

SOUTH LAKELAND DISTRICT COUNCIL

Minutes of the proceedings at a meeting of the Council held in the District Council Chamber, South Lakeland House, Kendal, on Tuesday, 18 December 2018, at 6.30 p.m.

Present

Councillors

Eric Morrell (Chairman)
Stephen Coleman (Vice-Chairman)

James Airey	Philip Dixon	Dave Khan
Giles Archibald	Alvin Finch	Helen Ladhams
Robin Ashcroft	Anne Hall	Kevin Lancaster
Rupert Audland	Tom Harvey	Pete McSweeney
Pat Bell	Eamonn Hennessy	Ian Mitchell
Ben Berry	Hazel Hodgson	Jon Owen
Matt Brereton	John Holmes	Doug Rathbone
Jonathan Brook	Kevin Holmes	Vivienne Rees
Andrew Butcher	Vicky Hughes	Matt Severn
Sheila Capstick	Anne Hutton	Graham Vincent
Brian Cooper	Andrew Jarvis	David Williams
Michael Cornah	Janette Jenkinson	Mark Wilson
Tracy Coward	Dyan Jones	Shirley-Anne Wilson

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Caroline Airey, Roger Bingham, Gill Gardner, Chris Hogg, Rachael Hogg, Helen Irving, Amanda Rigg, Peter Thornton and David Webster.

Also in attendance at the meeting were members of the Independent Remuneration Panel, David Holden and Sally Parnaby (Chairman).

Officers

Tom Benson	Electoral Services Manager
Inge Booth	Senior Committee Services Officer
Gareth Candlin	Economic Development Manager
Lawrence Conway	Chief Executive
Ruth Leahy	Project Officer, Economic Development
Anthea Lowe	Solicitor to the Council
Shelagh McGregor	Assistant Director Resources (Section 151 Officer)
Simon McVey	Assistant Director Performance and Innovation
Paul Mountford	Principal Performance and Intelligence Officer
Fraser Robertson	Senior Communications Officer
Helen Smith	Financial Services Manager
Debbie Storr	Director of Policy and Resources (Monitoring Officer)
David Sykes	Director People and Places
Sion Thomas	Corporate Asset Manager

C/48 TRIBUTE TO COUNCILLOR IAN STEWART

The Chairman referred to the sad news of the recent death of Councillor Ian Stewart.

Councillor Giles Archibald, Leader, said that Councillor Stewart had been well respected on both sides of the Chamber. He had been Chairman of the Council from 2006 to 2008, as well as a Member of the Cabinet for some time, and Members were privileged to have worked with Councillor Stewart over many years. Councillor Stewart had made a wonderful contribution to the community and had worked hard to serve the public, at parish, district and county level. Councillor Archibald referred to Councillor Stewart's passion for helping the vulnerable and, in particular, to his advocacy in pursuing the implementation of the Council Tax exemption for care leavers. Councillor Archibald said that whilst all mourned Councillor Stewart's untimely passing and sympathised with his family, what he had achieved must be celebrated. Councillor Stewart left a legacy of achievement which would last for a long time.

Councillor Ben Berry, Leader of the Opposition, referred to Councillor Stewart's ability to speak the truth. He had been a fantastic politician who had always been willing to negotiate and reach a consensus in order to get things done.

Councillor Mark Wilson, Leader of the Labour Group, commended Councillor Stewart's enthusiasm and commitment.

Councillor Stewart would be sorely missed.

The Chairman invited all present to pay silent tribute to the memory of Councillor Ian Stewart.

C/49 MINUTES

RESOLVED – That the Chairman be authorised to sign, as a correct record, the minutes of the meeting of the Council held on 10 October 2018.

C/50 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

The Chairman referred to Item No.10 on the Agenda (Community Governance Review – End of Stage 1) and advice which had been received from the Monitoring Officer with regard to potential interests. He asked those Members who were also town or parish councillors, and who felt that they were biased or predetermined, to indicate now and for other Members speaking during the debate to indicate at that stage whether they were members of town or parish councils and to provide the name of the relevant council.

The Chairman then referred to Item No.6 (Petition) and indicated that, as Chairman of Grange CIC which had been set up in relation to the Lido, he would leave the Chamber and the Vice-Chairman would take the Chair for that item.

In response to a query raised by Councillor Tom Harvey, the Solicitor to the Council provided clarification with regard to the Chairman's interest, advice on which he had received from both herself and the Monitoring Officer.

RESOLVED – That it be noted that Councillor Eric Morrell declared an interest in Minute No.C/54 below.

C/51 LOCAL GOVERNMENT ACT 1972 - EXCLUDED ITEMS

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

C/52 CHAIRMAN'S ANNOUNCEMENTS

A list of engagements which the Chairman had attended since the last meeting had been circulated at the commencement of the meeting.

C/53 PUBLIC PARTICIPATION

Mrs Terry Lambert addressed Council with regard to swimming provision in South Lakeland and Cumbria. She referred to the 1970s and the former pool on Allhallows Lane and that at Troutbeck Bridge which had been built by public subscription so that local children would not have to learn to swim in the lake. Mrs Lambert had been involved in all aspects of club administration and had trained as a teacher, coach, official, timekeeper, judge and referee at club, county, district, national and international level. She had been the Club County representative and had served as Cumbria Amateur Swimming Association President in 2007/08. Mrs Lambert's perspective was with regard to the impact of the lack of a 50 metre pool on the rural North West. Recent changes required swimmers to gain regional, national or international qualifying times in 50 metre pools in order for them to be able to take part in regional or national competitions. This had placed Cumbria's ten clubs' swimmers, and those of North Lancashire, at a serious disadvantage, with no pool available to meet the requirements. The North West Region tried to provide opportunities for clubs and their members to train in a 50 metre pool, however, were only able to offer pool space at Liverpool Aquatics Centre in 2019 which involved a large amount of travel and cost. Some Cumbria clubs had had to make costly private arrangements with other pools outside of the area, sometimes involving overnight stays. Mrs Lambert raised the fact that local clubs had also been disadvantaged by the loss of pools such as Troutbeck Bridge, and local schools struggled to find the finances and time to travel to distant pools in order to fulfil the required swimming lesson timetables. The problem was not limited to indoor swimming pools, with blue green algae present in many lakes. Most clubs had open water swimmers, triathletes and Masters' swimmers. The popularity of the Great North Swim and the Chill Swims and similar activities were proof of the willingness of people to take part in outdoor swimming and to travel here to do so. At a time when improvements were being made to Ulverston and Grange Baths, Mrs Lambert considered it important to raise this issue. If Cumbria swimmers and school children wanted to aim and succeed in becoming international and Olympic swimmers, they needed a 50 metre pool.

Mr George Parr referred to the Save Grange Lido petition and pointed out that South Lakeland District Council's obligations were to satisfy the realities. He also pointed out that the Save Grange Lido Group had not exposed their ideas in a public meeting in Grange. Mr Parr felt that some of the support for the petition was politically motivated, pointing out that he had received encouragement to support it for political reasons. He suggested that this could reduce the petition's persuasiveness for the Save Grange Lido Group's cause. Mr Parr raised that the significant reason for the previous pool closure in 1993 had been low usage and wondered whether the potential for reversal of this had been convincingly demonstrated by the Save Grange Lido Group. Mr Parr referred to the site having been listed Grade II by Historic England. He pointed out that Historic England was in support of the Council's designs, however, that the Save Grange Lido Group's designs had not yet gained that support. Mr Parr informed Council that, within the last month, volunteer staff from Grange Community Interest

Company had been asked by a Save Grange Lido activist about a bridge over the railway line that used to provide direct pedestrian access to the Lido from the car park. He pointed out that that bridge had been demolished some 12 years ago and felt that Save Grange Lido Group's query on this basic matter might suggest that problems of access required more consideration. Mr Parr quoted from the Consulting Structural Engineer's Report of 6 November 2018 which stated that the position of Save Grange Lido could not be defended by rational argument and should be rejected; the condition of the concrete was generally poor, beyond practical concrete surgical repair; grouting the underground tanks and infilling the pool with granular material would relieve all the primary elements; and this vision for the Lido was the most durable outcome in safeguarding the historic structure over the long term. Mr Parr stressed that it would be foolish for South Lakeland District Council not to act in accordance with this professional advice.

