EXECUTIVE DECISION NOTICE

CABINET

A record of the decisions made at the meeting of the Cabinet held on Wednesday, 14 December 2016, at 10.00 a.m.

Present

Councillors

Giles Archibald (Leader of the Council and Promoting South Lakeland Portfolio Holder)  
(Chairman)

Jonathan Brook  Housing and Innovation Portfolio Holder
David Fletcher  Environment Portfolio Holder
Chris Hogg  Culture and Wellbeing Portfolio Holder
Sue Sanderson  Deputy Leader and Council Organisation and People Portfolio Holder
Graham Vincent  Economy Portfolio Holder

An apology for absence was received from Councillor Peter Thornton (Finance Portfolio Holder).

Also in attendance at the meeting were Shadow Executive Members Ben Berry (Shadow Cabinet Leader (Promoting South Lakeland Portfolio)), John Holmes (Shadow Cabinet (Housing and Innovation Portfolio)), Janette Jenkinson (Shadow Cabinet (Economy Portfolio)), Kevin Lancaster (Shadow Cabinet (Finance Portfolio)) and David Williams (Shadow Cabinet (Culture and Wellbeing Portfolio)) and Mark Wilson (Leader of the Labour Group).

Apologies for absence were received from Shadow Executive Members James Airey (Shadow Cabinet (Environment Portfolio)) and Tom Harvey (Shadow Cabinet Deputy Leader (Council Organisation and People Portfolio)).

Officers

Inge Booth  Senior Committee Services Officer
Lawrence Conway  Chief Executive
Richard Machin  Senior Communications Officer
Shelagh McGregor  Assistant Director Resources (Section 151 Officer)
Alastair McNeill  Development Plans Manager
Debbie Storr  Director of Policy and Resources (Monitoring Officer)
David Sykes  Director People and Places
Lorayne Woodend  Strategic System and Delivery Officer

CEX/90

CHAIRMAN'S ANNOUNCEMENT

The Leader referred to the human tragedy in Syria and a minute’s silence was observed.
**CEX/91 CABINET EXECUTIVE DECISIONS**

The Leader proposed an amendment to Minute CEX/85 (2016/17) (Review of the Local Council Tax Reduction Scheme) to reflect that it had been discussed that some of the alternative options considered and rejected may have been of benefit to the Council in financial terms but detrimental to residents and that the Scheme went beyond the Council’s statutory requirements.

**RESOLVED – That, subject to the inclusion of the amendment raised above, the Chairman be authorised to sign, as a correct record, the Executive Decisions made by Cabinet on 23 November 2016.**

**CEX/92 DELEGATED EXECUTIVE DECISIONS**

**RESOLVED – That the Delegated Executive Decisions made by Portfolio Holders or Officers on 24 November 2016 be received.**

**CEX/93 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

**RESOLVED – That it be noted that no declarations of interest were raised.**

**CEX/94 LOCAL GOVERNMENT ACT 1972 - EXCLUDED ITEMS**

**RESOLVED – That it be noted that there are no excluded items on the Agenda.**

**CEX/95 PUBLIC PARTICIPATION**

**RESOLVED – That it be noted that no questions, representations, deputations or petitions have been received in respect of this meeting.**

**CEX/96 FORWARD PLAN**

Copies of the latest draft Forward Plan had been circulated prior to the meeting.

**RESOLVED – That the contents of the latest draft Forward Plan as at 13 December 2016 be noted.**

**CEX/97 COUNCIL’S RESPONSE TO THE NORTH WEST COAST CONNECTIONS DETAILED ROUTE PROPOSALS CONSULTATION (KEY DECISION)**

**Summary**

The Housing and Innovation Portfolio Holder reported that the National Grid North West Coast Connections project would be one of the largest investments in infrastructure in the North West of England for 50 years. It would deliver new 400kV electricity transmission lines connecting the proposed Moorside Nuclear Power Station with the National Grid Network. National Grid was consulting on a detailed route proposals and associated works for this connection. South Lakeland District Council was a statutory consultee and Cabinet was being asked to consider a proposed response at Appendix 1 to the report, which set out that:-

- the Council still supported the Morecambe Bay tunnel option in principle;
- the Council would prefer to see a tunnel used to cross the Duddon, as this would avoid many of the issues with the proposals;
as an alternative to a Duddon tunnel, the Council would also support an offshore connection, provided opportunities were not lost for future connectivity for new/growing industries or new energy supplies;

if neither the Duddon Tunnel nor offshore options were deliverable in an acceptable way, the key concerns that the Council had regarding impacts around the head of the Duddon, Foxfield, Kirkby-in-Furness, south of Kirkby-in-Furness and through the Furness peninsula would have to be addressed; and

mitigation measures to address these issues would include additional undergrounding, further re-routing, reduced additional infrastructure (such as Cable Sealing End Platforms) and greater rationalisation of the existing route through Furness.

The Council had also worked with the Planning Performance Agreement Group authorities, supported by consultants White Young Green, to prepare a joint response to the proposals in the S.42 consultation, including the Preliminary Environmental Information report (Appendix 2 to the report). Subject to approval, this would be worked up into a more detailed Planning Performance Agreement Group response.

The Portfolio Holder added that a number of representations had been received from several parish councils and that these had been taken into account in terms of the proposed response. He expressed thanks to both the Development Plans Manager and the Development Strategy Delivery Officer for their work.

A lengthy discussion ensued. The need to ensure that the proposed Moorside Power Station was secure was raised. Although the North West Coast Connections project was likely to have some impact on the landscape of the Duddon, it was suggested that there needed to be compromise in order to secure energy for the future. Members broadly supported the draft response to the consultation, however, it was felt that the Council's support in principle for the connection needed clarification, and the Portfolio Holder undertook to address this aspect.

Decision

RESOLVED – That

(1) the draft response set out in Appendix 1 to the report, supported by Appendix 2, be approved as South Lakeland District Council's response to the North West Coast Connections Consultation; and

(2) the Director People and Places, in consultation with the Housing and Innovation Portfolio Holder, be authorised to:-

(a) approve, on behalf of the Council, the Preliminary Environmental Information technical response prepared by the consultant team on behalf of the local authorities within the Planning Performance Agreement group; and

(b) make any changes to the draft response prior to submitting it to National Grid for:-

(i) any non-substantive changes required to the Draft Response; and

(ii) changes required in light of the content of the updated technical response, once received.
Reasons for Decision

The opportunity to influence the proposals is taken up in order to help ensure the best outcome and greatest benefits for the residents of South Lakeland.

The proposal to deliver connections for the new nuclear power station at Moorside has the potential to support economic, environmental and health and wellbeing Council Plan objectives in particular. The project will provide jobs – National Grid is committed to 1 in 5 jobs created being for local people – and will have supply chain benefits for local businesses. There are opportunities for reducing the impact of pylons on local communities and landscapes by altering the existing route and taking care over the choice and location of technologies and supporting infrastructure.

The project is also part of the Government’s wider energy package, which aims to reduce carbon emissions and support energy security. Responding to the consultation with the messages proposed will help to maximise support for these benefits, as well as helping to minimise negative impacts.

Alternative Options Considered and Rejected

The alternative option is to decline to take part in this consultation and/or to decline to include the Planning Performance Agreement response to support the Council’s response. Either would compromise the level of influence afforded by the Council in shaping the detailed route of the new National Grid connections, the associated mitigation and the supporting infrastructure. In turn, this would represent a lost opportunity to lobby formally for changes to the proposals that would reduce impacts on and bring enhancements for South Lakeland communities and landscapes.

The meeting ended at 11.00 a.m.