

## CABINET

6.00 P.M.

8TH JULY 2025

**PRESENT:-** Councillors Caroline Jackson (Chair), Peter Jackson, Martin Bottoms, Tim Hamilton-Cox, Paul Hart, Sam Riches, Sue Tyldesley and Nick Wilkinson

Apologies for Absence:-

Councillor Sally Maddocks

Officers in attendance:-

Mark Davies	Chief Executive
Luke Gorst	Chief Officer - Governance and Monitoring Officer
Paul Thompson	Chief Officer - Resources and Section 151 Officer
Jonathan Noad	Chief Officer - Sustainable Growth
Shaun Crossman	Solutions Architect
Carolyn Dalton	Museum Development Manager
Elliott Grimshaw	Business Imp & Project Delivery Lead
Paul Hatch	Principal Planning Policy Officer
Isabella Maher	Project Manager
Liz Bateson	Principal Democratic Support Officer

### 18 MINUTES

The minutes of the meeting held on Tuesday 3 June 2025 were approved as a correct record.

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

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

### 20 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Councillors Bottoms and Hart expressed an interest in Agenda item 8 Local Government: Morecambe Town Council 'Memorandum of Understanding' in their capacity as being Morecambe Town Councillors.

### 21 PUBLIC SPEAKING

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

### 22 ESTABLISHMENT OF HABITAT BANKS IN LANCASTER DISTRICT

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

Cabinet received a report from the Chief Officer Planning and Climate Change to agree to the approach to securing local Habitat Banks within the district by entering into legal agreements with offsite biodiversity unit providers and approve progression of a Council-

owned Habitat Bank delegating specific designation of Council-owned land for habitat banks to the Chief Officer – Planning and Climate Change, following case-by-case consultation with the other relevant Chief Officers comprising the Council's Senior Leadership Team.

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

Given that there are 2 proposals, both proposals are separately analysed in this section.

**Proposal 1: S106 agreements to secure private land with a Habitat Management and Monitoring Plan (HMMP) for Offsite Biodiversity Net Gain**

	Option 1: S106 agreement with private landowners to secure offsite biodiversity gains	Option 2: direct landowners to Responsible Bodies for conservation covenants
Advantages	<p>Provides revenue to oversee compliance with the S106 agreement.</p> <p>Council can work with landowners so proposals contribute to local nature recovery and potentially align with other policy, e.g. Green and Blue Infrastructure/LNRS/ flood risk reduction.</p> <p>Example templates for legal agreements are available (Planning Advisory Service).</p>	<p>No responsibilities for Council, just ensure biodiversity units are registered and correctly allocated to in-district developments post1decision</p>
Disadvantages	<p>Requires input from multiple services to determine acceptability of proposal and minimise risk of need for future enforcement.</p>	<p>May be more expensive for landowner, depending on Responsible Body criteria may only take large projects.</p> <p>Habitat bank may be set up out of district.</p> <p>No revenue to Council.</p>
Risks	<p>May only get small scale proposals from developers for their own developments, rather than habitat banks at large scale.</p> <p>Habitat bank business might fail during the 30-year period. Could require a bond to insure against this, but it may affect viability in early stage.</p> <p>Unforeseen events (e.g.</p>	<p>Entry into S106 is discretionary, but Council could be seen as unreasonable in refusing a viable option, especially if challenged in an appeal on a developer-led proposal).</p>

	catastrophic storm, fire or new disease – but landowner would not be penalised in such cases).	
--	--	--