Peter Endsor, Councillor, Chairman, and Mayor of Grange Town Council spoke on behalf of the Town. He said that Grange Town Council had been working with South Lakeland District Council for several years to resolve the problem of the Lido. South Lakeland District Council had carried out public consultation in Grange community and now had a way forward. He indicated that Grange Town Council continued to support the "light touch" refurbishment being proposed by South Lakeland District Council. This was because Grange Town Council believed that it was the most effective way of bringing the Lido back into the community where it belonged. On behalf of the community, which Grange Town Council listened to, it wished to see:-

- the site re-opened to the public, as soon as possible;
- the heritage buildings preserved sympathetically and attractively; and
- the site to be economically viable and low risk in terms of ongoing cost.

The Town Council's goal was for the area to become, once again, an asset to the Promenade and Town; a community facility rather than a derelict eyesore. Town Councillors had listened carefully to the alternative vision presented and had read all the documentation. They had also listened to the members of their community. Councillor Endsor had spoken to a lot of Grange residents, some of whom had signed the petition which was being presented at the meeting. He said that they had told him that they had signed the petition thinking that the buildings were going to be demolished and used as rubble to infill the pool. He said that most people would be happy with the light touch restoration. He was referring to the people who had phoned, emailed the Town Council and spoken at its meetings, and who had also spoken to Town Councillors in the street. Councillor Endsor felt that the refurbishment as proposed by South Lakeland District Council would be economically sustainable and would be used by the public all the year round. The District Council had 100% support from the Town Council which hoped that the light touch refurbishment would go ahead as planned.

Council was addressed by Town Councillor Claire Logan who had been born and brought up in Grange and, after a brief period of living in the north of our county, had returned to the Town with her family. Councillor Logan practiced as a solicitor in Grange and her children attended Grange Primary School. Grange held an enormous place in her heart. Councillor Logan informed Council that she had become one of the first directors of the not-for-profit Grange-over-Sands Lido Community Interest Company at its incorporation on 10 April 2018. Councillor Logan, as many locals, had fond memories of the Lido from when she was a child: swimming galas; watching people diving; and the cold water! She had also seen photos of her late Father standing on poolside as a lifeguard. Councillor Logan said that the Lido had been an

important facility for Grange since 1932 and the people of the Town once more wanted it to become an important place again, for both themselves and visitors. Large numbers used the Promenade regularly and it was natural for them to see the Lido site as an extension of the Promenade. Councillor Logan doubted very much that large numbers of townspeople would regularly use an outdoor pool in the future. Those who did enjoy a chilly dip in the open air would naturally migrate to the numerous bodies of water in the neighbouring Lake District to undertake the, ever-increasing in popularity, pastime of wild swimming. Councillor Logan imagined that the Lido site would bring great benefit to the people of Grange and its visitors if it became a multi-purpose space which was allowed to develop organically. The Save Grange Lido Group business plan included the establishment of two holiday lets. If such a proposal materialised and received planning permission, Councillor Logan was of the opinion that many people in the Town would see this as the first steps towards their Lido becoming an exclusive spa-type facility with expensive holiday lets and no space for community use. Councillor Logan felt that this important heritage site deserved a fresh lease of life, with a low-risk plan to give the community multiple possibilities without becoming an expensive burden to South Lakeland District Council taxpayers in years to come. She felt that the "light touch" plan put forward by the District Council to date was fantastic. It reopened the site to the community and its visitors which was what people wanted to see. It provided an opportunity to work together, as a Community, to make the space accessible to all.

C/54**PETITION**

Note – The Chairman, Councillor Eric Morrell, declared a non-pecuniary interest in this item of business by virtue of his involvement with the Grange Community Interest Company, and left the Council Chamber during the discussion and voting. In his absence, the Vice-Chairman, Councillor Stephen Coleman, took the Chair.

Mr Phil Bradby, Chair of Save Grange Lido, re-presented the petition brought to Council on 10 October 2018, over 1,000 signatures of which had subsequently been verified, the wording being, "we want GRANGE LIDO restoration to include the SWIMMING POOL, and South Lakeland District Council to confirm that any option without a swimming pool will be ruled out."

Mr Bradby said that Save Grange Lido was a voluntary community group working to help bring forward the restoration of a much loved swimming pool. He said that, when he had last swam in the pool when he was about 10 years old and living in Kendal, little had he known that almost 40 years later he would be working with a group of volunteers to save it. Mr Bradby said that it should not be forgotten that the decision being made today was not only for the current residents of Grange, but for the future generation of children in the whole South Lakeland District Council region who, the Group hoped, would one day thank the District Council for making the right decision. Mr Bradby said that he was also speaking on behalf of approximately 18,000 people who had signed the Group's petitions and the 74% of respondents in the official consultation who had asked that the Lido be restored for swimming. Mr Bradby pointed out that, a few miles away was one of the very best lidos in the country, and the District Council was its custodian. The Lido was one of just four of its kind and was exceptional because of its historically important art deco design and because it had a 50 metre swimming pool.

Mr Bradby started with one very important point: the Group was not asking for any money. It simply asked for the chance to raise the capital itself, and to make the business work. The Group wanted to add the pool back into the plans being prepared by the District Council's officers.

Mr Bradby said that the five minutes allocated was not long enough to cover what needed to be said, nor was it long enough to address all the misunderstandings and misinformation which abounded, so he would draw attention to just two points in this regard:-

(1) Viability

Contrary to what was being said, Mr Bradby said that the official reports showed that the Lido was viable with a pool.

He quoted the Neo Now, Options Appraisal 2013, "Our conversations with other lidos and open air pools elsewhere in the UK, which have centred on their running costs and income streams, have confirmed that it is financially sustainable to operate a lido..."

Mr Bradby said that the Group's carefully researched business plan drew on the knowledge and experience of numerous successfully operating lidos, from Cornwall to Scotland, and came to the same conclusion. He said that Council officers were, understandably, cautious, but the Lido was too important to dismiss the Group's business plan without proper professional assessment. The Group asked that consultants with the appropriate expertise be engaged to review this.

In addition to the petition, Mr Bradby handed in letters of support from the Cumbria Amateur Swimming Association, Ulverston Triathlon Club, Carnforth and District Otters Swimming Club, Chillswim and Ulverston Amateur Swimming Club Otters.

(2) Capital Costs

Mr Bradby said that, in relation to capital costs, various enormous figures had been quoted, but he had the estimate from Wrightfield Pools to restore the pool and plant. They were a leading UK specialist and had restored the pool at the hugely successful Lido Ponty. The estimated cost was £1.2m, which the Group had offered to raise.

Mr Bradby felt that this was an investment opportunity which was too good to miss. For a relatively small investment and at no cost to taxpayers, Cumbria could have a much needed 50 metre pool, a superb local amenity for schools and the community, and a tourist attraction for the Cartmel Peninsula.

Mr Bradby said that the alternative option of filling it in, whether temporary or permanent, would lead to a long, expensive and contentious planning and legal process. It would also be a financially poor decision because the investment, of approximately £2m of public money would add nothing to Grange or South Lakeland. It would just become a sad line on the ground and a space with no particular demand or function. It would have none of the revenue generating potential that a properly restored lido would offer the area.

Mr Bradby said that the £250,000 the Council planned to spend on filling in the pool could be spent in much better ways, especially as it could lead to another £250,000 to take it out.

Mr Bradby pointed out that Cumbria swimming clubs were crying out for a 50 metre facility to save the huge amount of time they wasted driving to pools in other counties. Building a new one would be prohibitively expensive but renovation of an existing facility was achievable.

Mr Bradby drew attention to the Group's strong support from Cumbria Amateur Swimming Association, Swim England, numerous swimming clubs across the county, Chillswim, and Ulverston Triathlon Club.

Mr Bradby referred to Morecambe which was thinking big and bringing about meaningful regeneration with its Eden Project, and felt that Grange Lido would fit perfectly into such a regeneration of the Bay. He referred to the recent rise in popularity of lidos and outdoor swimming which meant that there had never been a better time to restore the Grange Lido. He pointed out that, in the UK today, there were 130 successful lidos and outdoor pools, the majority of which were run by community groups. What the Group had in mind was, therefore, not unusual, unprecedented or unrealistic - it was, in fact, perfectly achievable with sound business planning and some positive thinking. This positivity would bring Grange and the whole of South Lakeland a fantastic restored art deco lido that would be the envy of councils across the country. It would bring new life, leisure opportunities and improve the health and wellbeing of children and adults alike. It would do all that while enhancing the local economy.

