

## COUNCIL

WEDNESDAY, 25TH NOVEMBER, 2020, 6.00 PM

HYBRID MEETING - VIA MICROSOFT TEAMS AND SHIELD ROOM, CIVIC CENTRE, WEST PADDOCK, LEYLAND, PR25 1DH

### IMPORTANT INFORMATION – MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC

Unfortunately, due to the current situation surrounding COVID19 we are unable to allow Members of the Public to speak at this meeting, these measures are temporary and will be reviewed as circumstances and the current restrictions improve. However, written representations are being received and can be read out at the meeting with a written response provided. If you would like to make representations on any of the items below please email Democratic Services, [democraticservices@southribble.gov.uk](mailto:democraticservices@southribble.gov.uk) ideally before 12pm on Monday 23 November 2020. The meeting will be streamed live to YouTube and can be accessed by clicking [here](#).

### AGENDA

- |  |                 |
|--|-----------------|
| <b>1 Apologies for absence</b>   |                 |
| <b>2 Minutes of the last meeting 30 September 2020</b>   | (Pages 5 - 14)  |
| <b>3 Declarations of Interest</b>  |                 |
| <b>4 Mayors Announcements</b>  |                 |
| <b>5 Cabinet</b>   | (Pages 15 - 20) |
| To receive and consider the report of the Cabinet held on 14 October 2020 and 11 November 2020 attached.   |                 |
| <b>6 Governance Committee</b>  | (Pages 21 - 24) |
| To receive and consider the report of the Governance Committee held on 22 September 2020 attached.   |                 |
| <b>7 Scrutiny Committee</b>  | (Pages 25 - 30) |
| To receive and consider the report of the Scrutiny Committee, Scrutiny Budget and Performance Panel and associated Task Groups held on 22 October 2020 and 9 November 2020 attached. |                 |
| <b>8 Constitution Review</b>   |                 |
| Report of the Director of Governance to follow.  |                 |

<b>9 Urgent Decisions Taken Due to COVID-19 Pandemic</b>	(Pages 31 - 34)
Report of the Shared Services Lead – Scrutiny, Democratic and Electoral Services attached.	
<b>10 Fees and Charges Policy</b>	(Pages 35 - 44)
Report of the Deputy Director of Finance attached.	
<b>11 Review Of Car Parking</b>	(Pages 45 - 56)
Report of the Director of Development and Neighbourhoods attached.	
<b>12 Questions to the Leader of the Council</b>	
<b>13 Questions to Members of the Cabinet</b>	
<b>14 Questions to Chairs of Committees and My Neighbourhood Hubs</b>	
<b>15 Questions to Member Champions and Representatives on Outside Bodies</b>	
<b>16 Exclusion of the press and public</b>	
To consider the exclusion of the press and public for the following items of business on the ground that it involves the likely disclosure of exempt information as defined in Paragraph(s) 3, 4 and 5 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A to the Local Government Act 1972.	
Paragraph 3: Information relating to the financial or business affairs of any particular person (including the authority holding that information)	
Paragraph 4: Information relating to any consultation or negotiations, or contemplated consultations or negotiations, in connection with any labour relations matter arising between the authority or a Minister of the Crown and employees of, or office holders under the authority.	
Paragraph 5: Information in respect of which a claim to legal professional privilege could be maintained in legal proceedings.	
<b>17 Shared Services Phase 2</b>	(Pages 57 - 156)
Report of the Deputy Chief Executive attached.	
<b>18 Future of City Deal</b>	(To Follow)

Report of the Director of Planning and Property Services to follow.

Gary Hall  
INTERIM CHIEF EXECUTIVE

Electronic agendas sent to Members of the Council Councillors Jane Bell (Mayor), David Howarth (Deputy Mayor), John Rainsbury, Carol Chisholm, Will Adams, Jacky Alty, Renee Blow, Damian Bretherton, Aniela Bylinski Gelder, Matt Campbell, Colin Clark, Colin Coulton, Malcolm Donoghue, Bill Evans, James Flannery, Derek Forrest, Paul Foster, Mary Green, Michael Green, Harry Hancock, Jon Hesketh, Mick Higgins, Cliff Hughes, Susan Jones, Chris Lomax, Jim Marsh, Keith Martin, Christine Melia, Caroline Moon, Jacqui Mort, Peter Mullineaux, Alan Ogilvie, Colin Sharples, David Shaw, Margaret Smith, Phil Smith, David Suthers, Stephen Thurlbourn, Michael Titherington, Caleb Tomlinson, Matthew Tomlinson, Matthew Trafford, Angela Turner, Karen Walton, Ian Watkinson, Gareth Watson, Paul Wharton-Hardman, Carol Wooldridge and Barrie Yates

The minutes of this meeting will be available on the internet at [www.southribble.gov.uk](http://www.southribble.gov.uk)

Forthcoming Meetings

6.00 pm Wednesday, 27 January 2021 - Shield Room, Civic Centre, West Paddock, Leyland, PR25 1DH

This page is intentionally left blank

**MINUTES OF COUNCIL**

**MEETING DATE** **Wednesday, 30 September 2020**

**MEMBERS PRESENT:** Councillors Paul Foster, Renee Blow, Colin Sharples, Mary Green, Michael Green, Angela Turner, Alan Ogilvie, Jane Bell, Matt Campbell, Carol Chisholm, Colin Clark, Colin Coulton, Malcolm Donoghue, Bill Evans, James Flannery, Derek Forrest, Michael Titherington, Aniela Bylinski Gelder, Harry Hancock, Jacky Alty, Mick Higgins, David Howarth, Cliff Hughes, Susan Jones, Chris Lomax, Keith Martin, Damian Bretherton, Caroline Moon, Peter Mullineaux, Jon Hesketh, John Rainsbury, David Shaw, Margaret Smith, Phil Smith, David Suthers, Stephen Thurlbourn, Caleb Tomlinson, Matthew Tomlinson, Matthew Trafford, Christine Melia, Karen Walton, Ian Watkinson, Gareth Watson, Paul Wharton-Hardman, Will Adams and Carol Wooldridge

**OFFICERS:** Darren Cranshaw (Shared Services Lead - Democratic, Scrutiny & Electoral Services), Victoria Willett (Service Lead - Transformation and Partnerships), Gary Hall (Interim Chief Executive), Jonathan Noad (Director of Planning and Property), Chris Moister (Director of Governance), Chris Sinnott (Deputy Chief Executive), Coral Astbury (Democratic and Member Services Officer), Jennifer Mullin (Director of Neighbourhoods and Development) and Clare Gornall (Democratic and Member Services Officer)

**PUBLIC:** Jennifer Gadsdon (Birchall Blackburn Law) – Chair, Leyland Town Deal Advisory Board

**26 Apologies for absence**

Apologies were received from Councillors Mort and Marsh.