### Proposal 2: Development of a habitat bank on Council-owned land

	Option 1: Enter into a S106 agreement with Chorley Council for habitat bank at Burrow Beck solar array	Option 2: To not enter into a S106 Agreement with Chorley Council, and to further explore alternatives
Advantages	<p>S106 is a legal agreement type known to both Councils.</p> <p>Low cost for S106 monitoring role payable to Chorley Council (c. £8000 plus legal costs) as Chorley has assessed the site as small and low risk.</p> <p>A simple stand-alone agreement, with no need for a reciprocal arrangement.</p> <p>Cost of maintenance of habitat at this site will be met by the revenue from the solar farm, whether or not the site becomes a habitat bank.</p> <p>Revenue from sale or allocation of biodiversity units can be used to help set up habitat banks on other Council land for when</p>	None
Disadvantages	<p>Council has 30+ year commitment. Would limit any other development on the site during the period.</p> <p>Small cost to set up agreement and carry out future monitoring and report, but minor compared to potential income from sale/allocation of units.</p>	<p>Not entering into a S106 to deliver the habitat bank would result in the Council having to search the open market for suitable units to buy in the future (for its own developments).</p> <p>There would be a loss of opportunity for potential income generation.</p>
Risks	<p>Possible risk that units delivered could be less than forecast, but metric and HMMP has been deliberately conservative.</p> <p>Uncertainty about future monetary value of biodiversity units – depends on demand.</p>	Alternative Habitat Banks may be located outside the district and could result in the exporting of biodiversity provision outside the district.

	Low financial risk as site management is funded by solar farm income, not dependent on sale of biodiversity units.	
--	--	--

In respect of Proposal 1, the preferred option is Option 1 (i.e. to enter into S106 agreements with private landowners to secure off-site biodiversity gains).

Private landowners providing off-site biodiversity gain locally will help development viability locally and so contribute to delivery of housing targets.

If private habitat banks are set up at scale locally this has potential to contribute to nature recovery and other local policy aims.

Off-site provision of biodiversity gain must be legally secured by S106 (or conservation covenant). Developers that need to make significant biodiversity gains can also use this method to secure net gain for individual developments, although scrutiny will be needed at application and post-application stages to assess viability and risks.

In respect of Proposal 2, the preferred option is Option 1 (i.e. to enter into a S106 Agreement with Chorley Council for a habitat bank at Burrow Beck Solar Array.

A S106 agreement with Chorley Council is the only opportunity currently available with another local authority. Chorley Council is further ahead in preparation of S106 agreements for habitat banks including agreement with another Council which means that there is a process ready to adopt for this proposed S106 agreement.

The Burrow Beck solar array at Bailrigg offers a low-risk opportunity for Lancaster City Council to start its first habitat bank. With Chorley Council willing to enter a hosting agreement to legally secure the habitat bank, this gives an opportunity to make a start, fitting with the timescale for the solar farm delivery. It is expected that if this option is adopted the habitat bank can be registered this year and start to make allocations of units.

This report set out the preferred way forward for (i) securing habitat banks throughout the district and (ii) utilising the timely delivery of the Burrow Beck solar array to deliver the Council's first habitat bank.

It is intended that the approach adopted by Chorley Council (Appendix 1 to the report) will continue to be used until such time as guidance is reviewed and amended.

Separate to this report, future consideration will need to be made about the priorities for the allocation or sale of units in future, and the price at which any units should be offered for sale (if they were to be made available to private developers, rather than being solely allocated to the council's own future developments). It is anticipated that any strategic decisions regarding this will be a matter for Cabinet, at the appropriate time.

Councillor Tyldesley proposed, seconded by Councillor Bottoms:-

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

Councillors then voted:-

- (1) That approval be given to Lancaster City Council entering into standalone legal agreements (Section 106 Agreements) with private landowners to secure offsite Biodiversity Gain Sites ('Habitat Banks') which will:
  - (a) Allow Officers to engage with landowners who wish to create a 'Biodiversity Gain Site' of 'Habitat Bank';
  - (b) Use Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG) habitat banking criteria to inform the assessment of proposed habitat banks;
  - (c) Enable officers, upon receipt of information from landowners to enter negotiations with landowners with a view to (i) checking proposals are suitable and acceptable for offsite Biodiversity Net Gain; and (ii) agreeing a Section 106 (or 'S106') to secure the site and a Habitat Management and Monitoring Plan (HMMP) for a minimum of 30 years, as appropriate;
  - (d) Permit the Chief Officer - Planning and Climate Change, or officers authorised by the Chief Officer, to negotiate S106 agreements on this matter and amend the guidance in light of experience and/or updated guidance or legislation from government; and,
  - (e) Allow for sign-off of the legal agreements.
- (2) That the development of habitat banks on Council-owned land be progressed as follows:
  - (a) To support Council officers in work to put Council assets forward for off-site BNG, the decision to create habitat banks on individual sites will be delegated to the Chief Officer of Planning and Climate Change, informed by an approved business case on a site-by-site basis as appropriate;
  - (b) To agree to the negotiation of a S106 agreement with Chorley Council for a habitat bank on Council-owned land at Bailrigg (Burrow Beck) solar array.