The Group, therefore, asked the Council to seize this opportunity to vote for the only sensible and feasible solution which was to restore Grange Lido with a swimming pool at its heart.

The Director of Policy and Resources (Monitoring Officer) drew attention to the fact that, subject to approval of the budget decision by Council, the decision on the design options for the Grange-over-Sands Lido, being an Executive function, would be made by Cabinet. She explained, however, that it would be appropriate for Council to forward any comments raised to be taken into account during consideration of the matter by Cabinet at its meeting scheduled to be held on 23 January 2019. Cabinet would be provided with a detailed report in order to enable an informed decision to be made.

The Director of Policy and Resources (Monitoring Officer) provided clarity with regard to suggested inaccuracies within paragraphs 3.13 and 3.14 of the report currently before Members relating to the petition, as follows:-

3.13 The paragraph in the Neo Now report referred to mentions discussions with other lidos: 11 were considered to be viable, figures were not obtained on a further nine. She explained that this was not a statement of Grange-over-Sands Lido being viable, but rather a more general statement of viable lidos across the UK.

3.14 She advised that it was correct to say that Historic England would not be supportive of permanent infill of the pool. Currently, the South Lakeland District Council proposal was for partial temporary infilling of the pool, so as not to preclude any future or long-term restoration aspirations. Officers had worked closely with Historic England and South Lakeland District Council's Conservation Officer in order to ensure that the current design was appropriate and sympathetic with regards to the heritage listing.

Councillor Jonathan Brook, Deputy Leader and Housing, People and Innovation Portfolio Holder, thanked members of the Save Grange Lido Group for their passion and commitment to the project. He reminded all present that there would be an opportunity for a further, more detailed debate at the Cabinet meeting scheduled to be held on 23 January 2019.

Councillor Brook said that this was a complex issue with a long history and differing opinions about viability and finances. The Council had listened to the different interested parties the proposals being put forward were for a light touch refurbishment allowing the Council to stabilise the structure and the sea defences, to make the area safe and to open it up to the public, whilst at the same time allowing Save Grange Lido Group to further develop its plans. The District Council's plan allowed for the possibility of a future pool, whilst enabling the Council to carry out the job of making urgent repairs to the existing structure.

Councillor Brook did not believe it to be appropriate at this stage to narrow down the options and to commit to a re-watered pool whilst the costs and future liability of the Council in respect of a pool restoration were not fully understood. He, therefore, moved the recommendations as set out within the report, adding that he looked forward to working further with all interested parties whilst, at the same time, getting on with the job of restoring this iconic structure and cleaning up and opening up a site that had been a blight on the town of Grange for too long.

Councillor Andrew Jarvis, Finance Portfolio Holder, seconded the motion.

Councillor Tom Harvey indicated that he had been a Member of Grange Town Council for approximately 10 years and that he had heard both sides of the argument. He felt that the Save Grange Lido Group, which was full of business expertise and drive as well as an ability to generate funding, should be given an opportunity to move forward with their plans. He stressed, however, that the Council should work closely with the Group and fully scrutinise its plans. Councillor Harvey proposed an amendment to recommendation (2) on the report, that, "following receipt of the petition, the Council endorses working with Save Grange Lido Group to fully scrutinise the plans with the view and ultimate aim of handing over the Lido to the Save Grange Lido Group, once fully constituted, and to do all it can to facilitate and assist the Group in delivering its ambitions."

The proposed amendment was seconded by Councillor James Airey who reminded Members that working in partnership with the community was key for South Lakeland. He felt that the proposals to temporarily infill the pool were ludicrous when the site could potentially be a jewel in the crown for South Lakeland. He pointed out that the Save Grange Lido Group's innovative idea ticked all boxes – health and wellbeing and economic viability. He also stressed the fact that the Group would welcome the Council seeking the services of an independent consultant to look at and review the Group's business plan. He asked for Council to wait a little longer and consult on the Group's plan and to give the people a chance to deliver.

Members discussed the proposed amendment.

Councillor Giles Archibald, Leader and Promoting South Lakeland Portfolio Holder was of the opinion that the spirit of the amendment was consistent with what had been said by Councillor Brook. The Council wanted to work with Save Grange Lido Group subject to conditions being satisfied. The suggestion that the Council should hand the asset over to the Group was, however, problematic with regards to liabilities, and could jeopardise the Council's aim to restore the site for the public.

Councillor Janette Jenkinson highlighted the fact that initiatives such as lidos were back in vogue, with people seeking different experiences. She was of the opinion that a pool element should be included in the plan. She referred to the successes of the Coronation Hall and Haverthwaite Railway. The Coronation Hall had been run by Ulverston Community Enterprise for the past five years, and that group was able to access funding that the Council could not.

Councillor Matt Severn enquired if Councillor Harvey had changed his opinion on the matter since February 2017 when he had been quoted in Cumbria for saying that, with costs starting at £500,000 and getting higher, what was clear was that the site would lose money year after year as a swimming pool, and that it should not fall on taxpayers to pick up the burden.

Councillor Ben Berry pointed out that his family was making a significant investment in the Low Wood Bay Resort and that the highlight was the provision of an outdoor pool. He was of the opinion that if a commercial operator was building an outdoor pool in the knowledge that this was what people wanted, then the Council should allow a community group do the same for the whole of the community and South Lakeland.

Councillor Vivienne Rees explained that she represented an area, the people of which were concerned with problems around swimming provision in the Central Lakes. She referred to the case of a former indoor pool facility and stressed the need for evidence for a realistic plan, with advice from experts. She referred to the Save Grange Lido Group, to its willingness to take on board the asset and to the practical manner in which it was acting and believed that, with appropriate investigation and advice, then it could be worthwhile in pursuing the Group's plan.

Councillor Robin Ashcroft paid tribute to the Administration for having grasped the issue of the Lido which had been an eyesore for two decades. Councillor Ashcroft was conscious of the diverse views across the community of Grange. He believed that the site needed to be financially sustainable as well as having utility and felt that thought must be given to this, with an open process and good communication. He felt heartened that there had been an improvement in communication in recent days and encouraged this moving forward. He was of the opinion that the Save Grange Lido Group's plans needed more work and hoped that the Group would be given an opportunity to further develop them. He expressed support for Councillor Brook's proposals and encouraged the continuation of negotiations.

A vote was taken on the proposed amendment which was not carried.

Councillor Jarvis having seconded the substantive motion said that there was no simple solution, discussions having been ongoing for the past 25 years since closure of the site. He expressed concern with regard to the business case put forward by the Save Grange Lido Group, including the long term viability, inadequate provision for marketing and an optimistic income stream from events. He felt that implementation of the Group's plans could lead to a major risk and long term obligation to the Council and taxpayers, however, indicated a willingness to work with other parties to see if the issues could be resolved. Given the uncertainties, Councillor Jarvis believed that it was essential that all options were fully considered, including on how decisions had been made or were made could constrain decisions in the future. The suggestion from Save Grange Lido Group was for any option without a swimming pool to be ruled out. Councillor Jarvis was of the opinion that all options needed to be carefully assessed. He urged Members, therefore, to consider all of the options and issues and to consider the way in which to move forward for the best, or the least worst, option.

In response to a query, the Director People and Places indicated that representations raised would be provided by officers to Cabinet when considering the matter at its meeting on 23 January 2019.

A vote was taken on the substantive motion and it was

RESOLVED – That

- (1) the petition be received;
- (2) the comments made during the debate be forwarded to Cabinet for consideration as part of the decision-making process; and
- (3) the Director of Policy and Resources (Monitoring Officer) be delegated authority, in consultation with the relevant Portfolio Holder, to formulate any necessary response that accords with the decision of the Council.

Note – Councillor Eric Morrell, Chairman, resumed the Chair for the remainder of the meeting.

C/55

REPORT FROM THE INDEPENDENT REMUNERATION PANEL FOR 2019/2020

Mrs Sally Parnaby, Chairman of the Independent Remuneration Panel (IRP), was invited to present the Panel's report to Council. The report recommended an increase up to a maximum of 2% on the Basic Allowance for 2019/20 to bring it up to £4,118.76 per annum.

