**

The Council would suggest that early participation should inform the completion of the Project Initiation Document (PID) to ensure there is support from key stakeholders in the early stages of plan-making process. However, it should be mindful that engagement takes time and consensus

may not be achieved, that means consideration that the implications on timescales should be carefully considered and should how the PID should be presented where there is significant disagreement over its content and direction.

**Question 27: Do you agree with our proposal to define more clearly what the role and purpose of the two mandatory consultation windows should be?**

No. The purpose of the current Regulation 18 and Regulation 19 consultations have been with Local Planning Authorities and have been well used and well understood by the public. The purposes of these two mandatory consultations (as highlighted in paragraph 153) do not appear to differ from the current understanding of Regulation 18 and Regulation 19 consultations. Therefore, the introduction of new terminology to essentially achieve the same thing is not necessary and would simply lead to confusion amongst the public and other stakeholders.

**Question 28: Do you agree with our proposal to use templates to guide the form in which representations are submitted?**

The Council would agree that the use of a standardised template for representations would be highly beneficial to collating and analysing responses. Whilst the Council have sought to standardise responses for some time now to maximise efficiency the reality has been that responses are still received in a number of ways – via email, written letter, PDF letter or online forms (the latter of which is the Council's preferred method).

Whilst the Council would accept with the Government's view that standardisation is preferable, it is not clear how this could be achieved or enforced in reality. Would the Government suggest that any responses received not in the standardised format not be accepted? If this is not the case then what is the motivation for responders to make use of the standardised approach?

**Question 29: Do you have any comments on the proposed list of prescribed public bodies?**

The prescribed list does not include Active Travel England.

**Question 30: Do you agree with the proposed approach? If not, please comment on whether the alternative approach or another approach is preferable and why.**

The proposed approach is essentially the same as the current position. Failure to contact the relevant prescribed bodies in the early stages of plan-making places the local planning authority at great risk later on in the process and could result in the plan not being found sound.

This is acknowledged in paragraph 161 of the consultation document which states that the new process is to be undertaken '*much the same way that is common practice already*'.

Similarly to previous consultation responses, it is not clear why the new reforms are essentially suggesting a change which is no different to the current approach.

**Question 31: Do you agree with the proposed requirements for monitoring?**

The City Council supports the establishment of a consistent set of national monitoring indicators. This approach has been provided in the past and ensures that a consistent approach to monitoring across geographical areas and over time is provided.

The annual monitoring of the delivery of the vision is also supported although additional information on this is required. There is the potential that this could result in the same level of work as required in the preparation of an annual Authority Monitoring Report something which the consultation implied it wanted to avoid.

The preparation of a more timely and detailed authority monitoring report is also supported, with this allowing local circumstances to be monitored in greater detail. It will ensure that the implementation of planning policies can be appropriately monitored with local indicators tailored to reflect local conditions.

The relationship of this with the current requirement to maintain and report on the delivery of a five-year housing land supply will need to be considered with the current consultation currently silent on this.

**Question 32: Do you agree with the proposed metrics? Do you think there are any other metrics which planning authorities should be required to report on?**

Table 3 provides a list of high-level indicators which would benefit from consistent monitoring. Wider data collection on other topic areas will be picked up via the monitoring of the vision for an area and through the more detailed monitoring reports prepared by a local authority.

**Question 33: Do you agree with the suggested factors which could be taken into consideration when assessing whether two or more sites are 'nearby' to each other? Are there any other factors that would indicate whether two or more sites are 'nearby' to each other?**

Other factors could including functional links such as public transport connectivity, habitat connectivity and shared service provision.

**Question 34: What preparation procedures would be helpful, or unhelpful, to prescribe for supplementary plans? e.g. Design: design review and engagement event; large sites: masterplan engagement, etc.**

The Council do not have any specific views on this issue. However, the scope of Supplementary Plans should not be overly prescriptive to enable local planning authorities to consider their role and benefits in the context of local circumstances.

**Question 35: Do you agree that a single formal stage of consultation is considered sufficient for a supplementary plan? If not, in what circumstances would more formal consultation stages be required?**

The Council have no objections to a single stage of consultation. However, it is not clear what the consultation is seeking to infer with this issue. As it currently stands under the 2012 regulations there is only one formal stage of consultation to an SPD (Regulation 12). However, there is pre-regulation

consultation required in order to meet the expectations of legislation the preparation of a statement which takes account of earlier responses to the content of the SPD. This can only be achieved by a further round of consultation.

It is not clear whether these reforms are seeking to remove this earlier round of pre-engagement. If not, then the proposed reforms on this matter would not change the current position in terms of SPD preparation.