**Officer responsible for effecting the decision:**

Chief Officer Planning & Climate Change

**Reasons for making the decision:**

The decision is in accordance with key objective of increasing biodiversity in the Council Plan, particularly Action 1.4 on Ecology & Biodiversity and consistent with the Local Plan; particularly Policy DM44 on the protection and enhancement of biodiversity.

The proposals also support specific actions in the Biodiversity Action Plan approved by Cabinet in 2024, particularly (a) Action 1.3 on developing an internal monitoring system to support the delivery of BNG across the district, ensuring delivery and condition can be monitored over 30 years; (b) Actions 6.1 & 9.4 on exploring the preparation of a local off-site BNG register at either a local or county level; and (c) Action 6.2 on investigating opportunities for BNG delivery on Council owned land. Given that the proposals described in this report are aligned to both formal Policy Frameworks documents previously approved by full Council and the Biodiversity Action Plan previously approved by Cabinet then Cabinet is the appropriate body for decision making body for proposals that would create working arrangements with another local planning authority and establishing the necessary biodiversity net gain implementation management

arrangements to enable BNG to be appropriately and objectively managed on Council-owned assets.

## 23 LOCAL GOVERNMENT: MORECAMBE TOWN COUNCIL 'MEMORANDUM OF UNDERSTANDING'

**(Cabinet Member with Special Responsibility Councillor Peter Jackson)**

Cabinet received a report from the Chief Executive to request that Cabinet adopts the Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) between Lancaster City Council and Morecambe Town Council.

As Members of Morecambe Town Council Councillor Bottoms and Hart had declared an interest in this item.

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

	Option 1: Adopt the MOU and commit the council to the stated objectives and priorities.	Option 2: Do not adopt the MOU and do not commit to the objectives and priorities.
Advantages	If adopted, the Chief Executive will sign the MOU and establish a meeting structure and action plan.	No advantages are identified for this option.
Disadvantages	No specific disadvantages are identified for this option.	If not adopted, the Council will have less emphasis on local government collaboration and less structured communication with Morecambe Town Council. This may reduce opportunity for progressive and collaborative action that benefits Morecambe residents.
Risks	None identified.	None identified.

The officer recommended option is to proceed with adopting the MOU so that the Chief Executive can sign the MOU and move towards the delivery of outcomes (Option 1).

Councillor Peter Jackson proposed, seconded by Councillor Hamilton-Cox:-

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

Councillors then voted:-

**Resolved:**

**(7 Members (Councillors Hamilton-Cox, Hart, Caroline Jackson, Peter Jackson, Riches, Tyldesley & Wilkinson) voted in favour, and 1 Member (Councillor Bottoms) abstained.)**

- (1) That Cabinet agrees to the principles and objectives as detailed in the Memorandum of Understanding and authorises the Chief Executive to sign on the Council's behalf.

**Officer responsible for effecting the decision:**

Chief Executive

**Reasons for making the decision:**

The report provides details of the objectives of the MOU and outlines the content and importance for effective local government collaboration amidst a period of potential change. Cabinet adoption of the MOU will enable officers to progress with the aims of this collaboration.

Effective local government communication and action aligns with the strategic principles of the Council Plan 2024-2027. Most notably this will evidence an informal partnership for shared ambitions.

**24 LOCAL GOVERNMENT: CARNFORTH TOWN COUNCIL 'MEMORANDUM OF UNDERSTANDING'**

**(Cabinet Member with Special Responsibility Councillor Peter Jackson)**

Cabinet received a report from the Chief Executive to request that Cabinet adopts the Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) between Lancaster City Council and Carnforth Town Council

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

	Option 1: Adopt the MOU and commit the council to the stated objectives and priorities.	Option 2: Do not adopt the MOU and do not commit to the objectives and priorities.
Advantages	If adopted, the Chief Executive will sign the MOU and establish a meeting structure and action plan.	No advantages are identified for this option.
Disadvantages	No specific disadvantages are identified for this option.	If not adopted, the Council will have less emphasis on local government collaboration and less structured communication with Carnforth Town Council. This may reduce opportunity for progressive and collaborative action that benefits Carnforth residents.
Risks	None identified.	None identified.