The IRP had also recommended the following:-

- amendments to Special Responsibility Allowances (SRAs) as follows:-
 - i. the SRAs for the Chairs of the Audit, Human Resources, Lake Administration and Overview and Scrutiny Committees to remain unchanged;
 - ii. the SRA for the Chair of the Planning Committee to be £2,794.50; and
 - iii. the SRAs for the Chairs of the Standards and Licensing/Licensing Regulatory Committees to be £931.50;
- other than the Group Leaders' Allowance, Members should receive no more than one SRA;
- Out of County Mileage Allowance to remain part of the single travel allowance scheme as per the previous year;
- travel expenses to be in accordance with the maximum rates set by HMRC without attracting a tax charge (currently 45p per mile), this to apply to the first 150 miles of a return journey regardless of the destination and 25p per mile thereafter;
- subsistence expenses to increase by RPI as at 1st April 2019;
- no change to Childcare/Dependant Carers' Allowance. Payments to remain at a maximum allowance of £15 per hour. The Allowance to be paid from the time the recipient leaves home to time of return; and
- Co-optees' Allowance be increased by up to a maximum of 2% to bring it up to £38.38 per meeting.

Mrs Parnaby thanked those Members and officers who had provided valuable input and, on behalf of the Panel, asked Council to accept the recommendations.

On behalf of the Council, the Chairman thanked Mrs Parnaby and the Independent Remuneration Panel for their work.

In moving the adoption of the recommendations, Councillor Giles Archibald, Leader and Promoting South Lakeland Portfolio Holder, expressed gratitude to the Panel for its work. He stressed that the position of a councillor could not be reserved for the independently wealthy and that, in order for the allowance to be meaningful, it needed to be increased to reflect inflation. He also pointed out that the position of Chairman of the Planning Committee was an onerous task.

Councillor Dyan Jones, Environment Portfolio Holder, seconded the motion.

Councillor Ben Berry proposed an amendment, "To agree the proposals of the Independent Remuneration Plan, except the increase of 2% to the basic allowance for 2019/20 and that the money saved be directed to fight poverty in South Lakeland." The amendment was seconded by Councillor James Airey.

Councillor Archibald did not wish to accept the amendment, however, indicated that he would be content to consider a further amendment that the Leader's allowance for this year be used to fight poverty in South Lakeland. He believed, however, that it was important for every Member of the Council to have the opportunity to serve as a councillor and that it would be setting a bad precedent not to increase the allowance in line with inflation. He reiterated though that he was willing, should Council so wish, to direct all of the Leader's allowance to be used to fight the critical issue of poverty in South Lakeland.

Councillor Berry suggested that he would be content to include the Leader's allowance within his amendment and clarified that it would now read, "To agree the proposals of the Independent Remuneration Plan, except the increase of 2% to the basic allowance for 2019/20, plus the Leader's pay rise for 2019/20, and that the money saved be directed to fight poverty in South Lakeland." Councillor James Airey indicated that he was content with the inclusion of the Leader's allowance within the amendment.

Councillor Archibald, however, did not accept this amendment either, maintaining that it was appropriate for Members to receive an allowance commensurate with the work that they carried out. He stressed that the Independent Remuneration Panel existed to provide advice on allowances and that it was entirely appropriate for councillors to receive these allowances, some in need of the money in order to carry out their role. He remained, however, content to direct his Leader's allowance to fight poverty in South Lakeland and suggested that, should Councillor Berry choose to also suggest that the Leader of the Opposition's allowance be included, then he would be happy to support this as well.

The Solicitor to the Council clarified that the current amendment was for the proposals of the Independent Remuneration Panel to be agreed, except the increase of 2% to the basic allowance for 2019/20, plus the Leader's allowance for 2019/20, and that the money saved be directed to fight poverty in South Lakeland. Having taken advice from the Finance Team, she pointed out that it would not be possible to ring-fence the money saved and that it would be put back into the Council budget in the usual manner.

Councillors Andrew Jarvis, Jonathan Brook, Vicky Hughes, Vivienne Rees and Matt Severn all spoke against the proposed amendment for a number of reasons. It was felt inappropriate for the money to be hypothecated from one source to another; there were Members who had little other income; it should be left to individual Members to decide on how to use their increase; and Members worked hard for their resident, some using their allowances for the good of their communities.

A vote was taken on the proposed amendment, which was lost.

Prior to a vote being taken on Councillor Archibald's substantive motion, he sought further clarification from the Solicitor to the Council with regard to the possibility of an amendment for the Leader's allowance to be directed to fight poverty. The Solicitor to the Council said that such an amendment could be moved, however, reiterated that it was not possible to ring fence funds. Councillor Archibald wished to make it clear that this had been his intent.

A vote was then taken on the substantive motion and it was

RESOLVED - That the recommendations of the Independent Remuneration Panel and the Members' Allowance Scheme for 2019/20, as attached at Appendix B of the Panel Report, be adopted with effect from 1 April 2019.

C/56

CORPORATE FINANCIAL MONITORING QUARTER 2

Councillor Andrew Jarvis, Finance Portfolio Holder presented the second quarter financial monitoring report of 2018/19, moving the recommendations contained therein.

Although there was a current underspend of approximately £250,000, Appendix 1 set out the revenue variances to date which totalled a projected year-end overspend of £251,000. The Portfolio Holder provided explanations for the key movements. Further reviews of budgets had been carried out by senior management following the preparation of the report which had identified actions to mitigate the projected overspend, including reductions in the Minimum Revenue Provision, Development Control and Homelessness. The net impact of these actions had resulted in a revised projection at year-end of an underspend of £112,000.

Cabinet had given approval on 31 October 2018 (Minute CEX/49 (2018/19) refers) for a transfer of £82,000 from the Cumbria Non-Domestic Rate Pool Income Reserve to fund the costs of an additional £45,000 for the European Regional Development Fund Flood Alleviation Scheme application process; £25,000 to fund the Kendal Markets Review; and £12,000 to fund the project development phase of the Burton-in-Kendal Heritage Scheme. Approval had also been given for the transfer of £20,000 from the General Reserve to the Community Grants budget heading further to a request at the July Council that a £20,000 Community Projects Fund be created. A £12,000 transfer from the Statutory Duties Reserve had been approved to fund the costs associated with dealing with the planning appeal for the Kirkby Moor Wind Farm planning application.

Appendix 2 to the report set out the position on the Capital Programme. Spend against the Programme to the end of Quarter 2 was £2.366m. Approval was sought from Council for a number of minor amendments which would bring the total of the current Programme to £9.795m, details of which were provided. It was now clear that there was unlikely to be any spending on the European Regional Development Fund during the current financial year or the Cross-a-Moor junction. A request to approve reprofiling of these projections, if required, would be sought as part of the updated Capital Programme submitted during the budget setting process.

Appendix 3 to the report provided an update on Treasury Management for the quarter showing that all activity had been within the approved limits. Investments had performed better than the relevant benchmarks. No repayment of existing or new borrowing was anticipated up to the end of the financial year.

The Finance Portfolio closed in thanking the Finance Team for highlighting the challenges and enabling time for options to be examined.

Councillor Jarvis was seconded by Councillor Graham Vincent.

Councillor Tom Harvey referred to the Period 6 Capital Programme position and sought an update on the Castle Diary scheme and uncertainties regarding payment and timing. Councillor Jarvis undertook to provide a written response.

In response to a query raised by Councillor David Williams, the Director People and Places explained that the £26,000 income shortfall relating to Lake Windermere moorings related to market pressures which needed to be addressed through marketing.

RESOLVED – That

- (1) the contents of the report be noted; and
- (2) the virements and budget changes to increase the Capital Programme as outlined in paragraph 3.6.1 of the report and reflected in the revised Capital Programme at Appendix 2 to the report be approved.

C/57

2019/20 TO 2023/24 DRAFT BUDGET

Councillor Andrew Jarvis, Finance Portfolio Holder, presented a first draft budget for 2019/20 to 2023/24.