**27 Minutes of meeting Wednesday, 15 July 2020 of Council**

RESOLVED (unanimously):

That the minutes of the Council meeting held on 15 July 2020 be signed as a correct record by the Mayor.

**28 Minutes of meeting Wednesday, 22 July 2020 of Council**

RESOLVED (unanimously):

That the minutes of the Council meeting held on 22 July 2020 be signed as a correct record by the Mayor.

## **29 Declarations of Interest**

Councillor Green, as a Lancashire County Council Cabinet Member and Councillor Yates, as the Chair of the Development Control Committee at Lancashire County Council, declared a prejudicial interest in agenda item 22, Land Partnership with LCC.

## **30 Proposals for the Election of the Mayor**

It was moved by Councillor Foster, Leader of the Council, seconded by Councillor Jones JP, Cabinet Member for Environment and it was

RESOLVED (Unanimously):

That Councillor Jane Bell be elected as Mayor of South Ribble for 2020/2021 for an extended period until October 2021.

Councillor Bell signed the declaration of acceptance of office of Mayor and thanked Councillors for her appointment.

**Councillor Bell took the Chair.**

## **31 Proposals for the Election of the Deputy Mayor**

It was moved by Councillor Shaw, seconded by Councillor Blow and it was

RESOLVED: (Unanimously): That Councillor Howarth be elected as Deputy Mayor for South Ribble for 2020/21 for an extended period of office until October 2021.

Councillor Howarth signed the declaration of acceptance of office of Mayor and thanked councillors for his appointment.

## **32 Tributes to the retiring Mayor**

The Mayor thanked the Retiring Mayor, Councillor Harold Hancock, and his Mayoress, Marion Hancock, for their hard work as ambassadors for South Ribble during a challenging period of office due to the CO-VID19 pandemic.

Councillors Foster and Shaw also paid tribute to the Retiring Mayor and Mayoress particularly their work for the Mayoral Charities.

Councillor Hancock thanked councillors, his Retiring Mayoress, Marion Hancock, Mayor's Secretary, the Mayor's attendant and Mayor's Chaplain, Rev. John Maiden, for their support over his term of office.

### **33 Cabinet**

Members received the general report of the Cabinet relating to meetings held on 5 August 2020 and 16 September 2020. It was proposed by the Leader of the Council Councillor Paul Foster, seconded by the Deputy Leader of the Council, Councillor Mick Titherington, and subsequently

RESOLVED (Unanimously): That the report be noted.

### **34 Governance Committee**

Members received a general report on the Governance Committee meeting held on Monday, 24 August 2020. It was proposed by the Chair of the Governance Committee, Councillor Ian Watkinson, seconded by the Vice-Chair, Councillor Colin Sharples and subsequently

RESOLVED (Unanimously): That the report be noted.

### **35 Scrutiny Committee**

Members received a general report of the Scrutiny Budget and Performance Panel meetings held on 3 August 2020 and 14 September 2020.

It was proposed by the Chair of the Scrutiny Committee, Councillor David Howarth, seconded by Councillor Will Adams and subsequently

RESOLVED (Unanimously): That the report be noted.

### **36 Changes to Committee Appointments**

Council considered a report of the Assistant Director of Scrutiny and Democratic Services outlining a number of changes to the membership of various committees.

It was proposed by the Leader of the Council, Councillor Foster and the Deputy Leader of the Council, Councillor Titherington and it was

RESOLVED (unanimously):

1. That Councillor Harry Hancock replace Councillor David Shaw as a member of the Planning Committee.
2. That Councillor Mick Higgins replace Councillor Keith Martin as a member of the Planning Committee.
3. That Councillor Gareth Watson replace Councillor Cliff Hughes on the Planning Committee.
4. That Councillor Cliff Hughes replace Councillor Gareth Watson on the Licensing and Public Safety Committee.
5. That Councillor Keith Martin replace Councillor Mick Higgins on the Licensing and Public Safety Committee.

6. That Councillor Colin Sharples to be appointed Chair of the Leyland My Neighbourhood Community Hub and Councillor Jacky Alty its Vice-chair.
7. That Councillor Angela Turner to be appointed Chair of the Penwortham My Neighbourhood Community Hub and Councillor Keith Martin its Vice-chair.
8. That Councillor Harry Hancock to replace Councillor David Howarth as a member of the Member Development Steering Group.

### **37 Private Hire Vehicle Livery**

Council considered a report of the Shared Services Lead – Legal and Deputy Monitoring Officer outlining the results of a consultation exercise undertaken throughout January / February 2020 and of proposals to amend the Council's taxi licensing policy, which had been approved by the Licensing and Public Safety Committee on 10 March 2020.

It was moved by the Chair of Licensing and Public Safety Committee, Councillor Flannery, seconded by Councillor Rainsbury and was

RESOLVED (unanimously):

1. That the contents of the report be noted.
2. That the Council formally adopts the agreed proposals following the approval by the Licensing and Public Safety Committee on 10 March 2020.

### **38 Proposal of Annual Licensing of Vehicles**

Council considered a report of the Shared Services Lead Legal and Deputy Monitoring Officer which advised members of a proposal in respect of the annual licensing of vehicles and which had been approved by the Licensing and Public Safety Committee on 10 March 2020. The proposal was to amend the policy to issue vehicle plates on a 12 monthly cycle rather than every 6 months, which would proactively reduce the Council's carbon footprint, in the light of the Corporate Plan.

It was proposed by the Chair of the Licensing and Public Safety Committee, Councillor Flannery, seconded by Councillor Rainsbury and was

RESOLVED (unanimously):

1. That the contents of the report be noted.
2. That the Council formally adopts the agreed proposal as outlined in paragraph 7 of the report, following approval by the Licensing and Public Safety Committee on 10 March 2020.

### **39 South Ribble Corporate Strategy**

Council considered a report of the Deputy Chief Executive seeking approval for the Corporate Strategy 2020/21 – 2022/23.



Councillor Bylinski Gelder referred to the term 'Social Value' used in the Strategy and sought to clarify its meaning to the Council. She explained that the term was enshrined in law under the Social Value Act 2013 which enabled public services to consider social, environmental and economic benefits in respect of procurement, to help commissioners achieve greater value for money. Arising from further debate regarding social value, the Mayor stressed that 'social value' and 'value for money' were separate concepts. It was suggested that perhaps this may be a useful topic for a future member learning session.

It was moved by Councillor Foster, Leader of the Council, seconded by Councillor Titherington, Deputy Leader of the Council and it was

RESOLVED (unanimously):

That the Corporate Strategy 2020/21 – 2022/23 be approved.

#### **40 The Leyland Town Deal - Town Investment Plan**

Council considered a report of the Director of Planning and Property, presented by Councillor Evans, Cabinet Member for Planning, Regeneration and City Deal regarding the draft Leyland Town Investment Plan.