Councillor Peter Jackson proposed, seconded by Councillor Bottoms:-

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

Councillors then voted:-

***Resolved unanimously:***

- (1) That Cabinet agrees to the principles and objectives as detailed in the Memorandum of Understanding and authorises the Chief Executive to sign on the Council's behalf.

**Officer responsible for effecting the decision:**

Chief Executive

**Reasons for making the decision:**

Effective local government communication and action aligns with the strategic principles of the Council Plan 2024-2027. Most notably this will evidence an informal partnership for shared ambitions.

The report provides details of the objectives of the MOU and outlines the content and importance for effective local government collaboration amidst a period of potential change. Cabinet adoption of the MOU will enable officers to progress with the aims of this collaboration.

## 25 CITY MUSEUM REDEVELOPMENT

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

Cabinet received a report from the Chief Officer Sustainable Growth that sought support for the project to redevelop the City Museum.

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

	Option 1: Do nothing	Option 2: Support a smaller scheme to re-develop the City Museum displays and public spaces	Option 3: Support scheme for full redevelopment of the City Museum.
Advantages	Cheaper in the short term	Will refresh the public offer of the City Museum and increase its visitor numbers, helping to increase income and support the High Street	Will refresh the public offer, create new public spaces, visitor footfall, income, opening hours, staffing levels and school visits. At the same time support the visitor economy (helping to retain



			visitors to Eden within the district) and the High Street (helping reduce anti-social behaviour in Market Square) and support community building/cohesion and wellbeing. Opportunity to create links with the Library next door for an enhanced cultural offer.
Disadvantages	Museum Service and City Museum building will continue to deteriorate and become unfit for purpose.	City Museum building in need of significant infrastructure repair and improvements (minimum £0.5m over the next 10 years). Significant damage to the building has been caused by water ingress, which has also damaged collections. Building currently has poor public facilities (e.g. no toilets), poor accessibility (e.g. no lift). Redisplaying the museum will not provide enough income to significantly increase staffing levels and opening hours or reduce spend through energy efficiencies.	Will require considerable Council resources in terms of officer time. Will require the City Museum to close for around 3 years from 2029-32. Will mean long-term borrowing on the part of the Council (although the intention is that this will be repaid from the increase in museum income).
Risks	Museum Service will become unsustainable and will cease to exist with negative consequences for Lancaster High	Council has to pay the full cost of building repairs and infrastructure improvements (such as re-wiring) and new displays.	That the City Museum redevelopment is not as successful as planned and the liability for the debt repayment returns

	Street, Visitor Economy, local communities, local schools and the future of the museum collections.	Museums unable to develop income to the point where it supports +50% of museum turnover or can cover the costs of borrowing to support museum developments. City Museum becomes unfit for purpose due to inaccessibility and lack of public facilities.	to the Council from museum budgets.
--	---	---	-------------------------------------

Option 3 is the officer preferred option – detailed work by Barker Langham established that a larger-scale redevelopment project had the greatest chance of success and of securing the museum and the building into the future. The Museum Service Review established that the City Museum building and displays require significant investment in order to support the sustainability of the City Museums and become the flagship for the district's heritage that it has the potential to become, telling the amazing and unique story of the area and its people.

Councillor Wilkinson proposed, seconded by Councillor Bottoms:-

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

Councillors then voted:-

***Resolved:***

***(7 Members (Councillors Bottoms, Hamilton-Cox, Hart, Caroline Jackson, Peter Jackson, Riches & Wilkinson) voted in favour, and 1 Member (Councillor Tyldesley) abstained.)***

- (1) That the draft Expression of Interest (EOI) is approved with permission given to the Chief Officer for Sustainable Growth in consultation with the Portfolio Holder to make any minor amendments before submission to the National Lottery Heritage Fund (NLHF).
- (2) That, following notification of a successful EOI, £95,000 is allocated from Council Reserves to support the work required before any Development Phase application to the NLHF can be made.
- (3) That the decision on whether to submit the Development Phase application to NLHF will be a future Cabinet decision.