The budget projections had been updated to reflect the ending of the Second Homes Agreement with the County Council, which reduced income across all years from 2019/20 by approximately £700,000. A number of additional budget pressures, growth bids and savings proposals had been identified that were outlined in the Appendices to the report. The Capital Programme had been adjusted to reflect projects where there was a well-developed business case, where work was unavoidable or where a degree of outline approval had already been indicated or was shortly expected. There were, additionally, a number of schemes where the business cases were not yet sufficiently advanced to include within the Medium Term Financial Plan capital budget. There was one change to the 2018/19 capital budget as, due to high demand, it was necessary to increase the Disabled Facilities Grant funding budget through the transfer of £191,000 of unallocated budget from the Affordable Homes budget. The resulting revised Capital Programme was presented in detail at Appendix 6 to the report. The report presented a draft position and work would continue to incorporate further changes into subsequent budget reports, such as the government grant position which was not yet known. The final Draft Budget Report would incorporate the consideration of the internal and external consultation and be presented to Cabinet on 23 January 2019, prior to final recommendations being made to Council on 26 February 2019.

Approval was also sought from Council for the proposed pay scales from 1 April 2019 resulting from the national local government pay settlement for 2018/20 and consideration by the Human Resources Committee on 11 December 2018.

The Government had published the provisional Local Government finance settlement for 2019/20 earlier in December. The settlement had included notification that the Cumbria business rate pilot bid had been unsuccessful but it was expected that the existing Cumbria business rate pool would continue for 2019/20. No additional income had been included in the draft budget relating to the pilot bid.

In moving the recommendations contained within the report, Councillor Jarvis informed Members that the Council was currently financially robust and thanked officers for their work. However, future uncertainties could not be ignored, and potential severe cuts in funding and the need to address them, at the same time minimising the impact on residents, would be a major challenge. He was seconded by Councillor Giles Archibald.

Councillor Matt Severn expressed support for the motion and, in particular, commended officers for their work in relation to the prioritised capital bids relating to loans to housing associations utilising the Right to Buy receipts accumulated to date and the development of additional homelessness accommodation for families. He was pleased that the Council was addressing the homelessness crisis. Councillor Jonathan Brook also commended Councillor Jarvis and officers for their work and highlighted the fact that South Lakeland District Council would, from 1 April 2019, pay its staff the equivalent of the foundation living wage. Councillor Giles Archibald spoke in praise of Councillor Dyan Jones who had first raised the issue of the foundation living wage and echoed thanks to Councillor Jarvis and officers for their work. He also drew attention to the Capital Programme and all the additional work which was being carried out by the Council due to good financial management.

RESOLVED – That

- (1) it be noted that the development of the Budget is an iterative process between now and Council on 26 February 2019. The assumptions, proposals and calculations included within it will be subject to change as more information from internal and external sources is provided and decisions around the final proposals can be made;
- (2) the proposals contained in the report to achieve a balanced budget in 2019/20 be noted;
- (3) the projected deficit position of circa £590,000 in 2020/21 rising to circa £2.6m by 2023/24 (this is after the Customer Connect savings have been included), as set out in Appendix 2 to the report, be noted;
- (4) it be noted that proposals (1) and (2) form the basis of statutory consultation with stakeholders;
- (5) the amended 2018/19 Capital Programme as presented at Appendix 6 to the report, be approved, noting that the future years programme is still under development; and
- (6) the proposed pay scales from 1 April 2019 onwards, as set out in Appendix 9 to the report, be approved.

C/58**NOTICE OF MOTION**

In accordance with Paragraph 11.1 of the Council's Rules of Procedure, the following notice of motion had been put to Council by Councillor Philip Dixon, Health and Wellbeing Portfolio Holder:-

"The Council notes:

The increase in child poverty in this District over the past four years, from 14% to 15.9% (measured after housing costs).

The increasing use of food banks in the country, as evidenced by the Trussel Trust figures, showing an annual 13% increase in usage, and Kendal's Kings Food Bank showing a 16% increase.

The current freeze on Benefits and the rollout of Universal Credit are partly to blame for these increases.

Council calls on the government:

To review its welfare strategy with a view to providing more support for the most vulnerable in our society.

To take urgent steps to address this appalling trend and to reinstate ambitious targets for lowering child poverty.

To take urgent action to help those who are most affected by poverty.

In addition, Council asks:

That the Chair of the Council write to the Local Government Minister expressing our dismay at these trends and seeking his support in requesting additional funds be provided to Local Authorities by Central Government to help those most disadvantaged."

In presenting the motion, Councillor Dixon referred to the fact that, although the national economy of the United Kingdom was the fifth largest in the world, there existed nevertheless the issue of poverty. Councillor Dixon felt strongly that the Government could do more to address the situation. He informed Members that the Joseph Rowntree Foundation had estimated that, in 2017, there had been four million children living in poverty, and these figures were increasing. In South Lakeland in the past seven months, Council officers had dealt with 78 families at risk of homelessness. In April 2018, 85 families had already been on the list of those being assisted and since then, 55 families had been accommodated in Town View Fields Hostel, with 31 families had been living in bed and breakfasts. On average, people were living in Town View Fields for an average of 20 weeks. Councillor Dixon stressed the fact that these figures related purely to Kendal, one of the most affluent areas. Councillor Dixon also spoke about food banks and pointed out that attendance at Kings Food Bank had increased. Approximately 1,800 meals had been provided in October 2018. Councillor Dixon expressed the opinion that current Government policies picked off the poor and weak and encouraged Members to support the motion, which was seconded by Councillor Giles Archibald, Leader and Promoting South Lakeland Portfolio Holder.

Councillor Ben Berry drew attention to his suggestion earlier in the meeting to direct the increase of 2% in the basic allowance for Members for 2019/20 to assist in the fight against poverty in South Lakeland and to the fact that this proposal had not been accepted.

Councillors Mark Wilson, Vicky Hughes, Matt Severn, and Dyan Jones, expressed support for the motion. They spoke passionately on the subject of poverty and raised strong concerns on issues such as children being unable to take part in all areas of the school curriculum, the need for support for those facing the stresses of redundancy, the need for authorities to support children's centres, cuts in benefits and cuts to social services.

Councillor Archibald as seconder of the motion emphasised the unacceptability of living in such a society and the fact that something was seriously wrong in this country. He hoped that Members would join in condemning this current regime which was punitive and causing hardship.

A request having been received from the requisite number of Councillors, the following vote on the motion was recorded:-

The following Members voted in favour (26) – Councillors Giles Archibald, Robin Ashcroft, Rupert Audland, Jonathan Brook, Stephen Coleman, Tracy Coward, Philip Dixon, Alvin Finch, Eamonn Hennessy, Hazel Hodgson, Vicky Hughes, Anne Hutton, Andrew Jarvis, Dyan Jones, Dave Khan, Helen Ladhams, Pete McSweeney, Ian Mitchell, Eric Morrell, Jon Owen, Doug Rathbone, Vivienne Rees, Matt Severn, Graham Vincent, Mark Wilson and Shirley-Anne Wilson.

The following Member voted against (1) – Councillor Kevin Lancaster.

The following Members abstained (12) – Councillors James Airey, Pat Bell, Ben Berry, Matt Brereton, Andrew Butcher, Sheila Capstick, Brian Cooper, Anne Hall, Tom Harvey, John Holmes, Kevin Holmes and David Williams.

RESOLVED – That

(1) the Council notes:-

- (a) the increase in child poverty in this District over the past four years, from 14% to 15.9% (measured after housing costs);
- (b) the increasing use of food banks in the country, as evidenced by the Trussel Trust figures, showing an annual 13% increase in usage, and Kendal's Kings Food Bank showing a 16% increase; and
- (c) the current freeze on Benefits and the rollout of Universal Credit are partly to blame for these increases;

(2) Council calls on the Government:-

- (a) to review its welfare strategy with a view to providing more support for the most vulnerable in our society;
- (b) to take urgent steps to address this appalling trend and to reinstate ambitious targets for lowering child poverty; and
- (c) to take urgent action to help those who are most affected by poverty; and

(3) in addition, Council asks that the Chair of the Council write to the Local Government Minister expressing its dismay at these trends and seeking his support in requesting additional funds be provided to Local Authorities by Central Government to help those most disadvantaged.

C/59**COMMUNITY GOVERNANCE REVIEW - END OF STAGE 1**

Note – Councillor Jonathan Brook declared a non-pecuniary interest in this item of business by virtue of the fact that he was a Member of Kendal Town Council which would potentially be affected by some of the recommendations. He pointed out, however, that the purpose of the report was for Members to note the responses to the Stage 1 of the consultation and to agree the draft recommendations for progression to the second consultation stage which he believed, did not preclude him from being present and taking part in the discussion and voting on the item.

