

## CABINET

6.00 P.M.

16TH FEBRUARY 2016

**PRESENT:-** Councillors Eileen Blamire (Chairman), Janice Hanson (Vice-Chairman), Abbott Bryning, Darren Clifford, Karen Leytham, Margaret Pattison and David Smith

Apologies for Absence:-

Councillor Richard Newman-Thompson

Officers in attendance:-

Mark Cullinan	Chief Executive
Nadine Muschamp	Chief Officer (Resources) and Section 151 Officer
Mark Davies	Chief Officer (Environment)
Suzanne Lodge	Chief Officer (Health and Housing)
Liz Bateson	Principal Democratic Support Officer

### 67 MINUTES

The minutes of the meeting held on Tuesday 19<sup>th</sup> January 2016 were approved as a correct record.

### 68 ITEMS OF URGENT BUSINESS AUTHORISED BY THE LEADER

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

### 69 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

No declarations were made at this point.

### 70 PUBLIC SPEAKING

Members were advised that there had been a request to speak at the meeting from a member of the public in accordance with Cabinet's agreed procedure, as set out in Cabinet Procedure Rule 2.7, with regard to funding to the Marsh Community Centre within the Budget & Policy Framework Update (Minute 77 refers). Yak Patel addressed the meeting in support of the continuation of funding for the Marsh Community Centre and answered questions from Cabinet Members.

### 71 MARKET SQUARE LANCASTER - TREES

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

Cabinet received a report from the Chief Officer (Environment) which requested agreement to the recommendations outlined by Councillor Hanson to Council on 3<sup>rd</sup> February 2016. Cabinet had deferred consideration of this item at its meeting on 19<sup>th</sup> January 2016 to enable Council to debate the item following receipt of a petition in objection to the proposals to fell the trees.

Councillor Hanson proposed, seconded by Councillor Leytham:-

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

Councillors then voted:-

***Resolved unanimously:***

- (1) That Cabinet recognises the value placed by our citizens on the lime trees in Market Square and therefore would like to retain them.
- (2) That Cabinet however recognises that by their nature lime trees can cause particular management and maintenance problems, particularly in a busy place like Market Square.
- (3) That Cabinet also recognises that properly managing the trees, cleaning the square to an acceptable standard, and ensuring the safety of pedestrians is likely to require additional budget which due to the Council's precarious financial position will need equivalent savings to be found.
- (4) That Cabinet requests that the Chief Officer (Environment):
  - Carries out more work over the course of a growing season to further identify the extent of the problem.
  - Continues to trial the use of various algicidal and other cleaning products as an addition to pressure washing.
  - Investigates how other places deal with this problem.
  - Explores how other stakeholders can help the City Council to achieve its aims.
  - Reports to Cabinet in autumn 2017 with realistic and affordable recommendations that will then be considered within the overall context of the councils financial position

**Officer responsible for effecting the decision:**

Chief Officer (Environment)

**Reasons for making the decision:**

The decision is consistent with the Council's tree policy which allows the Council to “reserve the right to exercise discretion in application of this policy when to do so would be in the best interests of the Council.” The decision enables further work to be undertaken prior to reporting back to Cabinet in 2017.

**72 SYRIAN REFUGEE RESETTLEMENT PROGRAMME**

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

Cabinet received a report from the Chief Officer (Health & Housing) which advised on the latest funding update in relation to resettlement of Syrian refugees and sought a policy position on the Council's participation in the resettlement programme.

The options, options analysis, including risk assessment and officer preferred option,

were set out in the report as follows:

The options for Cabinet are to either:

1. Agree to participate in the Syrian refugee resettlement programme from year 1 onwards.
2. Agree to participate in the Syrian refugee resettlement programme, but not until year 2 at the earliest.
3. Not to participate in the Syrian refugee resettlement programme at all.

The issues and risks for each option were covered in the body of the report. Option 2 was the officer preferred option taking into account the comments in paragraphs 2.5 and 2.6 of the report.