If the proposed reforms are making a genuine attempt to reduce the level of engagement, this seems to be contrary to the wider aims of the Government to seek more engagement and involvement in the planning process. If the level of engagement is to be reduced, then the reduction in engagement should not be used by third parties as a method of seeking to weaken the content and direction of an SPD for their own individual scheme.

**Question 36: Should government set thresholds to guide the decision that authorities make about the choice of supplementary plan examination routes? If so, what thresholds would be most helpful? For example, minimum size of development planned for, which could be quantitative both in terms of land use and spatial coverage; level of interaction of proposal with sensitive designations, such as environmental or heritage.**

Lancaster City Council do not accept that SPDs should be subject to examination which would simply lead to an unnecessary delay in the production of SPDs. The Government do not provide any sort of advantage to imposing such a requirement on SPDs so it would simply lead to further inefficiencies in the plan-making system.

The Government make clear via paragraph 187 of their consultation that SPDs may need to respond rapidly to changes not envisaged in the plan, specifically it states '*supplementary plans will provide a mechanism to respond to unanticipated development opportunities between plan-making cycles.*'

Making SPDs undergo Examination will produce precisely the opposite of that ambition, with the reality being that SPDs have the threat of being unnecessarily stuck in the examination process. The process of neighbourhood plans is an unhelpful example to use, it is this Council's experience that some neighbourhood plans have been stuck in the system for months as they are vexatiously challenged by third parties intent in delaying their production.

Therefore, to answer the question it is the Council's view that SPDs should not be subject to examination in any of the methods described.

**Question 37: Do you agree that the approach set out above provides a proportionate basis for the independent examination of supplementary plans? If not, what policy or regulatory measures would ensure this?**

See response to Question 36. The approach set out demonstrates the overly bureaucratic nature Government's reforms on this matter. It suggests that the Government are seeking to make the use and role of SPDs so overly difficult and challenging as to render the process useless. If this is the Government's ambition then the reforms should make this point clear.

**Question 38: Are there any unique challenges facing the preparation of minerals and waste plans which we should consider in developing the approach to implement the new plan-making system?**

As Lancaster City Council is not a Waste & Minerals Authority we have no comment to make on this matter.

**Question 39: Do you have any views on how we envisage the Community Land Auctions process would operate?**

The Council would agree that more needs to be done to better capture land values to drive the delivery of key elements of infrastructure and higher quality development than we currently see, particularly in the North-West of England. In that regard the concept of Community Land Auctions is an interesting one and at least starts the discussion on how the planning system can look to address this important of matters.

However, the current consultation lacks detail on how this approach might work in reality. It is not clear what the motivations will be for landowners to offer up their land for a fixed price, particularly in areas where opportunities for development are limited due to wider constraints (which is the case in Lancaster). Where land supply is plentiful then this approach (subject to more detail) might move this issue forward, however for areas where supply is limited it is not clear this approach will have any value.

**Question 40: To what extent should financial considerations be taken into account by local planning authorities in Community Land Auction pilots, when deciding to allocate sites in the local plan, and how should this be balanced against other factors?**

There are significant risks to this approach. It risks the wider community seeing landowners simply 'buying' planning permission for their land. The terminology used ('Auction') would exacerbate these concerns.

It is important that, if such an approach is to be advanced, further detail is provided on how the assessment of land should be undertaken and how any decisions on allocating land are transparently and accountably presented to ensure that the local community can see the relative planning merits for the allocation of land.

**Question 41: Which of these options should be implemented, and why? Are there any alternative options that we should be considering?**

The City Council do not have a view on which options should be implemented.

**Question 42: Do you agree with our proposals for saving existing plans and planning documents? If not, why?**

Lancaster City Council agree with the proposals for saving existing plans as described in paragraphs 262 – 265 of the consultation document.

**Authorisation**

<b>Report Sign Off</b> Mark Cassidy, Chief Officer - Planning and Climate Change, Lancaster City Council	22 September 2023
<b>Business Committee Sign Off and Authority to Submit</b> Councillor David Whittaker Chair of Council Business Committee, Lancaster City Council	

**Background Files**

The scope of the DLUHC consultation is available here:

[Levelling-up and Regeneration Bill: consultation on implementation of plan-making reforms - GOV.UK \(www.gov.uk\)](#)

**COUNCIL BUSINESS COMMITTEE****Re-dedication of the War Memorial and  
Garden of Remembrance Lancaster****12<sup>th</sup> October 2023****Report of the Senior Manager, Democratic Support  
and Elections****PURPOSE OF REPORT**

To seek a decision regarding a ceremony for the Re-dedication of the War Memorial and Garden of Remembrance.