Councillor Evans invited Jennifer Gadsdon, Chair of the Leyland Town Deal Advisory Board, to address Council. Ms Gadsdon explained the Town Deal Fund represented a once in a lifetime opportunity to transform and establish an identity for Leyland City Centre through the three projects outlined in the report. She welcomed the support of Council to enable the redevelopment and vision of the area.

It was moved by Councillor Evans, Cabinet Member for Planning, Regeneration and City Deal, seconded by Councillor Foster, Leader of the Council and it was

RESOLVED (unanimously): –

1. That Council supports the draft Town Investment Plan.
2. That Council notes the timeline for submission and delegates Council support for the finalised Plan to its representatives on the Town Board.
3. That Council confirms that the budgets identified at section 30 to 34 of this report can be used as match as part of the wider programme in the Town Investment Plan.
4. That delegated authority is given to the Council's Director of Planning and Property and Section 151 Officer in consultation with the Leader to confirm the Council's final support on costs at the point of submission to Government.
5. That Council wishes the Leyland Town Board every success in their bid and subsequent negotiations with Government.

## 41 Questions to the Leader of the Council

Councillor Howarth asked a question in relation to the local government reorganisation of Lancashire proposed by Lancashire County Council's Cabinet. Councillor Foster referred to separate proposals which South Ribble Borough Council had already submitted which included a directly elected Mayor, and indicated that a government response was still awaited. However, Councillor Foster said he was able to confirm that South Ribble would not be included in the first tranche of local government reorganisation.

Councillor Adams, a member of the Business Recovery Post CO-VID19 Member Working Group, asked whether the government would provide additional funding for businesses in the light of expected further restrictions over the winter. Councillor Foster made reference to the fact that Councillor Adams was an NHS employee working in the frontline and conveyed his thanks to Councillor Adams and to all NHS staff, on behalf of the Council. Councillor Foster indicated that the Council had spent 100% of the government grant funding received so far and said that he hoped the Chancellor would make adequate funding available for businesses as the pandemic continues.

## 42 Questions to Members of the Cabinet

### Question to the Deputy Leader and Cabinet Member (Health, Wellbeing and Leisure)

Councillor Alan Ogilvie submitted the following written question to Councillor Titherington, Cabinet Member (Health, Wellbeing and Leisure) prior to the meeting:

I have received queries from residents about the recommencement of children's gymnastics classes at Leyland Leisure Centre. They are aware that Chorley Council has restarted these classes as have a number of private clubs. Please advise when children's gymnastics classes are due to recommence in Leyland?

Subsequently Councillor Titherington had provided the following written response:

Serco have responded by advising that they have been in touch with British Gymnastics and it is felt that the guidelines available do not present a viable class structure. There are no plans at present to recommence classes. Obviously, the circumstances are constantly under review.

Further to the above, Councillor Titherington stressed at the meeting that safety was of paramount importance. He indicated that he would provide any further updates on the issue to all Members.

### Question to the Cabinet Member for Finance, Property and Assets

Councillor P Smith asked a question as regards value for money in relation to the former McKenzie Arms site; for example, if a social rented house cost £153,000 to build, but the actual value of the property is only £100,000, this would have financial implications for the Council under the 'Right to Buy' Scheme. Councillor Tomlinson responded that the conditions attached to the land were prohibitive and that the

Council would not be able to profit from it until 2032. It was essentially a derelict site that that Council were unable to sell or use for its intended purpose. He said that he did feel the housing development represented value for money, and be a legacy that he would be proud of. He stressed that he supported council housing and was investigating all options available to ensure that the land would not be used under the Right to Buy Scheme.

### **Question to the Cabinet Member for Environment**

Councillor Ogilvie asked whether the 90 minute time restriction on Worden Park Car Park had now been implemented. Councillor Sue Jones JP explained that there had been a 12 month trial and a public consultation which had just finished. She indicated that she would be discussing the results of the consultation with the Leader of the Council and a report would be brought to Council in November.

## **43 Questions to Chairs of Committees and My Neighbourhood Areas**

### Questions to Chairs of My Neighbourhood Hubs

Councillor K Martin congratulated the new Chair of Penwortham My Neighbourhood Hub, Councillor Turner. As the ex-chair of the previous Neighbourhood Forum he also paid tribute to the members and officers who had supported him and particularly Sue Simpson.

### Questions to Chairs of Committees

Councillor Thurlbourn asked the Chair of the Governance Committee, Councillor Watkinson, if the utilities contractors could be invited back to the Committee to discuss if the Council's energy is 'green' and if it is getting the best value for money in terms of kilowatt hours and for that report to then be brought to Full Council. Councillor Watkinson asked that Councillor Thurlbourn submit the request in writing for him to consider and take forward.

Councillor Adams asked the Chair of Planning Committee, Councillor C Tomlinson, if he and the Cabinet Member for City Deal, Planning and Regeneration would engage with central government and developers to ensure that whilst the borough welcomes house building, development must also build and support sustainable communities. Councillor C Tomlinson confirmed that this was the case and that they would ensure developers put the needs of communities at the heart of development.

Councillor Walton asked Councillor Sharples, Chair of the Leyland Neighbourhood Hub, when the next meeting would be. Councillor Sharples responded that he would be speaking the newly appointed Neighbourhood Hub officers to arrange a meeting and that he would let Councillor Walton know the date.

## **44 Questions to Member Champions and Representatives on Outside Bodies**

### Questions to Member Champions and Representatives on Outside Bodies

There were none.

#### **45 Exclusion of Press and Public**

It was moved by Councillor Foster, seconded by Councillor Evans and  
RESOLVED:

That the press and public be excluded from the meeting during consideration of the following items of business as it involved the disclosure of information defined as exempt from publication under paragraphs 3 and 4 of schedule 12A of the Local Government Act 1972.

*Paragraph 3 – Information relating to the financial or business affairs of a third party, including the authority holding that information; and*

*Paragraph 4 – Information relating to any consultations or negotiations, or contemplated consultations and negotiations, in connection with any labour relations matter arising between the authority or Minister of the Crown or the employees of, or officer holders under, the authority.*

#### **46 Proposals for a New Grade Structure and Travel Benefits**

Council considered a report of the Deputy Chief Executive setting out proposals to create a new grade structure for shared services and adopt a shared approach to job evaluation. The report also included proposals for new travel benefits for shared services as the final element of the terms of conditions.

It was moved by the Leader of the Council, Councillor Foster, seconded by the Deputy Leader of the Council, Councillor Titherington and was

RESOLVED (unanimously):

That recommendations 3, 4, 5, 6 and 7 of the confidential report be approved.