**Officer responsible for effecting the decision:**

Chief Officer Sustainable Growth

**Reasons for making the decision:**

It is in the long-term interests of the Council to progress the work to redevelop the City Museum and its building (Lancaster's old Town Hall) by supporting the submission of an Expression of Interest to National Lottery Heritage Fund and approving the funds needed to develop a Development Phase application.

The redevelopment of the City Museum and consequent increase in sustainability for the City Museum(s) supports the Council Plan in three main ways:

3.3 Access to Culture & Leisure – project 'Developing a vision and action plan for the City Museums'

4.1 Value for money – part of the Fit for the Future/OBR project

2.4 Investment & Regeneration

The project also supports the Council's Culture & Heritage Vision.

**26**

**LANCASTER CITY CENTRE CAR PARKING STRATEGY****(Cabinet Member with Special Responsibility Councillor Wilkinson)**

Cabinet received a report from the Chief Officer Sustainable Growth to consider the next steps in agreeing and approving the Lancaster City Centre Parking Strategy and Action Plan to give explicit policy support and further certainty to the achievement of the city council's car parking and wider social, environmental and economic objectives.

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

	Option 1: Do not approve the revised Lancaster City Centre Car Parking Strategy and Action Plan	Option 2: Approve the revised Lancaster City Centre Car Parking Strategy and Action Plan
Advantages	No advantages identified	<p>Provides a clear policy framework for delivering an improved parking portfolio aligned with the council's broader goals on economic vitality, climate action, and housing.</p> <p>Provides a statement that can be considered within the context of regional decisions on local transport and movement policy / resources.</p> <p>Confirms support for previously agreed city council capital and revenue interventions.</p> <p>Provides an explicit response to the draft strategy consultation</p>

		feedback and business/community concerns by confirming policy intent as well as active delivery.
Disadvantages	<p>Fails to provide an explicit response to consultation and fails to provide a policy design . shape to feed into regional transport objectives and regeneration goals.</p> <p>Council does not further commit to evidence-based policy planning, which may erode trust in decisions. Creates uncertainty limiting strategic planning and reducing the council's ability to coordinate land use. Difficult to consider release of further Canal Quarter sites for affordable housing as the target strategic parking numbers could not be maintained without the proposed interventions and underpinning policy justification.</p>	
Risks		

Following Members' consideration and confirmation that the proposals meet the council's objectives and its wider policy aspirations, Option 2 is preferred. The strategy is a policy document which outlines controlled, phased, and pragmatic investment in Lancaster's future parking infrastructure as a significant element of local transport and regeneration infrastructure planning.

Councillor Wilkinson proposed, seconded by Councillor Tyldesley:-

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

Councillors then voted:-

***Resolved unanimously:***

- (1) That the Lancaster City Centre Car Parking Strategy and Action Plan 2025–2028 (including its strategic aims, delivery framework, and implementation timeline) be approved.
- (2) That a strategy review is progressed through 2027 including performance data, user feedback, and updates to delivery priorities.

- (3) That individual project decisions will return to the relevant authority (Cabinet/Portfolio Holder) where further staged approvals or funding decisions are required subject to correct governance and due diligence being in place.

**Officer responsible for effecting the decision:**

Chief Officer Sustainable Growth

**Reasons for making the decision:**

Concerns from the business community, about the long-term provision of public parking, and general parking are understood. Through the revised Lancaster City Centre Car Parking Strategy and Action Plan, alongside ongoing work with county council, the issue will be addressed at a strategic city-wide level, with appreciation of the statutory strategic policy imperatives the city council is working within.

The council recognises that having an appropriate level of car parking in the city is important to support the economy and provide a range and choice of transport options and to ensure accessibility for the less mobile and populations underserved by public transport. An agreed strategic parking portfolio delivered as part of the revised Lancaster City Centre Parking Strategy provides critical context and framing for the council's ambitions to provide parking provision that is fit for purpose and fit for the future.

The decision is consistent with the Council Plan:

*A Sustainable District* – car parking provision and car use is a consideration in meeting the challenges of the council's declared Climate Emergency and a range of other council objectives.

*An Inclusive and Prosperous Local Economy* – building a sustainable and just local economy that benefits people and organisations needs to consider car parking provision as a key feature of accessibility for certain groups and communities.

