

CABINET

6.05 P.M.

3RD OCTOBER 2017

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

Officers in attendance:-

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

31 MINUTES

The minutes of the meeting held on Tuesday 5th September 2017 were approved as a correct record.

32 ITEMS OF URGENT BUSINESS AUTHORISED BY THE LEADER

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

33 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Councillor Leyshon and Councillor Whitehead declared pecuniary interests in Agenda item 6, Bailrigg Garden Village Governance Proposals. Councillor Leyshon's pecuniary interest being that he was employed by Lancaster University. Councillor Whitehead's pecuniary interest was in view of her being an Emeritus Professor at Lancaster University. (Minute 35 refers).

Councillor Leyshon and Councillor Whitehead declared an interest with regard to item 8, Accountable Body Authorisation for Community Groups, Councillor Leyshon being the Chair of the Palatine Projects Group and Councillor Whitehead being a member of the Palatine Projects Group.

No other declarations were made at this point.

34 PUBLIC SPEAKING

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

35 BAILRIGG GARDEN VILLAGE GOVERNANCE PROPOSALS

(Cabinet Member with Special Responsibility Councillor Hanson)

(Councillors Leyshon and Whitehead having both declared pecuniary interests in the following item left the meeting at this point and did not participate in the discussions or vote.)

Cabinet received a report from the Chief Officer (Regeneration & Planning) which sought approval for the governance arrangements for the Bailrigg Garden Village project.

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

	Option 1: To agree the proposed Governance Structure	Option 2: To agree a Governance structure which excludes any representation from the University on the Project Board	Option 3: not to agree a Governance Structure.
Advantages	Establishes the structure for reporting and control of the project at an early stage before significant decisions need to be made.	Eliminates entirely any suggestion of conflict of interest with the University's role	None
Disadvantages	None	Distances the university from shaping strategy and using its significant resources and innovation to help shape the Garden Village.	Further delay in progressing the project. Failing to meet the expectations of the HCA. Reputational damage.
Risks	Risk of conflict of interest associated with the University's role has been mitigated.	Risk of alienating the university from the project.	Ministerial intervention

Option 1 is the officer preferred option. The project is now entering an important stage where significant areas of work need to be commissioned and external funding accounted for and monitored. Ministers are keen to see progress and the HCA are pressing for formal governance processes to be set up. Now that the issue of how to treat the university as part of the governance structure has been resolved progress on establishing the structure and putting it into operation needs to occur.

Councillor Hanson proposed, seconded by Councillor Warriner:-

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

The Cabinet Members present then voted:-

Resolved unanimously:

- (1) That the Governance Structure for Bailrigg Garden Village illustrated in Appendix C to the report, be approved and put into operation.
- (2) That the Project Plan contained in Appendix B to the report, be noted and the Planning Policy Cabinet Liaison Group be asked to monitor the natural evolution of that plan, with key decisions required against milestones being referred back to Cabinet as appropriate.
- (3) That it be noted that a further £130K bid for top up Capacity Funding was submitted to the Homes and Community Agency in August under delegated authority and that this funding should be accepted by the Council, if successful.
- (4) That delegated authority be given to the Chief Officer (Regeneration and Planning) in agreement with the Chief Officer (Resources) to approve the making and acceptance of further external funding bids as appropriate for project development / capacity purposes only.
- (5) That the General Fund Revenue Budget be updated as appropriate to reflect any additional expenditure and associated funding arising from recommendations 3 and 4, subject to there being a nil impact on the Council's overall resources.
- (6) That officers report back to Cabinet prior to entering into any commitments beyond those needed to undertake the master planning, infrastructure planning and community consultation alongside the Local Plan process needed to inform the project implementation stage.

Officers responsible for effecting the decision:

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

Reasons for making the decision:

The Bailrigg Garden Village is the largest single housing land allocation in the Council's emerging Lancaster District Local Plan, which is due to be recommended for submission to the Secretary of State in December 2017. The establishment of an appropriate governance process reduces risk to the Council in terms of challenge to its appropriate use of external Government funding, the means by which the Council will use its land assets, and other due diligence requirements for a project of this size.

Councillors Leyshon and Whitehead returned to the meeting at this point.

36

'SMART DISTRICT' - CONNECTING THE PUBLIC REALM**(Cabinet Members with Special Responsibility Councillors Hughes & Leyshon)**

Cabinet received a joint report from the Chief Officer (Environment) and Chief Officer (Resources) which sought Cabinet's support for developing the concept of 'Smart District' using technology to generate efficiencies and improve how we deliver our

services.

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

	Option 1: Support the concept of Smart district, and consider proposals during the forthcoming budget.	Option 2: Do not support in concept and continue with traditional methods.
Advantages	Allows consideration alongside all other budget options. Allows time to develop a wider implementation plan	None
Disadvantages	None.	Lost opportunity to take advantage of digital technologies to make service improvements and efficiency savings.
Risks		

The Officer preferred option is Option 1. The report set out how by working in partnership the Council could take a leading role supporting economic development through the use of technology whilst at the same time generating efficiencies and improving its own services.