Councillor Leytham proposed, seconded by Councillor Smith:-

- “(1) That the contents of the letter (Appendix 1 to the report) from the Minister, Richard Harrington MP, be noted.
- (2) That Cabinet confirms that it wishes to participate in the Syrian refugee settlement programme on the basis of the Government’s funding position.
- (3) That all accommodation options be explored and potentially used to house refugees including the Council’s own housing stock, other social rented stock and private sector properties.
- (4) That in light of the information received on 15<sup>th</sup> February 2016 from Lancashire County Council that the suggested year 1 grouping comprises Blackpool, Pendle, Preston and South Ribble, Cabinet agrees that Lancaster City Council should take Syrian refugees from year 2 onwards.
- (5) That the implementation of the programme be delegated to the Chief Officer (Health & Housing) in accordance with financial regulations.
- (6) That at the appropriate time the Council actively seeks willing landlords with suitable properties.”

Councillors then voted:-

***Resolved unanimously:***

- (1) That the contents of the letter (Appendix 1 to the report) from the Minister, Richard Harrington MP, be noted.
- (2) That Cabinet confirms that it wishes to participate in the Syrian refugee settlement programme on the basis of the Government’s funding position.
- (3) That all accommodation options be explored and potentially used to house refugees including the Council’s own housing stock, other social rented stock and private sector properties.
- (4) That in light of the information received on 15<sup>th</sup> February 2016 from Lancashire County Council that the suggested year 1 grouping comprises Blackpool, Pendle, Preston and South Ribble, Cabinet agrees that Lancaster City Council should take Syrian refugees from year 2 onwards.
- (5) That the implementation of the programme be delegated to the Chief Officer (Health & Housing) in accordance with financial regulations.
- (6) That at the appropriate time the Council actively seeks willing landlords with

suitable properties.

**Officer responsible for effecting the decision:**

Chief Officer (Health & Housing)

**Reasons for making the decision:**

The decision will enable officers to progress any further discussions with Regional Strategic Migration Partnership regarding resettlement of refugees in this district. Whilst the City Council would be willing to participate in the resettlement programme from year 1, the Lancashire authorities selected to participate in year 1 are better placed to do so and Lancashire will reach its quota with those authorities. Joining in after year 1 would be advantageous enabling the City Council to learn lessons over best support, ways to accommodate and an opportunity to maintain the help it provides to asylum seekers through the asylum seeker dispersal programme which the City Council is already participating in.

**73 CORPORATE FINANCIAL MONITORING 2015/16 - QUARTER 3**

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

Cabinet received a report from the Chief Officer (Resources) which presented the corporate financial monitoring report and supporting information for Quarter 3 of the 2015/16 monitoring cycle.

As the report was primarily for noting, no options were provided.

Councillor Bryning proposed, seconded by Councillor Clifford:-

“That the report be noted.”

Councillors then voted:-

***Resolved unanimously:***

(1) That the report be noted.

**Officer responsible for effecting the decision:**

Chief Officer (Resources)

**Reasons for making the decision:**

The report is a requirement of the Council's Performance Management Framework in support of the delivery of key priorities and outcomes as set out in the overall policy framework.

**74 CORPORATE FEES & CHARGES POLICY REVIEW**

**(Cabinet Member with Special Responsibility Councillor Newman-Thompson)**

Cabinet received a report from the Chief Officer (Resources) with regard to

consideration of the annual review of fees and charges for 2016/17.

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

The policy attached to the report remains substantially unchanged and it is considered that it remains fit for purpose and it adequately covers Cabinet’s budget proposals. As such, no options are presented and Cabinet is requested to endorse the policy.

**Environmental Services – Car Parking** - This is the only area in which a number of options are presented and therefore for clarity and to seek Cabinet’s direction, full information is included in Appendix C to the report. It should be noted that all options will (at least) meet the draft budget income provisions for 2016/17.

**Off Street Pay and Display Charges (as set out in Section 3.1 of the report)**

Advantages	Disadvantages	Risks
<p><b><u>Option 1A</u></b>                      This option limits the increases to one tariff across all car parks in Lancaster and Morecambe thereby maintaining all the other tariffs at the existing charging levels</p> <p>Not increasing all the other parking tariffs would maintain the freeze that was approved for 2015/16</p> <p>The increases would maintain consistency with on street charges (if approved by the County Council) and retain the agreed differential charging</p> <p>Increased charges at Williamson Park are broadly in line with the main proposals</p>	<p>This option affects the most popular tariff in Lancaster and Morecambe and therefore a large proportion of customers would be affected</p>	<p>It has been assumed that the County Council will approve increases to its on street pay and display charges and if this does not happen and Cabinet approves this option the agreed differential in charging would not be maintained</p> <p>Increasing charges at Williamson Park could reduce the number of visitors</p>