**This report is public**

**RECOMMENDATIONS**

- (1) That Council Business Committee approves the arrangement of a ceremony for the Re-dedication of the War Memorial and Garden of Remembrance in Lancaster.
- (2) That the Civic and Ceremonial Officer be requested to make the necessary arrangements for the ceremony and to invite a member of the Royal Household to attend.

**1.0 Introduction**

Next December marks the 100<sup>th</sup> Anniversary of the installation and dedication of the War Memorial and Garden of Remembrance at Lancaster Town Hall.

**2.0 Proposal**

The Chairman of the Lancaster branch of the Royal British Legion has been in contact with the Mayor's Office regarding the anniversary of the installation and dedication of the War Memorial and Garden of Remembrance at Lancaster Town Hall which falls on 3<sup>rd</sup> December 2024. The British Legion has suggested that the Council arranges a re-dedication ceremony to mark the 100<sup>th</sup> Anniversary and invite a member of the Royal Household to the ceremony.

It is suggested that if a Royal was to be invited to a ceremony, this would need to be undertaken as soon as possible, with twelve months' notice to ensure availability.

Attached at Appendix A is an extract from a leaflet which documented the opening ceremony 99 years ago.

If Members agree, a ceremony will be arranged in liaison with the Lancaster branch of the Royal British Legion and the Vicar of Lancaster.

**3.0 Conclusion**

Council is requested to make a decision regarding a re-dedication ceremony and inviting a member of the Royal Household to the ceremony.

<p><b>CONCLUSION OF IMPACT ASSESSMENT</b>                  (including Health &amp; Safety, Equality &amp; Diversity, Human Rights, Community Safety, Sustainability and Rural Proofing): None</p>	
<p><b>LEGAL IMPLICATIONS</b> None</p>	
<p><b>FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS:</b> The cost of the ceremony would be expected to be minimal and funded from within existing Civic budgets.</p>	
<p><b>OTHER RESOURCE IMPLICATIONS, such as Human Resources, Information Services, Property, Open Spaces:</b> None.</p>	
<p><b>SECTION 151 OFFICER'S COMMENTS</b>                  The Section 151 Officer has been consulted and has no comments to add.</p>	
<p><b>MONITORING OFFICER'S COMMENTS</b>                  The Monitoring Officer has been consulted and has no comments to add.</p>	
<p><b>BACKGROUND PAPERS</b>                   none</p>	<p><b>Contact Officer:</b> Jenny Kay  <b>Telephone:</b> 01524 582065  <b>Email:</b> jkay@lancaster.gov.uk</p>



## CHAPTER 2 – LANCASTER

*They shall grow not old, as we that are left grow old; Age shall not weary them nor the years condemn; At the going down of the sun, and in the morning; We will remember them.*

*Laurence Binyon*

### The War Memorial and Garden of Remembrance. Town Hall Lancaster (NIWM No:3307) Map Ref SD 479615

A meeting in Ashton Hall in December 1918 decided upon a Civic Memorial to the fallen. In September 1921 a Committee was established and an appeal made to the public for subscriptions towards the cost of the erection of the memorial. A total of £2,230 was raised to cover the cost of the memorial and associated expenses. £1,894 was spent and the balance of £336 was transferred to the Corporation for the continued repair and upkeep including the addition of names. (See Note 1).

The War Memorial and Garden of Remembrance, CP3, and L1, was designed by T H Mawson & Sons. It is on the east side of the Town Hall. The design is

reminiscent of the Belgian Memorial to Britain on the Thames Embankment in London; it is 36 feet long and stands on a low flagged platform. The stone background is divided into a central portion rising to a height of 16 feet, with wings 11 feet 6 inches high on either side. There are five panels on each wing, each five feet long, on which the names of



L1 1006 men are inscribed. In the centre stands the bronze figure of Peace with outstretched wings and uplifted hands in the attitude of benediction. The figure is on a low pedestal, clear of the Longridge stone background, but the wings are against it. The Bromsgrove School of Art designed the bronze figure and the panels were furnished by Morton of Cheltenham.