**Councillors Green and Yates declared a prejudicial interest in the following item and left the meeting.**

#### **47 Land Partnership with LCC**

Council considered a report of the Director of Planning and Property seeking approval for a budget to take forward a potential project on Lancashire County Council land.

It was moved by Deputy Leader of the Council, Councillor Titherington, seconded by the Leader of the Council, Councillor Foster and was

RESOLVED (unanimously): –

That recommendations 3, 4 and 5 of the confidential report be approved.

Chair

Date

This page is intentionally left blank

## **Report of Cabinet**

1. Any Cabinet recommendations on the reports that require a decision by full Council appear as separate items on the agenda.

## **GENERAL REPORT OF THE MEETING OF CABINET HELD ON WEDNESDAY 14 OCTOBER 2020**

### **Proposed Leisure Facilities Strategy for South Ribble**

2. Cabinet adopted the new South Ribble Leisure Facilities Strategy as a key document that will help deliver a sustainable future for public Leisure Facilities in the Borough. Cabinet also requested that officers bring back to Cabinet and Council further reports outlining in detail how the new Leisure Facilities Strategy will be delivered including future management arrangements for the Leisure Centres.
3. The Strategy outlined a vision for future Leisure Facilities in the borough that was sustainable and fully contributed to the wider aspirations and ambitions of the Council's Corporate Plan, notably in the areas of Health and Wellbeing, tackling Health Inequalities and Community Development.

### **South Ribble Playing Pitch Hub**

4. Cabinet approved the development of the Playing Pitch Hub project to be located at Bamber Bridge Leisure Centre in line with the budget allocated within the Council's Capital programme. It also approved the submission of a Football Foundation bid for the Playing Pitch Hub project in January or April 2021 with the objective of obtaining partnership funding for the project. Finally, Cabinet made the necessary authorisation and issued instructions to officers to carry out a procurement exercise for the building work of the playing pitch hub, to bring back a report on the final business plan for the project with site plan and costings, and to bring back a report for decision on the award of a construction contract.
5. The Playing Pitch Strategy outlined a strategic approach to ensuring the future provision of outdoor playing pitches meets local community needs against a background of projected housing growth. The Playing Pitch Strategy identified a shortfall of two full size 3rd Generation (3G) football pitches in the Borough. This decision was about developing a project to provide those two 3G pitches, along with the refurbishment of Bamber Bridge Leisure Centre and building the necessary ancillary facilities to support the project.

### **Refurbishment of Hurst Grange Park Coach House, Penwortham**

6. Cabinet granted permission to spend the allocated capital budget of £732,732 for the Refurbishment of Hurst Grange Coach House and the associated project activities; and awarded the contract for the building works.
7. The Hurst Grange Coach House project had been progressing over a number of years and was considered at Full Council in July 2020 where the go ahead was

given for the acceptance of the grant from the National Lottery Heritage Fund and to progress an open tender process to identify a preferred bidder.

### **Refurbishment of Playgrounds at Hurst Grange Park, Penwortham & Bellis Way, Walton-Le-Dale**

8. Cabinet granted permission to spend the allocated £225,000 capital budget for the Refurbishment of Hurst Grange Park Playground; awarded the contract for the refurbishment of Hurst Grange Park Playground; and agreed to spend the allocated £30,000 capital budget for the refurbishment of Bellis Way Playground, increased to a maximum of £60,000 subject to a successful external funding bid by the Friends of Bellis Way Playground.
9. The current capital programme included a number of play areas identified for improvement. Hurst Grange Park and Bellis Way Playgrounds had funds allocated in this financial year and bids were invited on a design and build basis.

### **Volunteering Policy and Framework**

10. Cabinet agreed to approve and implement the policies “Volunteering with the Council” and “Employee Volunteering”. The former provided a standard and clear framework to recruit, retain and support volunteering with the Council. The latter set out the framework for how the Council will enable its own employees to volunteer.

### **Parks Capital Projects**

11. Cabinet agreed to grant permission to spend the allocated capital budget of £10,000 for building conservation works to the icehouse front façade and thanked the Trustees of the Worden Estate for their kind offer of funding towards the cost of a new icehouse door and their continuing interest in the park. Permission was granted to spend the allocated capital budget of £30,000 for the completion of the new Arboretum and to spend the allocated capital budget of £25,000 for the replacement of a drainage culvert at Hurst Grange Park, Penwortham.
12. The decision was part of the current capital programme which included a number of proposed improvements within the borough’s parks and open spaces to maintain their quality and safety.

### **Extension of Public Space Protection Orders**

13. Cabinet delegated authority to the Director of Neighbourhoods & Development in consultation with the portfolio holder for the Environment to decide whether to renew the relevant PSPOs for a further three years, subject to consideration of the consultation responses received.
14. In November 2017 the Council adopted a series of Public Space Protection Orders (PSPOs) which replaced the Dog Control Orders previously adopted by



the Council in September 2009. There was a legal requirement for the Council to renew the PSPOs every three years.

### **South Ribble Prevention Zone Framework**

15. Cabinet approved the South Ribble updated local prevention zone framework, which set out how the Council will work with partners, businesses and the public at a local level to prevent, contain and manage outbreaks. Successful local management will break the chains of COVID-19 transmission to enable people to return to and maintain a more normal way of life.

### **Options for Council rebrand**

16. Cabinet agreed the logo options for consultation and that the feedback and any amendments to the logo options be brought back to Cabinet for final approval. The principle of refreshing the council's logo had already been agreed. Given the changes that were being proposed it was felt it was important to get further feedback from residents, staff and members on the changes to inform the final design of the corporate logo.

### **Corporate Performance Framework Review**

17. Cabinet approved the Corporate Performance Framework as a shared policy document. The policy will ensure that the Council has an up-to-date and robust approach to performance management that can consistently and effectively respond to the needs of each authority across shared services. Effective performance management is vital for improving outcomes for our communities as it provides a key mechanism for continuous service improvement and excellence.

### **Shared Services Phase 1 Service Reviews**

18. Cabinet approved the recommendations for Shared Services Phase 1 Reviews which included proposals for restructures, alongside action plans focusing on aligning key systems and processes.

## **GENERAL REPORT OF THE MEETING OF CABINET HELD ON WEDNESDAY 11 NOVEMBER 2020**

### **Corporate Strategy Position Statement – Quarter 2, 2020/21**

19. Cabinet considered a position statement for the newly approved Corporate Strategy for Quarter 2 (July – September) 2020/21, providing update on the 14 projects and 24 performance measures.
20. Cabinet thanked the Scrutiny Budget and Performance Panel for its detailed scrutiny of the report and accepted the recommendations. It welcomed the report and looked forward to the next report when more data will be available to measure against the newly approved Corporate Strategy.