<p><b><u>Option 1B</u></b>                      This option limits the</p>	<p>This option would introduce</p>	<p>Differential charges in</p>
--	------------------------------------	--------------------------------

<p>increases to Lancaster's car parks and would maintain the freeze that was approved for 2015/16 for Morecambe's Car Parks</p> <p>The increases would maintain consistency with Lancaster's on street charges (if approved by County) and retain the agreed differential charging</p> <p>This option acknowledges the ongoing reductions in usage in Morecambe</p>	<p>differential charging on car parks in Lancaster and Morecambe</p> <p>Increasing evening charges in Lancaster could affect the night-time economy</p>	<p>Lancaster and Morecambe would lead to confusion on charges and this would result in operational and enforcement problems</p> <p>It has been assumed that the County Council will approve increases to its on street pay and display charges and if this does not happen and Cabinet approves this option the agreed differential in charging would not be maintained</p>
<p><b>Option 1C</b> As per Option 1B plus:-</p> <p>Usage on long stay tariffs in Lancaster has increased in recent years and these increases would discourage customers who are commuting</p> <p>Unlike Option 1B this option would not affect evening charges and the night-time economy</p>	<p>This option would introduce differential charging on car parks in Lancaster and Morecambe</p>	<p>As per Option 1B</p>

**To extend the facility allowing resident permit holders in residents parking zones to use off street car parks at certain times**

Advantages	Disadvantages	Risks
<p>This is consistent with the other residents parking zones where off street car parks are available nearby</p> <p>This provides residents with the opportunity to</p>	<p>Dallas Road Car Park is extremely busy and spaces could only be used subject to availability</p>	<p>Castle Zone B resident permit holders may still find it difficult to park</p>

park elsewhere where on street parking spaces are limited or are full		
---	--	--

The Officer Preferred Options are:-

To implement **Option 1A** in respect of Off Street Pay and Display Charges:–

- Increase all **Up to 1 hour** parking charges across all car parks in Lancaster and Morecambe from £1.30 to £1.40 and from £1.10 to £1.20 on the Festival Car Park in Morecambe.
- Increase the **Up to 1 hour** charge from 0.90p to £1.00 and the **Full Day** charge from £1.50 to £1.60 at Williamson Park in Lancaster.

This maintains consistent charging across all the main car parks in Lancaster and Morecambe and avoids any confusion over charging arrangements that would lead to operational and enforcement problems.

To extend the facility allowing resident permit holders in residents parking zones to use off street car parks at certain times

Councillor Bryning proposed, seconded by Councillor Pattison:-

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

Councillors then voted:-

***Resolved unanimously:***

- (1) That Cabinet endorses the Fees and Charges Policy as set out at Appendix A to the report.
- (2) That Cabinet approves Option 1A to increase the Up to 1 hour charge by 10p across all car parks in Lancaster and Morecambe and the Up to 1 hour and Full Day charges by 10p at Williamson Park, Lancaster as set out at Appendix C in the report, subject to Budget Council.
- (3) That Cabinet approves extending the facility for resident permit holders to use off street car parks as indicated in Appendix C to the report from 2016/17.

**Officers responsible for effecting the decision:**

Chief Officer (Resources)  
Chief Officer (Environment)

**Reasons for making the decision:**

Fees and charges form an integral part of the budget setting process, which in turn

relates to the Council's priorities. Under the Medium Term Financial Strategy (MTFS), income generation is a specific initiative for helping to balance the budget.

**75 INITIAL ASSESSMENT OF KNOWN COUNTY BUDGET PROPOSALS ON CITY COUNCIL SERVICES**

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

Cabinet received a report from the Chief Executive which provided Cabinet with an initial assessment of the direct impact of County Council's budget proposals on City Council function.

As the report was primarily for noting and comments no options were provided.

Councillor Leytham proposed, seconded by Councillor Smith:-

"That the report be noted."

Councillors then voted:-

***Resolved unanimously:***

(1) That the report be noted.