Councillor Hughes proposed, seconded by Councillor Leyshon:-

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

Councillors then voted:-

Resolved unanimously:

- (1) That Cabinet supports the concept of ‘Smart District’ to inform the Council’s emerging digital strategy and ‘management of the place’.
- (2) That the business case be developed further for consideration during the budget and planning process, with initial operational focus on the management of the public realm.

Officers responsible for effecting the decision:

Chief Officer (Environment)
Chief Officer (Resources)

Reasons for making the decision:

The decision is consistent with the Council’s corporate priority of providing clean, green

and safe public spaces and enables officers to develop options for consideration as part of the budget planning process.

37 ACCOUNTABLE BODY AUTHORISATION FOR COMMUNITY GROUPS- UPDATE

(Cabinet Member with Special Responsibility Councillor Hughes)

Councillor Leyshon and Whitehead had previously declared an interest in this item. At this point Councillor Hanson and Councillor Blamire both declared an interest: Councillor Hanson in view of her involvement with the Friends of Regent Park and Councillor Blamire through her involvement with the Friends of Williamson Park.

Cabinet received a report from the Chief Officer (Environment) to consider the approval of delegated responsibility to the Chief Officers (Environment) and (Resources) to authorise and accept external funding applications, and for the Council to act as the accountable body for community bodies working to improve facilities on council owned land.

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

	Option 1: Delegate Responsibilities as outlined	Option 2: Seek Cabinet approval on each individual basis
Advantages	<p>As there are so many projects in this area of work, this will save time, allowing officers to focus on supporting the community and delivery of the corporate objective for green spaces.</p> <p>It will allow groups to respond quickly to opportunities which arise.</p> <p>Projects are usually funded by three or four different funding bodies. Delegated responsibility will provide flexibility when pulling funding packages together.</p> <p>Enables quick applications to go in to maintain community interest.</p>	<p>Allows consideration of specific budgetary pressures and commitment of future budgets as and when bidding opportunities arise.</p>
Disadvantages	<p>Annual commitments against existing budget levels may be incurred, reducing future scope to make savings in those areas.</p>	<p>It does not provide the flexibility and responsiveness which is required for these small scale community projects. Some funding is available at short</p>

		<p>notice which does not easily fit into council procedures and timescales.</p> <p>Due to the quantity of projects and funding applications – the officer time in complying with these requirements on a project by project basis.</p>
Risks	<p>There will be no immediate risk regarding ongoing maintenance costs as this will be addressed at the start of any project, but would be risk associated with committing future years' budgets, potentially.</p> <p>There is a risk that the group don't fulfil their requirements and the funding is reclaimed – Officers work very closely with groups to ensure this does not happen. Acting as the accountable body also allows us to have more control over funding requirements, procurement procedures, quality of work, etc. that may reduce long term risks to the council.</p>	<p>Loss of funding opportunities due to the required timescales.</p> <p>Loss of community interest due to the required timescales especially when funding has been secured and needs spending by a certain date.</p>

The preferred option is option 1 as it enables the council to respond more quickly to securing funding for these relatively small scale community projects and the risks and consequences are considered manageable.

Councillor Hughes proposed, seconded by Councillor Pattison:-

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

Councillors then voted:-

Resolved unanimously:

- (1) That authority be delegated to the Chief Officer (Environment), in agreement with the Section 151 Officer, to approve the making and acceptance of external funding bids above the key decision threshold where:
 - any such bid is for the purposes of improving public open space in the District; and
 - it can be contained within the budget and policy framework and would not require redirection of resources between service areas, functions or activities

on an ongoing basis.

- (2) That authority be delegated to the Section 151 Officer, in agreement with the Chief Officer (Environment), to adopt the role of “accountable body” where appropriate, in order to support formally constituted ‘Friends of’ and community groups in helping to improve public open space in the District, subject to due diligence and any financial implications being contained within the budget and policy framework.
- (3) That the above delegations remain in place until October 2021 and be subject to review at that time.

Officers responsible for effecting the decision:

Chief Officer (Environment)
Chief Officer (Resources)

Reasons for making the decision:

The Council is experienced in managing external funds and has robust arrangements in place for administering such funding as well as undertaking the role of Accountable Body. The decision is consistent with the delivery of the Council’s objective for Green spaces: ‘the Council will encourage local communities and individuals in their local area to become involved in protecting and improving the quality of local areas, parks and public spaces in a way that is sustainable.’

38 REVIEW OF THE YEAR 2016 - 2017

(Cabinet Member with Special Responsibility Councillor Blamire)

Cabinet received a report from the Chief Executive which provided an overview of the Council’s progress in 2016-17 towards the delivery of corporate plan priorities and outcomes as set out in the Corporate Plan 2016-2020.

No options were provided as the report was primarily for noting.

Councillor Blamire proposed, seconded by Councillor Warriner:-

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

Councillors then voted:-

Resolved unanimously:

- (1) That Cabinet notes the report which set out progress against the Corporate Plan 2016/2020 priorities.

Officer responsible for effecting the decision:

Chief Executive

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 and specifically the Corporate Plan 2016 - 2020.

Chairman

(The meeting ended at 6.17 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 6TH OCTOBER, 2017.

**EFFECTIVE DATE FOR IMPLEMENTING THE DECISIONS CONTAINED IN THESE MINUTES:
MONDAY 16TH OCTOBER, 2017.**