The dedication ceremony took place on the 3rd of December 1924 with the Mayor of Lancaster, Alderman George Jackson, presiding and 300 subscribers at the ceremony joined over 900 relatives of the dead. The general public were admitted to the ground around the Fire Station. Every vantage point was taken - Robert Street and Lower Nelson Street being crowded, the windows of the Town Hall were also filled. The bands of the 1st and 5th Battalions of the King's Own Royal Regiment under Captain Morge provided the music on either side of the Garden. The War Memorial Committee handed the Memorial over as follows:

*"The seal was placed on the Town's Memorial by a document conveying it to the Corporation to be maintained hereafter by them in the following terms:*

*"An agreement made the 3rd Day of December 1924 between the Committee of the Lancaster War Memorial (hereafter called the committee) of the one part, and the Mayor, Aldermen and Burgesses of the Borough of Lancaster (hereinafter called the Corporation) of the other part. Whereas the Committee have by way of public subscription erected on ground of the Corporation situate on the East side of the Town Hall Lancaster aforesaid, a memorial to the men of Lancaster who fell in the Great War and whereas it is expedient that provision should be made for the maintenance repair and protection of the said memorial it is now hereby agreed as follows:*

- (1) The Committee hereby transfer the said Memorial to the Corporation to vest in the Corporation and their assigns for ever.*
  - (2) The Corporation hereby accept the said memorial and in pursuance of the powers conferred upon them by the War Memorials (Local Authority Powers Act 1923) to maintain repair and protect the said memorial for ever*
- In witness whereof the Chairman and Honorary Secretary of the Committee have hereunto set their hands and the Corporation hereunto cause their common seal to be affixed the day and year before written.*

*Signed by:*

*George Jackson (Chairman) and John Robert Nuttall (Honorary Secretary) on behalf of the Committee in the Presence of G Albert Wilson assistant Hon. Secretary, Lancaster."*

***{Sadly this important Civic Document can no longer be found in the Town Hall or the Museum. Should anyone know of the whereabouts please inform the Ceremonial Officer at the Town Hall}***

A firing party in the charge of Sergeant Clarkson flanked the left of the memorial and Privates Tabbron, Pennell, Smith and King of the Regimental Depot kept silent watch with arms reversed. An address was given by the Rev J W Mountford, Superintendent of the Wesleyan Circuit, who was a chaplain in the war. The Mayor hoped that Lancastrians would never forget their duty, he trusted that the Corporation (who had on the same day received ownership of the Memorial) would always see that the Memorial was carefully tended, and when spring came each year make the garden beautiful.

**BOROUGH OF LANCASTER.**  
**CIVIC RECEPTION, H.M. FORCES.**

NAME *Joseph Bell Fording*  
 ADDRESS *56 Waltham St. Lancaster*  
 REGTL. No. AND RANK *Pt 17289* UNIT *9th Lancashire*  
 MARRIED OR SINGLE *Single*  
 MILITARY DISTINCTIONS AWARDED (IF ANY)  
 LENGTH OF SERVICE (HOME) *22/11/14 - 7/11/14* (ABROAD) *11/12/15 - 20/1/16*  
 WHETHER DISCHARGED, DEMOBILISED, OR INVALIDED ON ACCOUNT OF WOUNDS, OR STILL SERVING  
 REMARKS *Killed in action. mother*

This information is required for a Permanent Historical Record of the War Service of Men of Lancaster.

L2

Forms were used in 1924 to invite the relatives of the fallen soldiers to a Civic Reception and also to inscribe the names on the Memorial. A facsimile of the form used is at L2 and an illustration, L3, of the sensitive way of bracketing brothers together - this of the four Butterworth Brothers. In WW1 the dead sons of the Lancaster District included one set of four brothers, six sets of three and fifty sets of two; in WW2 there were six sets of two brothers.



L3

Service men from one hundred and twenty three different services and regiments are commemorated on this memorial, a total of 1340. Nearly 300 of those

who died in the First World War have no known grave. Included are men from the following regiments and services:

King's Own Royal Regiment (426), Royal Regiment of Artillery (117); Royal Navy (81), Royal Air Force (66), Lancashire Fusiliers (40), Royal Engineers (34), The Border Regiment (33), The Seaforth Highlanders (32), The King's Liverpool Regiment (28), The Manchester Regiment (24), The Loyal Northern Lancashire Regiment (22) The King's Shropshire Light Infantry (21), The Royal Army Service Corps (20), The Royal Fusiliers (20) The Royal Army Medical Corps (18), The East Lancashire Regiment (16), Canada (25), Australia (6), South Africa (3), New Zealand (2) and The Merchant Navy (1).



L4

Following the Second World War the memorial was extended and a table of stone erected in front of the Angel of Peace upon which, in the centre, is a bronze of the Arms of the City, L4, set in a long bronze panel upon which are recorded the names of a further 300 Lancastrians who died. Later a further 25 additional names have been added from WW1 and WW2, two names from the Korean War and one from the Falklands Campaign.