**Officer responsible for effecting the decision:**

Chief Executive

**Reasons for making the decision:**

The County Council's budget proposals will impact on City Council functions associated with the Council's priorities of Clean, Green, Health & Wellbeing and Sustainable Economic Growth.

**76 BUDGET & POLICY FRAMEWORK UPDATE 2016/20 - GENERAL FUND REVENUE BUDGET AND CAPITAL PROGRAMME**

**(Cabinet Member with Special Responsibility Councillor Newman-Thompson)**

Cabinet received a report from the Chief Officer (Resources) to inform Cabinet of the latest budget and council tax position so it could make recommendations back to Council in order to complete the budget setting process.

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

Cabinet is now requested to finalise its preferred council tax, revenue budget and capital programme proposals for referral on to Council, using the latest information as set out in the supplementary report.

**Council Tax**

Three basic options are set out in section 4 of the supplementary report.



**Revenue Budget**

Cabinet may adjust its revenue budget proposals, as long as the overall budget for 2016/17 balances and fits with the proposed council tax level. The Chief Officer (Resources), as s151 Officer, continues to advise that wherever possible, emphasis should be on reducing future years' net spending.

**Capital Programme**

Cabinet may adjust its capital investment and financing proposals to reflect spending commitments and priorities but overall its proposals for 2015/16 and 2016/17 must balance. Whilst there is no legal requirement to have a programme balanced over the full 5-year period, it is considered good practice to do so – or at least have clear plans in place to manage the financing position over that time.

In deciding its final proposals, Cabinet is asked also to take into account the relevant basic principles of the Prudential Code, which are:

- *that the capital investment plans of local authorities are affordable, prudent and sustainable, and*
- *that local strategic planning, asset management planning and proper options appraisal are supported.*

**Other Budget Framework Matters (Reserves and Provisions / MTFS)**

Given known commitments, risks and approved council tax targets there is limited flexibility in financial terms, but depending on priorities Cabinet may consider putting forward alternatives for various reserves, or different approaches for addressing the medium term budget deficit through the MTFS.

Proposals to be put forward by Cabinet should fit with any external constraints and the budgetary framework already approved. The recommendations as set out meet these requirements; the detailed supporting budget proposals are then a matter for Members.

This report outlines the actions required to complete the budget setting process for 2016/17 and for updating the MTFS to 2019/20. The associated update to the Corporate Plan is now scheduled for consideration at Cabinet in March, prior to being referred on to April Council. That will then conclude this year's corporate planning and budgeting exercise.

Councillor Blamire proposed, seconded by Councillor Clifford:-

- “(1) That in light of the extra flexibility in council tax referendum thresholds now provided by the Government through the final Finance Settlement, Council be recommended to approve a City Council basic tax increase of £5 (at Band D) for 2016/17, together with a year on year target of £5 at Band D for future years, subject to local referendum thresholds.
- (2) That in line with the above, Council be recommended to approve a General Fund Revenue Budget of £16.258M for 2016/17, resulting in a Council Tax Requirement of £8.296M excluding parish precepts, and a Band D basic City Council tax rate of £208.97.
- (3) That in terms of the feedback received from Council, it be noted that:

- Adopting a zero-based budgeting approach may be considered at some point in the medium to longer term, as already allowed for under current financial strategy (likely to be for 2018/19 at the earliest).
  - Marsh Community Centre funding is to be considered as part of the Housing Revenue Account budget proposals.
  - Salt Ayre redevelopment takes priority in the future use of the Invest to Save Reserve, to help reduce capital financing costs.
  - Subject to other work demands and priorities, council tax discretionary charging policy for empty homes will be reviewed for 2017/18.
- (4) That Cabinet endorses the review of Provisions, Reserves and Balances undertaken by the s151 Officer, and notes her advice regarding minimum Balances increasing by £0.5M to £1.5M, subject to annual review.
- (5) That Cabinet’s full supporting budget proposals (as set out in Appendices A,B,D and E to the report) be updated to reflect the recommendations above.
- (6) That the Leader and Finance Portfolio Holder be given delegated authority to finalise the Medium Term Financial Strategy, reflecting all the above, for referral on to Budget Council.”