Councillor Jonathan Brook, Deputy Leader and Housing, People and Innovation Portfolio Holder, introduced a report on the responses to the first stage of the public consultation carried out as part of the Community Governance Review having regard to the South Lakeland Community Governance Review Terms of Reference as agreed by Council on 24 July 2018 (Minute C/30 (2018/19) refers).

At its meeting on 24 July 2018, Full Council had agreed to carry out a Community Governance Review within the District. The Terms of Reference of the Review had been agreed and a Community Governance Review Project Team had been established to consider the review and make recommendations to the Council.

The first consultation period had commenced on 10 August 2018 and, as part of this, all of the parish councils within South Lakeland had been invited to contribute.

The Review was being undertaken in accordance with Chapter 3 of the Local Government and Public Involvement in Health Act 2007 (“the Act”) and the Guidance on Community Governance Reviews (March 2010) provided by the Department for Communities and Local Government Boundary Commission for England. The timetable was included within the Terms of Reference (detailed in Appendix 3 to the report) as agreed by Council on 24 July 2018.

As part of Stage 1, as well as key stakeholders (including the Cumbria Association for Local Councils (CALC), Cumbria County Council, Lake District National Park Authority (LDNPA) and Yorkshire Dales National Park Authority (YDNPA)), residents associations, community groups and local people had been asked to make representations in connection with the Review.

The Review had to ensure that the proposed community governance reflected the interests and identities of the community. It also had to make certain that the arrangements were effective and convenient for the electors of that community.

Parish wards had to be contained within district wards and county electoral divisions; that is, parish wards could not cross principal council ward and/or division boundaries.

Further district-wide (stage two) consultation, as detailed in the Terms of Reference, would commence 4 March 2019 ending 31 May 2019. Stage two consultation would consider any submissions made on these draft recommendations, culminating in the provision of final recommendations for approval.

Final recommendations would be considered by Full Council on 23 July 2019, with any reorganisation order issued in August 2019.

Following consideration of the responses received, details of which were provided within the report, draft recommendations had been drawn up and were set out in Appendix 1 to the report. They contained a number of potential changes, including:-

- reducing the number of councillors on Arnside Parish Council from eleven to eight;
- the potential altering of the parish boundary of Kendal Town Council to include an area of proposed development of land north of High Sparrowmire;
- the potential altering of the parish boundary of Kendal Town Council to include properties on Natland Mill Beck Lane and The Beeches, and to include a small area of proposed development on land at Watercrock;
- abolishing the current wards of Dent and Cowgill and having Dent Parish Council as an un-warded parish;
- the creation of a new Parish which amalgamated the parish of Fawcett Forest with the parish of Whitwell and Selside to create the Parish of Selside;
- that the ward of Grange West be abolished and Grange Town Council be made up of two wards: Grange North and Grange South;
- changing the naming of the wards in Kirkby Ireleth Parish Council;
- altering the election cycle and reducing the number of councillors on Lower Allithwaite Parish Council;
- a number of boundary changes to the parish of Natland;
- altering the election cycle of Skelwith Parish Council to ensure that the elections were held on the same day as South Lakeland district elections for the ward of Ambleside and Grasmere; and
- reducing the number of councillors on Windermere Town Council from twenty to thirteen.

Council was being asked to consider and approve the recommendations for publication and for the second consultation stage, Stage 3 of the review to commence.

Councillor Brook moved the recommendations contained within the report and was seconded by Councillor Philip Dixon.

Councillor Andrew Jarvis raised concern with regard to the draft recommendation to reduce the number of councillors on Windermere Town Council from 20 to 13 due to a history of uncontested elections. He pointed out that there were currently 15 councillors on the Town Council and was of the opinion that a reduction in the number of councillors would be of a disadvantage to the people of the Town, as well as to the balance of membership of the Lake District National Park Authority, and lead to an increase in electoral inequality. Councillor David Williams, who attended meetings of Windermere Town Council, disagreed, believing that the current number of seats could never be filled. Councillor Brook explained that the recommendations were meant to precipitate exactly this type of conversation and that all representations would be taken into consideration in the second stage of the review prior to any decisions being made.

Councillor Dixon, having seconded the motion, commended the recommendations and expressed the District Council's gratitude for the work carried out by town and parish councillors.

RESOLVED – That

- (1) the consultation responses received to the first Stage 1 of the consultation be noted; and
- (2) the draft recommendations as set out in Appendix 1 to the report be approved for progression to the second consultation stage.

Note – In accordance with the Council's Constitution, Part 4, Rule 8 (Rules of Procedure), a motion to continue the meeting past 9.30 p.m., moved by Councillor Jonathan Brook and seconded by Councillor Kevin Lancaster, was carried.

C/60

EQUALITY, DIVERSITY AND INCLUSION STRATEGY

Councillor Giles Archibald, Leader and Promoting South Lakeland Portfolio Holder, introduced the report and moved the recommendations contained therein, stressing the importance for all to be treated equally, with fairness and respect.

The draft South Lakeland District Council Equalities, Diversity and Inclusion (EDI) Strategy 2019-22 attached as Appendix 1 to the report set out how the Council was meeting the requirements of the public sector equality duty under the Equality Act 2010. This included setting out specific equality objectives, as well as containing useful statistics about the Council's communities to illustrate the different needs of people in South Lakeland.

The draft EDI Strategy included definitions of the terms Equality, Diversity, and Inclusion. It was being recommended to adopt this updated terminology into the title of the new document, and for this document to supersede the current Equality Scheme 2016-19 which sat within the Council's Policy Framework.

It was also being proposed that the draft EDI Strategy would have its performance reviewed annually by the Overview and Scrutiny Committee. This would make it a dynamic document allowing responses to emerging needs, such as changing population or rates of digital inclusion.

The Overview and Scrutiny Committee had given to consideration to the report at its meeting on 26 October 2018 (Minute O&S/35 (2018/19) refers). Members had acknowledged the need to embed equality and diversity, not only within the organisation but throughout the community, as well as the need to seek potential ways of passing on its message. They had welcomed the new Strategy and in particular the opportunity for its annual review by the Overview and Scrutiny Committee. Cabinet, at its meeting on 28 November 2018, had endorsed the Strategy for recommendation to Council (CEX/63 (2018/19) refers).

Councillor Archibald was seconded by Councillor Philip Dixon.

RESOLVED – That Council be recommended to adopt the draft South Lakeland District Council Equality, Diversity and Inclusion Strategy 2019-2022 to replace the existing Equality Scheme within the Council's Policy Framework.

C/61 GOVERNANCE UPDATE

Councillor Stephen Coleman, Chairman of the Audit Committee, presented the results of the review of the Council's Local Code of Governance and Constitution carried out by the Audit Committee on 5 December 2018 (Minutes AUD/39 and AUD/41 (2018/19) refer).

The Audit Committee had considered proposed amendments to the Local Code of Governance to ensure that it met best practice. The proposed revised Local Code of Governance was set out at Appendix 1 to the report. The majority of amendments were to include behaviours and actions under all principles to which they applied. One additional measure had been added:-

D14: consider social value when preparing service plans, considering procurement and commissioning and monitoring performance.

Other amendments reflected changes to standards and guidance.

The Audit Committee had also considered proposed changes to the Council's Financial Procedure Rules and Contract Procedure Rules which formed part of the Council's Constitution. The proposed rules were set out at Appendices 2 and 3 to the report. The main changes were:-

- to extend the current virement rules for revenue budgets to Capital Programme and reserves;
- to clarify terminology and update references to other documents;
- to propose more delegation around the use of reserves. Under the current arrangements approval to use reserves was needed from Council as part of the final accounts process but there was not a Council meeting between the finalisation of the reserve movements and the approval of the accounts by Audit Committee;
- to clarify that the Monitoring Officer can agree it is not expedient to comply with certain contract requirements, such as signing under seal or the use of Council policies. This reflected the growing use of framework agreements where the terms and conditions to be used had already been agreed and would give the Council appropriate protection;
- to remove references to paper tenders - all tender documents were now submitted electronically.

The changes proposed would apply from the date of Council approval for the remainder of the current financial year and subsequent years.

Further amendment of the Constitution would be required to reflect changes to the Leadership structure and other changes to job titles. These changes would be included in the Monitoring Officer's review of the Constitution which was due to be presented to the March meeting of Council.

Councillor Coleman moved the recommendations contained within the report and was seconded by Councillor Matt Severn.