**Note 1. Adding a name to The Memorial.** Should anyone wish to add a name to the memorial, from any conflict, please contact The Ceremonial and Members' Officer Lancaster City Council at the Town Hall.

<b>COUNCIL BUSINESS COMMITTEE</b>
-----------------------------------

## Mid-Year Changes to the Committee Timetable

12 October 2023

### Report of the Monitoring Officer

<b>PURPOSE OF REPORT</b>
--------------------------

To ask the Committee to authorise a delegation to the Chief Executive regarding mid-year changes to meeting dates, venues and times after the Committee Meetings Timetable has been approved.
---

<b>This report is public.</b>
-------------------------------

#### RECOMMENDATIONS

- (1) That the Committee agrees to delegate authority to the Chief Executive, in consultation with the relevant Chair, to change a meeting date, venue or time should this becomes necessary after the timetable has been agreed.
- (2) That the Monitoring Officer be asked to add this new delegation to the Scheme of Delegation to Officers in the Council's Constitution.

#### 1.0 Introduction

1.1 This Committee is responsible for agreeing the timetable of Council meetings each year. This includes the date, venue and start time of each meeting.

1.2 Occasionally, it is necessary to change a meeting date after the timetable has been approved. This will be for a specific reason, such as a change in financial reporting schedule or a venue becoming unexpectedly unavailable, and the current method to do this is quite cumbersome and resource intensive. If there is no meeting of the Committee due where a report about the change can be considered, Officers in Democratic Support are required to seek an urgent business decision outside the meeting with a report and decision notice being published. Further to that, a report has to be drafted to report in the decision to the next meeting of the Committee.

#### 2.0 Proposal

2.1 The Scheme of Delegation to Officers in the Council's Constitution list the delegated powers of the Chief Executive and Chief and Senior Officers.

2.2 It is proposed that this Committee authorises a delegation to the Chief Executive to change a meeting date, venue or start time, if this becomes necessary once the

Committee timetable has been agreed. Should the Committee agree to this proposal, the Monitoring Officer would then add this to the list of delegations to the Chief Executive.

**3.0 Conclusion**

- 3.1 The Committee is asked to consider approving the delegation to the Chief Executive, as set out in this report.

<b>CONCLUSION OF IMPACT ASSESSMENT</b> (Including Diversity, Human Rights, Community Safety, Sustainability and Rural Proofing)	
None identified.	
<b>FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS</b>	
None identified.	
<b>LEGAL IMPLICATIONS</b>	
None identified.	
<b>SECTION 151 OFFICER'S COMMENTS</b>	
The Section 151 Officer has no comments.	
<b>MONITORING OFFICER'S COMMENTS</b>	
The Monitoring Officer has contributed to the drafting of this report in his name.	
<b>BACKGROUND PAPERS</b>	<b>Contact Officer:</b> Debbie Chambers <b>Telephone:</b> 01524 582057 <b>E-mail:</b> dchambers@lancaster.gov.uk <b>Ref:</b>
None	

<b>COUNCIL BUSINESS COMMITTEE</b>
-----------------------------------

## Committee Timetable 2024/2025

12 October 2023

### Report of the Senior Manager, Democratic Support and Elections

<b>PURPOSE OF REPORT</b>
--------------------------

To consider a timetable of committee meetings for the 2024/25 municipal year.
---

This report is public.
------------------------

#### RECOMMENDATIONS

- (1) That Members consider the proposed timetable of meetings, times and venues for the 2024/25 municipal year as set out within the report and appendices.
- (2) That a final schedule of meetings be agreed at this meeting, or, if significant changes are made, that the matter be referred to Council for decision at its next meeting.

#### 1.0 Background and Introduction

- 1.1 This Committee's terms of reference include "To agree the annual timetable of Lancaster City Council meetings and any other timetabling issues which may arise." (Constitution Part 2, Section 5, paragraph 8). A draft timetable is therefore presented to Members at this meeting to be finalised. This will allow accommodation to be booked and notice to be given of the proposed dates to Members and officers.

#### 2.0 Proposal – start times, venues and number of meetings

- 2.1 Proposed start times, venues and number of meetings are shown at **Appendix 1**.
- 2.2 It should be noted that where the People and Organisational Development Committee and the Standards Committee hold hearings in respect of individual cases, which are likely to last for a half day or more, and require the attendance of witnesses and others, such hearings are held during the day. This is because a 6.10pm start time is not practical.