Councillors then voted:-

***Resolved unanimously:***

- (1) That in light of the extra flexibility in council tax referendum thresholds now provided by the Government through the final Finance Settlement, Council be recommended to approve a City Council basic tax increase of £5 (at Band D) for 2016/17, together with a year on year target of £5 at Band D for future years, subject to local referendum thresholds.
- (2) That in line with the above, Council be recommended to approve a General Fund Revenue Budget of £16.258M for 2016/17, resulting in a Council Tax Requirement of £8.296M excluding parish precepts, and a Band D basic City Council tax rate of £208.97.
- (3) That in terms of the feedback received from Council, it be noted that:
- Adopting a zero-based budgeting approach may be considered at some point in the medium to longer term, as already allowed for under current financial strategy (likely to be for 2018/19 at the earliest).
  - Marsh Community Centre funding is to be considered as part of the Housing Revenue Account budget proposals.
  - Salt Ayre redevelopment takes priority in the future use of the Invest to Save Reserve, to help reduce capital financing costs.

- Subject to other work demands and priorities, council tax discretionary charging policy for empty homes will be reviewed for 2017/18.
- (4) That Cabinet endorses the review of Provisions, Reserves and Balances undertaken by the s151 Officer, and notes her advice regarding minimum Balances increasing by £0.5M to £1.5M, subject to annual review.
- (5) That Cabinet’s full supporting budget proposals (as set out in Appendices A,B,D and E to the report) be updated to reflect the recommendations above.
- (6) That the Leader and Finance Portfolio Holder be given delegated authority to finalise the Medium Term Financial Strategy, reflecting all the above, for referral on to Budget Council.

**Officer responsible for effecting the decision:**

Chief Officer (Resources)

**Reasons for making the decision:**

The recent Finance Settlement provides greater flexibility with regard to referendum thresholds and given the Council’s ambition in trying to protect services it makes sense to maximise council tax income. The decision enables Cabinet to make recommendations back to Council in order to complete the budget setting process for 2016/17.

**77 BUDGET AND POLICY FRAMEWORK UPDATE 2016 TO 2020 - HRA RENT SETTING UPDATE**

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

Cabinet received a joint report from the Chief Officer (Health & Housing) and Chief Officer (Resources) which provided an update on the latest position regarding the options for setting rents for supported housing for 2016/17 and sought Cabinet’s decision on the rent level to be set for 2016/17. The report also picked up on relevant feedback from the February Council meeting.

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

	<b>Option 1</b>	<b>Option 2</b>	<b>Option 3</b>
	Increase all supported housing including sheltered housing rents to the 2016/17 “formula rent”	Increase other supported housing rents to the 2016/17 “formula rent”, but with sheltered housing rents increasing by up to 10% above the	Increase all supported housing including sheltered housing rents by 3% in line with the council’s original medium term rent setting strategy.

		2016/17 "formula rent".	
Advantages	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Moderate increase in rent levels</li> <li>Properties reach their formula rent</li> <li>Reduces the ongoing savings required within the HRA.</li> <li>Supports ongoing investment needs in sheltered housing.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Significantly increases income</li> <li>Reduces the ongoing savings required within the HRA.</li> <li>Supports ongoing investment needs in sheltered housing.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Lowest impact on tenants</li> <li>Reduces the ongoing savings required within the HRA.</li> </ul>
Disadvantages	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Does not maximise the potential income</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Rent levels may not be sustainable by sheltered housing tenants not in receipt of HB</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Properties will still not be at their "formula rent".</li> <li>Does not relieve the increasing income stresses on the HRA</li> <li>Does not support increased investment in sheltered housing.</li> </ul>
Risks	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>None identified</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Increase level of tenant debt</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>None identified</li> </ul>

For now it is assumed that rents will still be reduced from 2017/18 to 2019/20 by -1% year on year following the 1 year exception, with 2% increases per annum thereafter, as reported in January. Given these temporary changes in the Government's position, it is being recommended that the Council increase all supported housing rents to the 2016/17 formula rent (option 1) as this would establish supported housing properties, including sheltered housing, at their formula rent base and provide a greater level of income to support the HRA Business Plan, whilst remaining affordable.

### Marsh Community Centre

There is one other matter for consideration as part of the HRA budget. At Council on 3 February, Cabinet was asked to consider grant funding the Marsh Community Centre

from the Housing Revenue Account budget instead of the General Fund. The current grant level assumed in 2016/17 is £13,700, with inflationary increases thereafter.