### **Decision on new council logo and brand**

21. Cabinet approved that the new logo and agreed that the logo be introduced in line with the launch of the new website in January 2021.
22. The changes as outlined below were made were based on the feedback from the options that went out to consultation:
  - We created a simplified rose, which fits in with the style of the logo better and is based on the rose within the traditional South Ribble crest
  - We adjusted the blue font colour so it was slightly darker and matched better with the shade of red used for the rose
  - We softened the outline of the shield to make it look like the words and image belong together a bit better and to move away from comments that it was like a football club/school badge crest

### **Budget Monitoring 2020-21 Quarter 2**

23. The Cabinet thanked Scrutiny Budget and Performance Panel for its detailed scrutiny of the report and accepted the recommendations made at its meeting on 9 November 2020. It also noted the report and agreed that the re-profiled budgets for the capital programme, which reflects forecasted underspend against the existing budgets, be approved.
24. The Cabinet Member indicated that the financial details regarding funding in relation to the COVID-19 pandemic would in future be the subject of a separate report, which he expected early in the new year.

### **Community Wealth Building Action Plan**

Cabinet approved the following:

1. That Cabinet endorses the Community Wealth Building Action Plan;

2. That Cabinet asks the Deputy Chief Executive to prepare a delivery plan covering the period to March 2022 including resources to deliver the actions; the delivery plan to be considered by Cabinet in January 2021;
  3. That further engagement with the business sector be undertaken which will be reported to Cabinet in January 2021 and will feed into the delivery plan to be considered at that meeting;
  4. That the delivery plan above be considered as part of the emerging budget for 2021/22;
  5. That a Member Learning Hour on Community Wealth Building be held prior to the Cabinet meeting in January 2021.
25. As evidenced in the new Corporate Plan and Community Strategy, the Council has an ambition and vision for Economic Development activity to be undertaken in a cooperative way involving a range of public, commercial and social sector partners and residents of the Borough. It also has the ambition that all activities undertaken by these partners should bring maximum local economic, social, democratic, cultural and environmental benefit for South Ribble and its residents.

#### **Award of Contract for St Gerard's Football Pitch Project**

26. Cabinet granted permission to spend the remaining allocated capital budget for the building of a new grass football pitch and car park at St Gerard's Football Club and to award the contract for the building works to the Preferred Bidder.
27. The St Gerard's project relates to a specific S106 amount of funding available for the development of a new football pitch at the club. The money has been built into the Council's capital programme. As part of the green links programme the project was also highlighted in a report to Cabinet in June 2019. We reached the stage of requesting Cabinet to award the contract to allow works to begin.

COUNCILLOR PAUL FOSTER  
LEADER OF THE COUNCIL

This page is intentionally left blank

## **Report of the Governance Committee**

1. Any Governance recommendations on the reports that require a decision by full Council appear as separate items on the agenda.

## **GENERAL REPORT OF THE MEETING HELD ON TUESDAY 22 SEPTEMBER 2020**

### **External Auditor 2018-19 Update**

2. The committee received a verbal report from the Council's External Auditor, Grant Thornton on the progress of the 2018-2019 Audit.
3. The committee were advised that good progress had been made and the auditors were looking to finish testing within the next couple of weeks. The auditors were looking to complete the Value for Money assessment during October and would be bringing in specialist support from within
4. After a member enquiry, the external auditor confirmed that they would produce a letter containing detailed information on the timescales for finalising the 2018/2019 audit and to update the committee on the progress made with the Value for Money audit. This would be sent to Officers for circulation prior to the next meeting.

### **External Audit 2019-20 Audit Plan**

5. The External Auditor's reported that the Audit had identified five significant risks. Of these risks a few were typical of local authorities, such as valuation of lands/buildings and pension fund liabilities. Management override of control is also another typical risk, however due to the circumstances experienced within the authority over the past year, the auditors would be increasing their scrutiny in this area.
6. The committee noted that the audit on Vale for Money would consist of two areas of focus. The External Auditors were now examining the governance arrangements of the Council, as the work of Internal Audit was complete. Time would be spent corroborating the findings within the reports and resource would be brought in from the Auditor's forensics team.

### **Treasury Management Annual Report 2019/20 and June Quarter Monitoring 2020/21**

7. The Committee considered a report of the Deputy Director of Finance and Section 151 Officer which presented the outturn for Treasury Management activity for the financial year 2019/20 and monitoring information in respect of the first quarter of 2020/21.
8. It was reported that the Council had also borrowed money at the start of lockdown, in order to ensure cashflow for any unexpected expenditure, in order to avoid the possibility of entering a large unarranged overdraft.

However, once support had been given from the Government, the money had been moved to an account which provided interest. In response to a member enquiry, it was confirmed that the authority had borrowed £10 Million in late March 2020 and paid this back in June 2020, with a 2% interest charge.

9. Members were further advised that there had been two instances in the year in which counterparty limits were inadvertently breached. In neither instance was there any substantive increase in the Council's exposure to risk, nor any financial loss.
10. The Committee expressed disappointment that the counterparty limits were breached and sought clarity on how the processes may be strengthened, in order to avoid the situation reoccurring in the future. It was explained that the procedures had been considered and an additional check had now been added to the process to ensure that the checks would be made on existing borrowing.

### **Internal Audit Plan 2020-21**

11. The committee received a report from the Director of Governance and Monitoring Officer which sought to inform members of the proposed Internal Audit Plan 2020-21 and of changes to the Internal Audit Service.
12. The committee noted that there had been circumstances that had impacted on the progress of the Internal Audit work for the year. As a result of COVID, members of the team had been seconded to the community hub, which limited their ability to undertake Internal Audit.
13. The capacity of the Internal Audit team had also been reduced with the temporary service lead having left the Authority. A proposed new structure had been presented to the Shared Services Joint Committee (SSJC) and proposed appointing a re-established shared service lead and the introduction of a senior auditor. Subject to consultation, Officers were expecting these proposals to be approved in the beginning of October.
14. The committee requested a schedule of the high-risk audits be provided outside of the meeting for consideration.

### **AGS Action Plan – Update**

15. The Committee received a report of the Director of Governance and Monitoring Officer which sought to update members on the progress made on the implementation of the approved Annual Governance Statement.
16. Members were advised that a lengthy action plan arose from the Annual Governance Statement, and progress had been made with most actions with a majority being delivered. The risk management and policy framework had been reviewed, with the responsibility for the corporate risk register being placed with the Transformation and Partnerships service. Training on ethical

governance had also been provided to members and had been well attended, this would be organised for Officers moving forwards.

17. The Director of Governance advised members, following an enquiry, that the corporate risk register had been placed within the Transformation and Partnerships Service due to their responsibility for overseeing the Council's corporate priorities. This was in line with practice at other local authorities.

18. Although significant progress had been made, there was still actions which required more work, such as the review of the constitution. Although this had largely been completed it still required consideration by the Governance Committee Constitutional Task Group.