- 2.3 Regarding start times in general, the majority of Council meetings have been held in the evenings since 2015, with full council moving from a 2pm start to a 6pm start. It was felt that holding meetings in the daytime might preclude people who work during the day from standing for election, hence the move to evening meetings. The Committee may wish to consider, in light of the Council's financial challenges, whether start times for meetings should be moved back to daytime. There is a cost for heating, lighting and staffing of buildings outside of usual office hours.
- 2.4 Regarding venues for meetings, it is suggested that Committee meetings remain in the same venues as 2022/23, subject to a decision of Cabinet to be taken on 24 October 2023 regarding livestreaming of Cabinet meetings. Professional livestreaming equipment with the facility for e-voting was installed in the Council Chamber at Morecambe Town Hall earlier this year for use for full Council meetings. However, the equipment is not portable, it is fixed in that room. Should Cabinet take the decision to livestream their meetings, the venue for their future meetings will no longer alternate between Morecambe and Lancaster Town Halls. All Cabinet meetings will be held at Morecambe Town Hall, to utilise the livestreaming functionality.
- 2.5 The Committee may feel that Morecambe Town Hall should be used for all committee meetings to allow them to be livestreamed. The exceptions to this might be the People and Organisational Development (P&OD) and the Standards Committees. Very little of their business can be transacted in public due to the nature of the issues they consider, which tend to involve individuals and their personal data. If the Committee is minded to change venues for committees, officers would recommend that this is referred to Council.
- 2.6 The Joint Consultative Committee of P&OD Committee Members and Trade Union representatives is held virtually because this body is not required to hold face to face meetings, unlike the City Council's other committees.

### **3.0 Proposal - Dates**

- 3.1 The draft timetable is shown at **Appendix 2**. It is based on the number of meetings held this municipal year, with one or two differences explained below.
- An extra P&OD meeting has been added on 6 March to consider the Pay Policy, which has to be agreed by Council by 31 March each year. This will allow the item to be included on the agenda for the Council meeting on 12 March, with the policy being made available to Councillors as soon after the 6 March meeting of P&OD as possible. So the total number of P&OD has increased from 2 to 3 per year.
  - Overview and Scrutiny Committee meetings have been re-scheduled to be held the week before Cabinet meetings to reflect the Committee's wish to undertake more pre-decision scrutiny.
  - Planning Committee in May has been moved to Tuesday 28 May 2024 because Monday 27 May is a Bank Holiday.

### **4.0 Conclusion**

- 4.1 Members are asked to consider this report and agree a timetable of meeting dates, times, and venues for the 2024/25 municipal year at this meeting.

- 4.2 Should any significant changes be proposed, for example, daytime starts for meetings currently held in the evenings, this committee is asked to make recommendations to Council for a final decision.

<p><b>CONCLUSION OF IMPACT ASSESSMENT</b> (including Health &amp; Safety, Equality &amp; Diversity, Human Rights, Community Safety, Sustainability and Rural Proofing) None.</p>	
<p><b>LEGAL IMPLICATIONS</b> It is a legal requirement that the City Council publishes its timetable of meetings by the commencement of each Municipal Year. Amendments can be made throughout the year provided at least 5 days' notice is given.</p>	
<p><b>FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS</b> There are no additional financial implications for the proposed draft timetable. The costs of the meetings will be met from existing budgets. There may be some small savings if meetings are all meetings are held in the daytime.</p>	
<p><b>OTHER RESOURCE IMPLICATIONS</b>, such as Human Resources; Information Services; Property; Open Spaces: None.</p>	
<p><b>MONITORING OFFICER COMMENTS</b> The Monitoring Officer has been consulted and has no further comments.</p>	
<p><b>SECTION 151 OFFICER'S COMMENTS</b> The Section 151 Officer has been consulted and has no further comments.</p>	
<p><b>BACKGROUND PAPERS</b> None.</p>	<p>Contact Officer: Debbie Chambers Telephone: 01524 582057 E-mail: dchambers@lancaster.gov.uk</p>

## APPENDIX 1

<b>START TIMES, VENUES AND NUMBER OF MEETINGS</b>			
<b>Meeting</b>	<b>Venue</b>	<b>Start Time</b>	<b>Number of Meetings</b>
Annual Council (Ceremonial)	Ashton Hall	12 noon	1
Annual Council (Business)	MTH	6:00pm	1
Council	MTH	6:00pm	9
Council Business Committee	MTH	6:00pm	3
Cabinet	Alternates: MTH/LTH*	6:00pm	9
Overview & Scrutiny Committee	MTH	6:00pm	9
Budget and Performance Panel	LTH	6.10 pm	5
Licensing Committee	MTH	1:00pm	8
Planning Regulatory Committee	MTH	10:30am	13
People and Organisational Development Committee	LTH	6:10pm	3
JCC	REMOTE	Flexible	2
Audit Committee	MTH	6:00pm	4
Standards Committee	LTH	6:10pm	2

\*Cabinet may decide to livestream meetings from May 2024, in which case all meetings will be held at Morecambe Town Hall in the Council Chamber where the equipment is located. See paragraph 2.4 of the report.