*Healthy and Happy Communities* – tackling car parking provision and some of the negative consequences inherent in the current portfolio will contribute to healthy and happy community objectives

*A Co-Operative, Kind and Responsible Council* – further consultation and ongoing discussion with stakeholders will achieve the best outcomes for in tandem with running efficient quality public services, of which car parking provision is a key service provision

## **27 REPORTING IN OF URGENT BUSINESS DECISION**

In accordance with the Scheme of Delegation to Officers (Part 2, Section 7 – Delegations to the Chief Executive Matters of Urgency) the Chief Executive submitted a report to Cabinet with details of an urgent decision taken following consultation with the Leader, deputy Leader and with the agreement of the Chair of Overview & Scrutiny. The Urgent Decision related to the procurement of a contractor to carry out urgent works on Bridge House, Lancaster following defects discovered to the cladding and was taken on 5 June 2025. (UB 138 refers).

**Resolved unanimously:**

That the Urgent Decision taken by the Chief Executive on 5 June 2025 be noted.

**28 EXCLUSION OF THE PRESS AND PUBLIC**

It was moved by Councillor Riches and seconded by Councillor Caroline Peter Jackson:

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

Members then voted as follows:-

**Resolved unanimously:**

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

**29 ELECTRIC VEHICLE CHARGING HUB (Pages 17 - 20)****(Cabinet Member with Special Responsibility Councillor Riches)**

Cabinet received a report from the Chief Officer Planning & Climate Change which sought to update Cabinet on the Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs (DEFRA) Air Quality Grant; provide an options appraisal for an electric vehicle charging hub; and approval to deliver a scheme in 2025/26. The report was exempt from publication by virtue of paragraph 3 of Schedule 12A of the Local Government Act, 1972.

The options, options analysis, including risk assessment and officer preferred option, were set out in the exempt.

**Resolved unanimously:**

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

**Officer responsible for effecting the decision:**

Chief Officer Planning & Climate Change

**Reasons for making the decision:**

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

**30 SALT AYRE DATA CENTRE (Pages 21 - 22)****(Cabinet Member with Special Responsibility Councillor Hamilton-Cox)**

Cabinet received a report from the Chief Officer Resources that approval to build a new sustainable hybrid data centre at Salt Ayre Leisure Centre for use by the Council and the potential to be used as a revenue generating asset. The report was exempt from publication by virtue of paragraph 3 of Schedule 12A of the Local Government Act, 1972.

The options, options analysis, including risk assessment and officer preferred option, were set out in the exempt.

**Resolved unanimously:**

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

**Officer responsible for effecting the decision:**

Chief Officer Resources

**Reasons for making the decision:**

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

**31 CANAL QUARTER REGENERATION PHASE III (HERON WORKS) - PROGRESSING DEVELOPMENT DESIGN, PLANNING APPROVAL, AND DELIVERY**

The Chair advised the meeting that this report had been withdrawn from the agenda.

**32 LANCASTER CANAL QUARTER EARLY PHASE HOUSING PROPOSALS – PROGRESS UPDATE AND FUTURE DELIVERY (Pages 23 - 26)****(Cabinet Member with Special Responsibility Councillor Caroline Jackson)**

Cabinet received a report from the Chief Officer Sustainable Growth that outlined progress and detailed the potential next steps and options in taking forward the previously agreed early phase housing proposals under the council's approved Lancaster Canal Quarter Masterplan. The report was exempt from publication by virtue of paragraph 3 of Schedule 12A of the Local Government Act, 1972.

The options, options analysis, including risk assessment and officer preferred option, were set out in the exempt.

**Resolved unanimously:**

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

**Officer responsible for effecting the decision:**

Chief Officer Sustainable Growth

**Reasons for making the decision:**

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

---

Chair

(The meeting ended at 7.40 p.m.)

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

**MINUTES PUBLISHED ON THURSDAY 10 JULY, 2025.**

**EFFECTIVE DATE FOR IMPLEMENTING THE DECISIONS CONTAINED IN THESE MINUTES:  
FRIDAY 18 JULY, 2025.**



By virtue of paragraph(s) 3 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A  
of the Local Government Act 1972.

Document is Restricted

By virtue of paragraph(s) 3 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A  
of the Local Government Act 1972.

Document is Restricted

By virtue of paragraph(s) 3 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A  
of the Local Government Act 1972.

Document is Restricted