COUNCILLOR IAN WATKINSON  
CHAIR OF THE GOVERNANCE COMMITTEE

CA

This page is intentionally left blank



## Report of Scrutiny Committee

1. This report summarises the business considered at the meetings of the Scrutiny Committee held on 22 October 2020 and the Scrutiny Budget and Performance Panel held on 9 November 2020.

## SCRUTINY COMMITTEE – 22 OCTOBER

### Community Wealth Building Action Plan

2. The Cabinet Member for Community Engagement, Social Justice and Wealth Building, Councillor Aniela Bylinski Gelder, and the Director of Planning and Property, Jonathan Noad, presented the South Ribble Community Wealth Building Action Plan to the Committee.
3. We were also joined by the independent Policy Advisor, Matthew Baqueriza-Jackson.
4. We initially sought assurance that the proposals were realistic for a shire district like South Ribble compared to cities and unitary authorities but confidence in the delivery of benefits in South Ribble was expressed.
5. Examples of other local authorities which had successfully implemented similar Wealth Building Action Plans were provided and further information can be found on the Centre for Local Economic Strategies website.
6. In response to a query regarding the evidence base for the Action Plan, we were informed that a core officer group had been established in the Council's Economic Development department and consultation had been undertaken with South Ribble Partnership.
7. However, we were disappointed that the report and draft action plan did not include engagement with businesses and business organisations. Assurances were provided, however, that officers would meet with local businesses to discuss the Action Plan in early November and we recommended that corporate organisations such as the Federation of Small Businesses, the Chamber of Commerce and the Institute of Directors, also be consulted.
8. We also queried how the success of the Action Plan would be measured and were informed that a Social Value Monitoring Officer would be employed to oversee progress and observance by businesses and employers. A social value portal would also provide ready-made indicators for success.
9. We also look forward to performance measures being developed as part of the implementation plan.
10. We expressed some concern over the abilities of small businesses to commit to the social values of the Action Plan but were assured that the report would recommend that the values only apply to tenders over £30,000.
11. We also recommended that more explicit links between the Action Plan and the Community Strategy and Health and Wellbeing Strategy be made.

12. We welcomed suggestions of using case studies of social value work and the Action Plan on the Council's online channels to communicate and promote community wealth-building in a user-friendly and understandable way.
13. It was suggested that, owing to the implicative and novel nature of the Action Plan, the report should be considered by Full Council. The Cabinet Member and officers were receptive to this recommendation and confirmed that this could be included in the Cabinet's resolution if appropriate.
14. A Member Briefing could also be held to ensure that the proposals are sufficiently communicated to all members.
15. We questioned the reference to 'socially-just use of land' and how this could be practiced in South Ribble. It was explained in response that the Council could utilise land previously inaccessible to residents for different uses, such as community and health benefits. We requested further information on land owned by the Council.
16. In response to a question regarding the benefits of the Action Plan for residents, it was explained that more opportunities would be available and spending power would be concentrated for residents of South Ribble.
17. We anticipate a progress report on the action plan as part of the performance monitoring report.
18. We noted the report and thanked the Cabinet Member, the Director of Planning and Property and the Policy Advisor for their attendance.

### **Scrutiny Portfolio Update: Community Engagement, Social Justice and Wealth Building**

19. The Cabinet Member for Community Engagement, Social Justice and Wealth-Building, Councillor Aniela Bylinski Gelder, and the Directors of Customer and Digital, Paul Hussey; Neighbourhoods and Development, Jennifer Mullin; and Planning and Property, Jonathan Noad, presented an update on the work of the portfolio since May 2019.
20. The Cabinet Member highlighted some of her key achievements and we commended the work of the portfolio since its creation last year.
21. We also praised the Council's response to the COVID-19 pandemic and support provided to residents, businesses and communities.
22. We queried the wide-reaching breadth of the portfolio and its appropriacy, but we were assured that the different areas of the portfolio link well together and underpin the practices of care for South Ribble residents.
23. In response to a query regarding learning from customer complaints, members were informed that complaints are thoroughly investigated with learning shared with the relevant department and regular training sessions for Gateway staff.
24. We sought clarification on the term 'channel shift' and how residents who cannot access services electronically can still engage with the council. 'Channel shift' was defined as the move from traditional methods of engagement to informal means such as social media and live chat. We were assured, however, that traditional methods of communication would remain available for residents who could not access services

digitally and that extensive training would be held for the public. Further information on this would be available in due course.

25. We were also pleased that work on the Council's new website was in the advanced stages and a beta version would be available for members to test before Christmas 2020.
26. We discussed the delivery of the portfolio's projects and officers expressed confidence in the current capacity of staff.
27. We questioned the decision-making and budgetary powers of the new My Neighbourhood Hubs and were informed that the models were still in development. It was hoped that decision-making would be more autonomous and Individual budgets would be allocated to each Hub with the option of applying for additional funding from a central budget consisting of £20,000 for larger-scale projects.
28. We welcomed assurances that further development of the My Neighbourhood Hubs would take place in early 2021 and that this was a key priority for the portfolio moving forwards, in addition to implementing the Community Wealth Building Action Plan.
29. We thanked the Cabinet Member and the Directors of Customer and Digital, Neighbourhoods and Development and Planning and Property for their attendance and wished the Cabinet Member well with her portfolio priorities moving forwards.

### **Worden Hall Progress Update**

30. The Cabinet Member for Finance, Property and Assets, Councillor Matthew Tomlinson, and the Assistant Director of Projects and Development, Neil Anderson, presented an update on the progress of the Worden Hall project.
31. We sought clarification on the expected cost of the project and were informed that £2.17 million had been reserved for the project. This sum also included cover for any contingencies.
32. We queried if the Hall would retain its name following completion of works and were assured, in response, that the matter had not been discussed and that there was no intention to change it.
33. We were pleased to note that the project was expected to be completed in the next financial year and acknowledged the major works being undertaken.
34. We questioned the decision to extend the current car park site at Worden Park as opposed to creating a separate provision and were informed that the original plans would have meant cutting down trees which was felt to contradict the administration's green agenda.
35. We were also pleased to note that the car park would comply with the Disability Discrimination Act (DDA) to include disabled parking provisions and further information on the number of parking spaces within the extended car park was requested.
36. A planning application for the project was likely to have been submitted for consideration by the Planning Committee by the next meeting of the Scrutiny Budget and Performance Panel and we looked forward to receiving a further progress update then.