	May 2024	June	July	August	September	October	November	December	January 2025	February	March	April	May	
<b>Mon</b>			1											<b>Mon</b>
<b>Tue</b>			2			1						1		<b>Tue</b>
<b>Wed</b>	1		3 JCC Overview & Scrutiny			2			1			2		<b>Wed</b>
<b>Thu</b>	2 PCC ELECTIONS and possible others		4 Standards	1		3 Licensing			2			3	1 ELECTIONS?	<b>Thu</b>
<b>Fri</b>	3		5	2		4	1		3			4	2	<b>Fri</b>
<b>Sat</b>	4	1	6	3		5	2		4	1	1	5	3	<b>Sat</b>
<b>Sun</b>	5	2	7	4	1	6	3	1	5	2	2	6	4	<b>Sun</b>
<b>Mon</b>	6 Bank Holiday	3	8	5	2 Planning	7	4	2	6	3	3	7 Planning	5 Bank Holiday	<b>Mon</b>
<b>Tue</b>	7	4 Cabinet	9 Cabinet	6	3	8	5	3 Cabinet	7	4	4	8	6	<b>Tue</b>
<b>Wed</b>	8	5	10	7	4 Overview & Scrutiny	9	6 JCC	4 Overview & Scrutiny	8 Overview & Scrutiny	5 Overview & Scrutiny	5	9 Overview & Scrutiny	7overvi	<b>Wed</b>
<b>Thu</b>	9	6 Licensing	11 P&OD	8	5 Licensing	10	7	5	9 Licensing	6 Licensing	6 P&OD	10	8	<b>Thu</b>
<b>Fri</b>	10 Annual council	7	12	9	6	11	8	6	10	7	7	11	9 Annual Council	<b>Fri</b>
<b>Sat</b>	11	8	13	10	7	12	9	7	11	8	8	12	10	<b>Sat</b>
<b>Sun</b>	12	9	14	11	8	13	10	8	12	9	9	13	11	<b>Sun</b>
<b>Mon</b>	13 Business Council	10	15	12	9	14	11	9	13 Planning	10 Planning	10 Planning	14	12 Business Council	<b>Mon</b>
<b>Tue</b>	14	11	16	13	10 Cabinet	15	12	10	14 Cabinet	11 Cabinet	11	15 Cabinet	13	<b>Tue</b>
<b>Wed</b>	15	12 Overview & Scrutiny	17	14	11	16 Overview & Scrutiny	13 Council	11 Council	15	12	12 Council	16	14	<b>Wed</b>
<b>Thu</b>	16	13	18	15	12	17	14	12	16 Standards	13	13 Licensing Budget & Perf.	17	15	<b>Thu</b>
<b>Fri</b>	17	14	19	16	13	18	15	13	17	14	14	18	16	<b>Fri</b>
<b>Sat</b>	18	15	20	17	14	19	16	14	18	15	15	19	17	<b>Sat</b>
<b>Sun</b>	19	16	21	18	15	20	17	15	19	16	16	20	18	<b>Sun</b>
<b>Mon</b>	20	17	22	19	16	21	18	16 Planning	20	17	17	21	19	<b>Mon</b>
<b>Tue</b>	21	18	23	20	17	22 Cabinet	19	17	21	18	18	22	20	<b>Tue</b>
<b>Wed</b>	22 Audit	19 Council	24 Council	21	18 Budget & Perf	23	20 Overview & Scrutiny	18	22 Council	19 Budget & Performance	19 Audit	23 Council	21	<b>Wed</b>
<b>Thu</b>	23	20	25	22	19	24 Business Committee	21 Licensing	19	23	20	20	24	22	<b>Thu</b>
<b>Fri</b>	24	21	26	23	20	25	22	20	24	21	21	25	23	<b>Fri</b>
<b>Sat</b>	25	22	27	24	21	26	23	21	25	22	22	26	24	<b>Sat</b>
<b>Sun</b>	26	23	28	25	22	27	24	22	26	23	23	27	25	<b>Sun</b>
<b>Mon</b>	27 Bank Holiday	24 Planning	29 Planning	26 Bank Holiday	23	28 Planning	25 Planning	23	27	24	24	28 Planning	26 Bank Holiday	<b>Mon</b>
<b>Tue</b>	28 Planning	25	30 Audit	27	24	29	26	24	28	25	25	29	27	<b>Tue</b>
<b>Wed</b>	29 Overview & Scrutiny	26	21	28	25 Council	30	27 Audit	25 Christmas Day	29 Budget & Performance	26 Council	26	30	28	<b>Wed</b>
<b>Thu</b>	30 Business Committee	27 Licensing		29	26	31	28 P&OD	26 Boxing Day	30	27 Business Committee	27		29	<b>Thu</b>
<b>Fri</b>	31	28		30	27		29	27	31	28	28		30	<b>Fri</b>
<b>Sat</b>		29		31	28		30	28			29		31	<b>Sat</b>
<b>Sun</b>		30			29			29			30			<b>Sun</b>
<b>Mon</b>					30 Planning			30			31			<b>Mon</b>
<b>Tue</b>								31						<b>Tue</b>
	May 2023	June	July	August	September	October	November	December	January 2024	February	March	April	May	