RESOLVED – That

(1) the review of the Local Code of Governance be noted and the proposed changes set out at Appendix 1 to the report be approved; and

(2) the review of the Constitution be noted and the proposed changes set out at Appendix 2 to the report be approved.

C/62

LEADER'S ANNOUNCEMENTS AND CABINET QUESTION TIME, INCLUDING THE COMPOSITE REPORT OF THE CABINET (1 HOUR MAXIMUM)

In introducing the Executive Reports (Mid-Year 2018/19), Councillor Giles Archibald, Leader and Promoting South Lakeland Portfolio Holder, informed Council that discussions had continued to take place between Members of Parliament, the Council and GSK regarding the forthcoming closure of its sterile injectables manufacturing unit at Ulverston. GSK remained committed to work with the community. There had been a proposal of a transfer of some land to the public sector on which to form new businesses and enterprises. GSK was also committed to job creation and assisting people in finding new work, as well as the apprentice programme. The Company had reconfirmed its commitment to support the new Leisure Centre at Ulverston to the tune of £2m. Councillor Archibald said that he continued to emphasise to GSK the Council's concern with regard to the effect of the closure on employees whose welfare was of the utmost priority.

Councillor Archibald spoke of the need for the Council to ensure that children were provided with safe walking and cycling paths to school and referred to the excellent example of the Masters Grange path in Kirkby Lonsdale. He asked Members to approach their local schools to find out if there was anything that the Council or other government tiers could do in order to assist.

Councillor Archibald announced the good news of the award of a £60,000 grant for the scheme of improvements to Millerground, money for which had already been earmarked within the Capital Programme. Millerground was an excellent example of partnership working with the community and the additional funding would help all aspirations to be met. Councillor Archibald expressed thanks to all involved in the work and in attracting the grant.

In accordance with paragraph 10.2 and 10.3 of the Council's Rules of Procedure, the following written questions had been submitted to the meeting:-

From Councillor Tracy Coward to Councillor Graham Vincent, Economy and Assets Portfolio Holder - *You often tell us of the strong South Lakeland economy. Could you please put this into a North West context?*

Councillor Vincent responded by saying that, last year, the Office for National Statistics had shown that South Lakeland had the biggest economy in Cumbria. New figures announced on the previous day had shown that South Lakeland was still the biggest economy, adding a further £21m. South Lakeland's economic partner, Barrow, once again showed strong growth. Barrow and South Lakeland were the only Cumbrian districts to have increased Gross Added Value, all of the others having decreased. However, South Lakeland's other economic partner's, Lancaster's, had grown by even more than South Lakeland. This had brought the Council's economic partnership into sixth place in the North West, behind Manchester, Cheshire East, Liverpool, Cheshire West and Chester and Trafford. Morecambe Bay was now an official grouping in the

Office for National Statistics charts. Morecambe Bay was establishing a strong economic position and continued to grow collectively and individually. It had prepared and distributed its prospectus and was in the final draft of its asks of the Government. This would require the Local Enterprise Partnerships of Cumbria and Lancashire to work together to support ambitions. South Lakeland had a position in the North West as a powerful economy. Although a further £0.5b increase in Gross Added Value was needed to move into fifth place, it was an aim.

From Councillor Eamonn Hennessy to Councillor Graham Vincent, Economy and Assets Portfolio Holder - *The Cumbria Local Enterprise Partnership has Advanced Manufacturing as one of their 3 main priorities. Is South Lakeland a contributor to this priority?*

Councillor Vincent explained that Advanced Manufacturing was the manufacture of products that required significant technical background and process control. South Lakeland and South Cumbria both had many significant Advanced Manufacturing companies, a number of which were leaders in their fields and, all together, provided the largest Advanced Manufacturing base in Cumbria:-

- James Cropper – technical fibre products;
- Anord-Mardix – switch gear and power distribution systems (500 employees);
- Gilbert Gilkes – hydro turbines (150 employees);
- Team – on-site pipe maintenance (100 employees in Cumbria);
- Kendal Nutricare – highly nutritious baby food (140 employees);
- Hollingsworth and Vose – global manufacture of filtration materia (50 employees);
- Billerud – renewable packaging for pharmaceutical industry (140 employees);
- Acrastyle – high voltage sub-station protection and controls (60 employees);
- Marle International – LED technology (100 employees);
- Oxley Group – LED technology (180 employees);
- Siemens Subsea – high specification sub-sea connections;
- Trittech – sonar specialists (60 employees); and
- GSK – antibiotics manufacturing (190 employees);

Councillor Vincent added that Barrow's economy was booming, centred around BAE Systems, with high performance engineering on site. Other Advanced Manufacturing included Gyro Data – steerable drilling systems. This list demonstrated that South Lakeland was big not only in tourism but also in Advanced Manufacturing.

From Councillor Kevin Lancaster to Councillor Giles Archibald, Leader and Promoting South Lakeland Portfolio Holder - *Some members will recall that some time ago I asked a question concerning Private Water Supplies in South Lakeland and the implementation of the EU Drinking Water directive. Those members will also recall that I received a dismissive and unhelpful response. The parish council in Garsdale, a ski instructor from Cautley and many others have since asked many questions and none has received what they considered to be a worthwhile answer. Tales of the actions of our sub-contractors feature regularly in every bar in the more remote valleys of the district as I am sure Cllr Mitchell will be able to confirm. One pensioner claims she was verbally threatened with imprisonment whilst another felt so intimidated that she needed my colleague Cllr Capstick to be present when the visit was conducted. No-one who has read any of the reports written by our contractor can be left in any doubt as to their poverty of argument. Four years have passed. How many of these reports have you read and is your administration proud of the way it has implemented the EU Drinking Water directive in this district?*

Councillor Dyan Jones, Environment Portfolio Holder, responded to the question, which fell within the remit of her portfolio. She explained that local authorities acted as the regulators for private water supplies and had a number of statutory duties under the Private Water Supplies Regulations. These Regulations placed a duty on local authorities to conduct a risk assessment of each private water supply within their area at least once every five years and to undertake monitoring in order to determine compliance with drinking water standards. Most importantly, the service protected the health of residents and visitors who consumed water from a private supply whilst living, working, or exploring South Lakeland. This was very important, as 10% of the local population relied on private water supplies and some 2.81 million visitors had stayed in hotels, bed and breakfasts, holiday cottages, camping and caravan sites and bunkhouses in 2017, many of which were on private water supplies. Councillor Jones found it difficult to believe the accusations contained in Councillor Lancaster's question and was not aware of any complaint having been made against the Council's contractor, about whom only positive feedback had been received. Councillor Jones took the opportunity to update members on South Lakeland's private water service and the essential protection to public health which it provided. South Lakeland had approximately 1,700 private water supplies, of which 690 were required to be Regulated. The Regulated supplies were those which served either commercial premises, or those which served more than one property. Single domestic supplies were exempt from the Regulations. The most recent Chief Drinking Water Inspector's (DWI's) report, published in August 2018, showed that South Lakeland had the largest number of private water supplies of any District Council in England and Wales, with only the unitary authorities of Cornwall, Herefordshire, Shropshire, Carmarthenshire and Powys having more. Since the last response to questions raised regarding this service, there had been a number of changes. The Private Water Supply 2009 Regulations had been superseded by the Private Water Supply (England) Regulations 2016, and the Private Water supply (Amendment) Regulations 2018. The Council had written to all residents and businesses within district whilst these Regulations had been in their consultation period in order to allow residents to respond to any concerns they may have directly to the Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs (DEFRA). The main changes imposed by these Regulations had been:-

- An increased consideration of radioactive and radiological substances which may be present in private water supplies – over the last three years the Council had carried out a survey of radon in private water supplies across the District and, as a result, has gained an exemption from the requirement for further monitoring – Councillor Jones understood that South Lakeland District Council was the only local authority in England and Wales to gain this exemption and this was important because the laboratory analysis cost for a radon sample alone was £90 and would increase to just over £100 in the New Year.
- A requirement to now serve enforcement notices in all situations where supplies fell short of minimum standards or where they failed to meet microbiological and chemical parameters when tested.
- Removal of the maximum fee which Local Authorities could previously charge in recognition that the time taken to bring many of these supplies up to minimum standards often far exceeded the limits previously set in 2009.
- Under the 2018 Amendment Regulations the Council was now required to sample for a much wider range - approximately 45 – of parameters set out in the Regulations for three years (in most cases three annual samples) and then, providing samples were below 30% of the maximum permitted concentration or value, the Council could exercise its discretion and cease sampling for them. This was a new additional resource demand and more time would be required to collect the samples. As the Council started to reduce parameters, it would need a method

of managing the sampling programme so that it knew which parameters were required at each of the premises from where samples were taken. The IT Group was currently helping the team develop a bespoke solution.