37. We thanked the Cabinet Member and the Assistant Director of Projects and Development for their attendance.

## **SCRUTINY BUDGET AND PERFORMANCE PANEL – 9 NOVEMBER 2020**

### **Period 2 Quarterly Performance Monitoring Report 2020/21**

38. The Leader of the Council, Councillor Paul Foster, the Interim Chief Executive, Gary Hall, and the Shared Services Lead for Partnerships and Transformation, Vicky Willett, presented a report on the performance of the Council's Corporate Plan at the end of period 2.
39. The report set out the performance between June and September 2020 against the delivery of the Corporate Plan projects and objectives.
40. We were pleased that 8 out of 14 of projects were on-track.
41. We queried how the link between projects and priorities could be strengthened and were informed that all projects were scoped to ensure clarity and a more streamlined approach. However, we welcomed the suggestion that the project mandates could be supplied to Panel members to provide further detail.
42. We noted the period of change for the Council and queried other methods of transformation besides Shared Services. We also requested that organisational development be looked at in more detail at a future meeting.
43. In response to our questions, we were provided with an overview of the work of the South Ribble Together Community Hub and the Holiday Hunger Scheme and any financial implications for the Council.
44. We also discussed the mental health support for youth project and queried the timescales for the delivery of this. In response, we were assured that development would progress quickly in 2021 and that other support networks and mechanism were in place in the meantime.
45. We were pleased to note that the support programme would be offered to those aged up to 24 years but asked that the timeframes involved the delivery of the programme be reviewed.
46. With regards to the percentage of 16 and 17-year-olds not in education, employment or training (NEET), we were assured that several Council initiatives such as the Apprentice Factory and partnerships with schools and local businesses were in place to improve access to opportunities for young people.
47. We noted the report and thanked the Leader, Interim Chief Executive and Shared Services Lead for Partnerships and Transformation for their attendance.

### **South Ribble Corporate Framework Review**

48. The Leader of the Council, Councillor Paul Foster, and the Shared Services Lead – Partnerships and Transformation, Vicky Willett, presented a report on the outcomes of a review into the Council's Corporate Performance Framework.

49. We requested that performance information on other Council services, such as missed bin collections, be more explicitly reflected in the Framework and were advised that detailed breakdowns of performance in each service could be provided to the Panel to allow us to decide what to assess further.
50. We also queried the accuracy and reliability of the data and were informed that all performance measures were subject to a robust review process.
51. We noted the report and thanked the Leader and Shared Services Lead for Transformation and Partnerships for their attendance.

## **Budget Monitoring 2020-21 Quarter 2**

52. The Cabinet Member for Finance, Property and Assets, Councillor Matthew Tomlinson, and the Section 151 Officer, James Thomson, presented a report on the performance of the budget outturn at the end of Quarter 2.
53. Discussion largely focused on the impact of the COVID-19 pandemic and we questioned the current budgetary implications of support provided by the council. In response, we were advised that the situation was superfluous but that £20 million had been provided to support businesses during the initial lockdown earlier in the year and additional funding from central government was anticipated to cover the second lockdown period.
54. We welcomed the Cabinet Member's suggestion of incorporating all COVID-19-related financial information into one report in the interests of transparency and ease of monitoring.
55. We queried how the savings target of £187,000 identified in the report would be achieved. This figure was noted as target savings from Shared Services but we were informed that, due to issues in Human Resources, these savings would not be met. A report detailing proposals for further savings would be considered at the next Full Council meeting.
56. We wondered if a further cut could be made to the garden waste charges as the income was more than expected but were advised that, although the reduced charge had led to an increase in subscriptions, the Cabinet Member was confident in the appropriacy of the current £25 fee.
57. Similarly, we noted a deficit in income from court summons and were informed that this was a result of courts being closed due to the pandemic but also because of the need for sensitivity and compassion during the COVID-19 outbreak.
58. Discussion largely focused on staff vacancies and the progress of recruiting a second Enforcement Officer and Head of Licensing was queried. We also questioned whether the Museum Curator would be replaced following his retirement earlier this year.
59. We also sought assurances on the number of vacancies within the Governance directorate. Although some concern was acknowledged, it was felt that there was no impact on ability to deliver services.

60. With regards to the review of reserves, work is still ongoing, and we look forward to learning the results of the review as part of next year's budget process.
61. We were also pleased to note the Cabinet Member's confidence in the current delivery of the capital programme.
62. We noted the report and thanked the Cabinet Member and the Section 151 Officer for their attendance.

**Recommendation(s)**

That Council note the report.

COUNCILLOR DAVID HOWARTH  
CHAIR OF THE SCRUTINY COMMITTEE  
CL

REPORT TO	ON
COUNCIL	Wednesday, 25 November 2020



TITLE	PORTFOLIO	REPORT OF
Urgent Decisions Taken Due to COVID-19 Pandemic	Leader of the Council	Shared Services Lead – Democratic, Scrutiny & Electoral Services

Is this report confidential?	No
------------------------------	----

## PURPOSE OF THE REPORT

1. To formally report to Council on the urgent decisions taken in accordance with the Council's constitution due to the COVID-19 pandemic.

## PORTFOLIO RECOMMENDATIONS

2. Council is asked to note the report.

## REASONS FOR THE DECISION

3. To ensure the Council is made aware of the urgent decisions taken in accordance with the Council's constitution.

## CORPORATE OUTCOMES

4. The report relates to the following corporate priorities: (tick all those applicable):

An exemplary Council	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Thriving communities	<input type="checkbox"/>
A fair local economy that works for everyone	<input type="checkbox"/>
Good homes, green spaces, healthy places	<input type="checkbox"/>

## BACKGROUND TO THE REPORT

5. Due to the COVID-19 pandemic the Council was required to cancel all Member meetings. It was therefore necessary to use the urgent decision procedure in accordance with Standing Order 35 of the Council's Constitution. Whilst hybrid meetings have been taking place some urgent decisions have been required primarily linked with the pandemic.
6. The constitution allows for urgent decisions to be taken by the Chief Executive in consultation with the Leader/relevant Cabinet Member.
7. Additionally it was decided that the Scrutiny Chair should confirm that he was satisfied that there was genuine urgency before any urgent decision was taken (rather than just where decisions might be outside the budget or policy framework as required in the constitution).
8. Urgent decisions were only taken where this was absolutely necessary and where possible advance notice was provided that the decision was to be taken in the weekly update sent to all Members.
9. In order to provide full transparency the decision reports and notices were published on the Council's website.