**URGENT BUSINESS****Notification of Decision Taken Under the Urgent Business Procedure: Changes to dates of Budget & Performance Panel meetings for the 2023-2024 municipal year.****Report of the Senior Manager, Democratic Support and Elections****PURPOSE OF REPORT**

To advise Members of decisions taken by the Chief Executive, in consultation with the Chair of Council Business Committee.

**This report is public**

**RECOMMENDATIONS**

**That the decisions taken by the Chief Executive, in consultation with the Chair of Council Business Committee, in accordance with the Urgent Business Procedure Rules, in respect of the following, be noted:-**

- 1) That the meetings timetable for Budget and Performance Panel be amended to the following dates: Budget and Performance Panel will now meet on the following dates: 20<sup>th</sup> September 2023, 6<sup>th</sup> December 2023, 31<sup>st</sup> January 2024, 14<sup>th</sup> February 2024, 14<sup>th</sup> March 2024.**

**1.0 Background**

- 1.1 On an occasion when an urgent decision is needed and the matter cannot wait for the next ordinary meeting of the appropriate committee, the Chief Executive is authorised to make the necessary decision following consultation with the Chairman of the relevant Committee (Part 2, Section 7, of the Constitution).

**2.0 Proposal**

- 2.1 Since the approval of the Committee Timetable at the December 2023 meeting of Council, the Section 151 Officer identified a need to rearrange the dates of the 2023/24 meetings of Budget and Performance Panel to better align with the reporting requirements of Cabinet and Council.
- 2.2 As the next scheduled meeting of Council Business Committee would have fallen after the first meeting of Budget and Performance Panel, this decision was requested to be taken between meetings by the Chief Executive in

consultation with the Chair of Council Business Committee.

**3.0 Consultation**

- 3.1 In line with Part 2, Section 7, of the Constitution, Matters of Urgency – there has been consultation with Councillor David Whitaker, Chair of Council Business Committee.
- 3.2 After seeking the approval the Chair of Council Business Committee, this decision was taken by the Chief Executive on 6 July 2023.

**4.0 Conclusion**

- 4.1 The Committee are asked to note the decision taken by the Chief Executive between meetings in consultation with the Chair of Council Business Committee.

<p><b>CONCLUSION OF IMPACT ASSESSMENT</b>                  (including Health &amp; Safety, Equality &amp; Diversity, Human Rights, Community Safety, Sustainability and Rural Proofing)</p> <p><b>CONCLUSION OF IMPACT ASSESSMENT</b>                  (including Health &amp; Safety, Equality &amp; Diversity, Human Rights, Community Safety, Sustainability and Rural Proofing)</p> <p>None</p>	
<p><b>LEGAL IMPLICATIONS</b></p> <p>None.</p>	
<p><b>FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS</b></p> <p>None.</p>	
<p><b>OTHER RESOURCE IMPLICATIONS, such as Human Resources, Information Services, Property, Open Spaces.</b></p> <p>None.</p>	
<p><b>SECTION 151 OFFICER’S COMMENTS</b></p> <p>The Section 151 Officer and been consulted and has no comments to add.</p>	
<p><b>MONITORING OFFICER’S COMMENTS</b></p> <p>The Monitoring Officer and been consulted and has no comments to add.</p>	
<p><b>BACKGROUND PAPERS</b></p> <p><a href="#">Urgent Business 132 - Changes to dates of Budget &amp; Performance Panel meetings for the 2023-2024 municipal year.</a></p>	<p><b>Contact Officer:</b> Liz Bateson  <b>Telephone:</b> 01524 582047  <b>E-mail:</b> ebateson@lancaster.gov.uk  <b>Ref:</b></p>