- In order to accommodate the additional sampling requirements and ensure that samples were transported in the correct temperature-controlled environment, the Council would be trialling the use of a temperature controlled vehicle in the first quarter of the new year.
- The 2018 Amendment Regulations also required local authority sampling officers to be United Kingdom Accreditation Service accredited – to assist local authorities, the Drinking Water Inspectorate was developing a local authority accreditation scheme and, once available, officers would become accredited.

In response to these changes, the Private Water Team had submitted evidence to the DWI that radioactive and radiological substances were not a significant risk to supplies within district, saving approximately £100 per water test to residents. Fees associated with the service still remained within the limits imposed by the 2009 Regulations, despite these limits having now been removed as requested by a number of Local Authorities. The fees charged were done so on a reasonable cost recovery basis to support the service which the Council delivered. Private water supply risk assessments had to be carried out by the local authority or those appointed by them and had to be carried out using a risk assessment tool produced by the DWI, which was part of DEFRA. The DWI was the competent authority for ensuring the Drinking Water Directive requirements were met in England and Wales. It provided independent reassurance that public water supplies in England and Wales were safe and that drinking water quality was acceptable to consumers and had a statutory role to act as technical advisors to local authorities in relation to the implementation of the Private Water Supplies Regulation. This included the provision of technical and scientific advice on all aspects of drinking water quality, including on private water supplies. The Inspectorate published an annual report on private water supplies in England and Wales. In February 2018, inspectors from the DWI had met with Council officers to discuss progress of its private water service. Although generally pleased with the progress made, and the visible improvements to supplies within district which they visited, Inspectors had felt that the service was under-resourced in order to undertake the rolling programme of risk assessments on supplies. A contractor had subsequently been identified and employed to support the work of the Council's officers. Any work submitted by the contractor, Watersense UK, was carefully reviewed by the Council's officers to ensure that it met the DWI requirements before it was passed to those responsible for the water supply. Additional resources to support this ongoing important public protection work for the future would be identified through the Customer Connect Programme. In response to the final part of the question, Councillor Jones informed Members that she would not generally see personal and property specific information contained in Risk Assessment reports unless directly approached by a resident to investigate a specific enquiry. Officers had implemented a complex series of Regulations which far exceeded the Regulatory requirement prior to 2009. The work they have undertaken had led to the improvement of a significant number of private water supplies within the district. They had implemented a charging regime which was fair, consistent with other similar sized local authorities, and focused on reasonable cost recovery. Councillor Jones concluded that, despite comments, she was proud of how the Council had implemented the requirements of the Regulations.

Councillor Lancaster was of the opinion that the response demonstrated that the Administration of the Council was not interested in the poor way in which its officers implemented the Private Water Supplies Regulations. He referred to the Council's commitment to the provision of affordable housing and asked Councillor Jones if she would agree that this commitment did not extend to affordable water?

Councillor Jones undertook to provide a written response.

From Councillor Doug Rathbone to Councillor Jonathan Brook, Deputy Leader and Housing, People and Innovation Portfolio Holder - *I have heard good things about our handyman scheme. Please would you describe some of its successes? How can Councillors and their Wards or Parishes tap into this valuable service?*

Councillor Brook responded, pointing out that, as indicated within his Executive Report, Handy Person scheme jobs were up by 48% and Disabled Facilities Grant completions up by 115% during 18/19. Occupational Therapist referrals had increased, as well as the number of approvals for jobs. The scheme was intended to help elderly or vulnerable householders carry out very simple, but essential, works at their homes. The labour was provided free-of-charge and the cost of items and materials paid for by the householder, unless these had been supplied to the scheme by a partner agency (as in the case of some security items). They were small jobs but with significant results. Types of jobs and the figures for those carried out in 2018/19 included:-

- Supply and Fit Grab Handle(s) (220);
- Supply and Fit Hand Rail(s) (147);
- Fit Key Safe (105);
- Fit Curtains/Pole/Rail/Blinds (61);
- Fit LED Light Bulb (50);
- Move/Assemble Furniture (49);
- Fit Hand/Grab Handle(s) - Customer Supplied (48);
- Replace Washers in Taps/Cisterns/Ball Valves (42);
- Replace Light Bulb/Fluorescent Tube/Lamp Shade (41);
- Repair Door(s)/Window(s) (37);
- Repair/Renew Light Fitting (28);
- Replace Sealant Around Sink/Bath (23);
- Fit Picture/Mirror, etc., to Wall (23);
- Repair/Fit Toilet Seat (23);
- Unblock Sink/Repair Minor Leak (15);
- Fit Passive Infrared Security Light(s) (14);
- Fit Door Lock (13); and
- Repair Gate/Fence/Path (11).

Councillor Brook said that, bearing in mind the demographic of the area and the concerns of elderly and the need to move towards lifetime homes, the Handy Person scheme had a significant and growing role to play in the safety and security of South Lakeland's residents and in the reduction in care costs. Councillor Brook explained how councillors could tap into the scheme through the Website or directly through the Housing Standards Team. He welcomed discussions with Members on how to publicise the scheme within individual wards, for example, in community centres.

The written questions having been presented and answered, the following verbal questions were taken from the floor:-

Councillor James Airey asked Councillor Andrew Jarvis, Finance Portfolio Holder, about the financial implications of the plans to build a hotel and leisure complex on the Glebe and whether the Council was not simply content with having offered up the Royalty within the Lake District National Park Local Plan?

Councillor Jarvis' understanding was that nobody had the right to build on the Glebe as there was a covenant on the property. He said that there had been no such discussions between officers, the Cabinet or the Lake District National Park Authority. There was no such intention, nor had it ever been the intention, and there was no such proposal in the Lake District National Park Local Plan.

Councillor Airey, as a supplementary question, asked whether officers had put the Glebe forward in the Plan without the knowledge of the Administration.

Councillor Jarvis responded by saying that since he had become a Member of the Cabinet, there had been no such proposal.

Councillor Giles Archibald, Leader and Promoting South Lakeland Portfolio Holder, pointed out that this was misinformation. He emphasised the fact that there was a covenant on the Glebe and that this had been pointed out at a recent meeting of the Cabinet. Councillor Archibald reminded Members that when he had become Leader of the Council he had extended an offer to all group leaders for early discussions on issues in order to pre-empt misinformation, however, explained that not all had taken up the opportunity.

Councillor David Williams referred to the Executive Report from Councillor Graham Vincent, Economy and Assets Portfolio Holder, and questioned the portfolio responsibility for the promotion of small businesses in both towns and rural areas, as well as Councillor Vincent's earlier mention of Gilkes as being a local Advanced Manufacturing company. He referred to a recent meeting of the Planning Committee at which Councillor Giles Archibald had spoken in opposition to a planning application for a gas fired electricity generation station at Old Hutton. At that meeting, a representative from Gilkes had addressed Members in support of the application due to the fact that the Company would be supplying the machinery and that this was a contract which was urgently needed. The Company had indicated that it was prepared to diversify its business to meet the contract.

Councillor Vincent informed the Council that, during talks, Gilkes had only expressed interest in battery storage which formed an element of previous application that had been refused by the Planning Committee, and not in wind turbines. He undertook to research the matter and to provide a response in writing. Councillor Giles Archibald, Leader and Promoting South Lakeland Portfolio Holder, added that the Council had always believed in sustainable growth, however, that he had spoken in object at the Planning Committee meeting due to a lack of mention of carbon footprint during the construction phase and the need for a reduction in greenhouse gases.

C/63

MINUTES OF MEETINGS

RESOLVED – That it be noted that no comments or question shave been received in respect of the minutes of committee meetings held between 17 September and 23 November 2018.

**C/64 QUESTIONS TO CHAIRMAN OF THE COUNCIL OR CHAIRMAN OF ANY
COMMITTEE OR SUB-COMMITTEE**

RESOLVED – That it be noted that no questions have been received under Rule 10.6 of the Council's Rules of Procedure.

The meeting ended at 10.10 p.m.