Officer advice on this matter is that should Cabinet be minded to support this, then there would need to be some modifications to the Service Level Agreement (to give clearer benefit to council housing tenants) to ensure that it could be properly charged to the HRA. Furthermore, a one year funding is advisable, ahead of the wider review of funding for the Voluntary, Faith and Community sectors. The cost of providing grant funding would, in effect be met from the HRA's general resources, including rental income changes as highlighted above. In summary therefore, options on this matter are to not incorporate it into Cabinet's budget proposals, or incorporate it on either a one year or a permanent basis.

Cabinet is recommended to refer the HRA budget for 2016/17 to Council as set out in Appendix A for approval, subject to any amendments in connection with rents or with the Marsh Community Centre. A provisionally updated Statement on reserves is attached at Appendix B and Cabinet is asked to endorse this information with the Statement also being referred on to Council as part of the updated HRA budget proposals.

The Government's evolving policies on social rent are extremely challenging, and are a significant move away from the principles established under the Self-Financing Regime introduced by Government in April 2012. The Council needs to ensure that the HRA remains financially sound, and that it can meet the investment needs of its housing stock. To ensure this the Council needs to make prudent decisions in relation to setting rents in support of this.

Councillor Leytham proposed, seconded by Councillor Hanson:-

"That the recommendations, as set out in the report, be approved with the following wording inserted at the end of recommendation (2): 'Cabinet agrees to one year funding of £13,700 subject to a modified SLA to reflect the benefit to council housing tenants'.

Councillors then voted:-

***Resolved unanimously:***

- (1) That it be noted that Government has issued revised statutory draft legislation for supported housing rents including sheltered housing and that associated rents therefore be increased to "formula rent" from 1 April 2016 (Option1) and that the revenue budget forecasts be updated accordingly.
- (2) That having considered feedback from Council and associated options regarding funding for the Marsh Community Centre, Cabinet agrees to one year funding of £13,700 subject to a modified SLA to reflect the benefit to council housing tenants.
- (3) That the resulting Housing Revenue Account budget for 2016/17 as currently set out at Appendix A to the report, and subject to any changes arising from the above, be referred on to Council for approval.

**Officers responsible for effecting the decision:**

Chief Officer (Health & Housing)  
Chief Officer (Resources)

**Reasons for making the decision:**

The Council is required under statutory provisions to maintain a separate ring-fenced account for all transactions relating to the provision of local authority housing, known as the Housing Revenue Account (HRA). This covers the maintenance and management of the Council's housing stock. It is necessary to prepare separate revenue and capital budgets for the HRA each year, and to set the level of housing rents in sufficient time for the statutory notice of rent variations to be issued to tenants. The decision enables Cabinet to recommend a balanced budget and fully financed capital programme for referral on to Council. In addition the decision to allocate funding from the HRA account to support the Marsh Community Centre will, through a modified SLA, ensure that council housing tenants benefit from the Community Centre.

**78 TREASURY MANAGEMENT STRATEGY 2016/17****(Cabinet Member with Special Responsibility Councillor Newman-Thompson)**

Cabinet received a report from the Chief Officer (Resources) which set out the 2016/17 treasury management framework for Cabinet's approval and referral on to Council.

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

Cabinet may put forward alternative proposals or amendments to the proposed Strategy in Appendix A, but these would have to be considered in light of legislative, professional and economic factors, and importantly, any alternative views regarding the Council's risk appetite. As such no further options analysis is available at this time.

Furthermore, the Strategy must fit with other aspects of Cabinet's budget proposals, such as investment interest estimates and underlying prudential borrowing assumptions, feeding into Prudential and Treasury Management Indicators.

The officer preferred option is to approve the framework as attached to the report, allowing for any amendments being made under delegated authority prior to referral to Council. This is based on the Council continuing to have a low risk appetite regarding the security and liquidity of investments particularly, but recognising that more flexibility should help improve returns, whilst still effectively mitigating risk. It is stressed in terms of treasury activity, there is no risk free approach. It is felt though that the measures set out above provide a better, more flexible framework within which to work over the coming year.

Councillor Blamire proposed, seconded by Councillor Pattison:-

"That the recommendations, as set out in the report, be approved with recommendation (2) revised to include the Leader being given delegated authority to finalise the Treasury Management Framework."

Councillors then voted:-

***Resolved unanimously:***

- (1) That Cabinet approve in principle the policy change to increase the period to 60 years over which the Minimum Revenue Provision is charged, for expenditure incurred prior to 2008.
- (2) That the Leader and Finance Portfolio Holder be given delegated authority to finalise the Treasury Management Framework, as updated for Cabinet's final budget proposals, for referral on to Council.

**Officer responsible for effecting the decision:**

Chief Officer (Resources)

**Reasons for making the decision:**

As part of the adoption of the CIPFA Code of Practice on Treasury Management it is a statutory requirement that the authority has a Treasury Management Strategy Statement and Investment Strategy. The decision seeks minor changes to the Council's Treasury Management Policy and fits with the proposed Medium Term Financial strategy.

**79 COLLABORATION WITH PRESTON CITY COUNCIL**

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

Cabinet received a report from the Chief Executive to enable Cabinet to consider future collaboration with Preston City Council, including interim arrangements for Legal Services.

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

Option 1:

The advantages of procuring legal services support from Preston City Council are that it enables Lancaster City Council to have the necessary legal advice and support services and that these will be provided by a council that we already have a strong collaborative relationship with.

Option 2:

The alternative option, which is not preferred, is that Lancaster City Council procures the services from another provider.

Option 1 is the officer preferred option.

Councillor Blamire proposed, seconded by Councillor Clifford:-

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

Councillors then voted:-

***Resolved unanimously:***

- (1) That the proposal for Preston City Council to provide the required Legal Services Support to Lancaster City Council be endorsed.
- (2) That Cabinet receive further reports in respect of other services in due course.

**Officer responsible for effecting the decision:**

Chief Executive

**Reasons for making the decision:**

The decision will ensure that appropriate legal advice is available to the Council.

**80 EXCLUSION OF THE PRESS AND PUBLIC**

It was moved by Councillor Hanson and seconded by Councillor Pattison:-

“That, in accordance with Section 100A(4) of the Local Government Act 1972, the press and public be excluded from the meeting for the following item of business, on the grounds that it could involve the possible disclosure of exempt information as defined in paragraphs 1, 2 and 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 paragraphs 1, 2 and 3 of Schedule 12A of that Act.

**81 EMERGENCY CALL CENTRE - COMMUNITY ALARMS, TELECARE, AND ASSOCIATED SERVICES****(Cabinet Member with Special Responsibility Councillor Leytham)**

Cabinet received a report from the Chief Officer (Health & Housing) to enable Cabinet to consider the future provision of the Council's Emergency Call Centre – Community Alarms, Telecare and associated services. The report was exempt from publication by virtue of paragraphs 1, 2 & 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.

Councillor Leytham proposed, seconded by Councillor Hanson:-

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

Councillors then voted:-



***Resolved unanimously:***

- (1) That the City Council enters into detailed discussion with New Progress Housing Group with the following objectives:
- The City Council ceases to be a telecare/community alarm provider to the private sector with this business transferring to New Progress Housing Group – both monitoring and installation.
  - New Progress Housing Group are commissioned to provide the community alarm monitoring service to the Council's sheltered housing and community alarm properties
  - New Progress Housing Group are commissioned to provide other ancillary out of office hours emergency services including lone worker monitoring
- (2) That subject to completing due diligence the Chief Officer (Health and Housing) is authorised to enter into a contract with New Progress Housing Group for the above services, with the draft revenue budgets being updated accordingly.

**Officers responsible for effecting the decision:**

Chief Officer (Health & Housing)  
Chief Officer (Resources)

**Reasons for making the decision:**

The decision is consistent with the Council's role to provide customer focussed services that offer value for money and meet the needs of people who live in the district by reviewing and refocusing service delivery.

---

Chairman

(The meeting ended at 7.00 p.m.)

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

**MINUTES PUBLISHED ON FRIDAY 19<sup>TH</sup> FEBRUARY, 2015.**

**EFFECTIVE DATE FOR IMPLEMENTING THE DECISIONS CONTAINED IN THESE MINUTES:  
MONDAY 20<sup>TH</sup> FEBRUARY, 2016.**