## PROPOSALS

10. Council is asked to note the following urgent decisions, which were taken in accordance with the Council's constitution:

13 July 2020	To depart from its published age policy and continue to license a vehicle which expires due to age during the COVID19 lockdown
31 July 2020	Adoption of the proposed Pavement Licensing Policy Business and Planning Act 2020
13 August 2020	Town Deal Forward Funding
26 August 2020	COVID19 Response Discretionary Business Grants
28 September 2020	Test and Trace Support Payment of £500
13 October 2020	Pearson House, Station Road, Bamber Bridge – additional expenditure
18 October 2020	Discretionary Test and Trace Support Payment of £500
3 November 2020	COVID19 Local Restrictions Support Grant
13 November 2020	To allow Medical Certificates to be issued by General Practitioners other than the Hackney Carriage & Private Hire Drivers' own GP

A copy of the reports and decision notices were published when the urgent decisions were taken and are available by following this weblink:



## **CONSULTATION CARRIED OUT AND OUTCOME OF CONSULTATION**

11. Consultation details were included in the individual urgent decision reports considered.

## **ALTERNATIVE OPTIONS CONSIDERED AND REJECTED**

12. Not applicable to this report. Alternative options were included in the individual urgent decision reports considered.

## **AIR QUALITY IMPLICATIONS**

13. None as a result of this report. Implications were included in the individual urgent decision reports considered.

## **RISK MANAGEMENT**

14. None as a result of this report. Risk issues were included in the individual urgent decision reports considered.

## **EQUALITY AND DIVERSITY IMPACT**

15. None as a result of this report. Equality and diversity impact was included in the individual urgent decision reports considered.

## **COMMENTS OF THE STATUTORY FINANCE OFFICER**

16. This report informs Council of the urgent decisions taken. Statutory Finance Officer comments were provided on each of the urgent decisions taken.

## **COMMENTS OF THE MONITORING OFFICER**

17. We are satisfied that the decisions that have been made are in accordance with the relevant provisions of the Constitution. Clearly the exceptional circumstances we were confronted with required a more extensive use of urgency powers than would normally be the case.

## **BACKGROUND DOCUMENTS**

Individual urgent decisions reports listed above are available by following this weblink:

<https://southribble.moderngov.co.uk/ecCatDisplay.aspx?sch=doc&cat=13240>

## **APPENDICES**

There are no appendices to this report.

Darren Cranshaw  
Shared Services Lead – Democratic, Scrutiny & Electoral Services

Report Author:	Telephone:	Date:
Darren Cranshaw	01772 626612	17/11/20

REPORT TO	ON
COUNCIL	25 November 2020



TITLE	PORTFOLIO	REPORT OF
Fees and Charges Policy	Cabinet Member (Finance, Property and Assets)	Deputy Director of Finance

Is this report confidential?	No
------------------------------	----

## PURPOSE OF THE REPORT

1. To create a fees and charges policy (attached as appendix one) for South Ribble Council that creates a framework for revising current fees and charges as well as guide to introducing new charges.

## PORTFOLIO RECOMMENDATIONS

2. This report asks council to approve:
  - A fees and charges policy (attached as appendix one) for the council's discretionary fees and charges
3. This report asks council to note the proposed annual process for reviewing fees and charges

## REASONS FOR THE DECISION

4. The council requires a policy for reviewing and amending fees and charges so that reviews are conducted frequently and consistently. A new framework will also assist the council when considering the introduction of new charges.
5. The council should endeavour, when it is legal and feasible to do so, to charge users to meet the full cost of providing services.

## CORPORATE PRIORITIES

6. The report relates to the following corporate priorities:

An exemplary Council	✓
Thriving communities	
A fair local economy that works for everyone	
Good homes, green spaces, healthy places	

## BACKGROUND TO THE REPORT

7. The council's constitution outlines that it is the responsibility of each Chief Officer (Directors) to review, at least annually, the fees and charges under their discretion.
8. Fees and charges represent a significant source of income to the council. The 2020/21 budget includes income of £3.2m.
9. The council does not have a fees and charges policy and therefore does not have a framework for reviewing the services it charges for including the possible introduction of new fees and charges.
10. A new fees and charges policy has been created to ensure fees are reviewed frequently and consistently. The finance service will lead on the review every year alongside Service Managers and Directors. A review of fees and charges will be submitted annually to January Executive Cabinet. The final proposal will be included in the budget report taken to council in February/March. The fees and charges policy can be found in appendix one of this report.

## FEES AND CHARGES POLICY

11. The new fees and charges policy is attached in appendix one. The aims of the policy are to provide a consistent framework for the review of the council's current fees and charges as well as guidance to introducing new charges.
12. The policy introduces some key principles of which two principles are not always achievable simultaneously:
  - Fees and charges should be set to assist the Council in achieving its **Corporate Priorities**. Services must raise income wherever there is a duty to do so, and should raise income wherever there is a power to do so, unless the introduction of a charge would prohibit the achievement of specific corporate and service objectives.
  - In line with **legislation**, fees and charges should be set to **recover full costs including overheads**.
13. All charges within the council's control should be reviewed on an annual basis where it permissible and efficient to do so. The council's finance team will lead on the review in consultation with Service Managers and Directors.
14. It is proposed that a review of fees and charges will be taken annually to Executive Cabinet in January alongside the draft budget report. This will be after the approval of the council's Corporate Strategy therefore ensuring that fees and charges are consistent with the strategy.

15. If the review includes the introduction of new charges the report must be approved by Full Council. This does not apply to the introduction of statutory charges.

16. A full list of all fees and charges will be published annually on the council's website

#### **ALTERNATIVE OPTIONS CONSIDERED AND REJECTED**

17. The option to not have an agreed policy was rejected due to the requirements of the constitution and best practise in setting fees and charges at the council.

#### **AIR QUALITY IMPLICATIONS**

18. None

#### **RISK MANAGEMENT**

19. None

#### **EQUALITY AND DIVERSITY IMPACT**

20. There is no impact from the setting of the policy however impact assessments will be carried out as part of the annual review of fees and charges.

#### **COMMENTS OF THE STATUTORY FINANCE OFFICER**

21. The fees and charges policy will enable officers to develop proposals to ensure proposed fees and charges are delivered in line with the council's corporate priorities and constitution.

22. The report outlines that it is the finance service's responsibility to coordinate an annual report to provide members with the opportunity to set fees and charges.

#### **COMMENTS OF THE MONITORING OFFICER**

23. The Local Government Act of 2003 gave councils the general power to charge for discretionary services that are not covered by other legislation. The proposed policy is in line with the requirements of the council's constitution. In certain specific areas there may be separate rules and guidance that we may need to have regard to.

#### **BACKGROUND DOCUMENTS**

24. There are no background papers to this report.

#### **APPENDICES**

Appendix 1 Fees and Charges Policy

James Thomson  
Deputy Director of Finance and Deputy Section 151 Officer

Report Author:	Telephone:	Date:
James Thomson	01257 515025	11/11/20

# **SOUTH RIBBLE BOROUGH COUNCIL**

## **FEES AND CHARGES POLICY**

Updated: November 2020

### **Background**

1. The council's constitution outlines that it is the responsibility of each chief officer to agree its departmental charging policy in conjunction with the chief finance officer. It also stipulates that fees and charges should be reviewed annually.
2. A corporate led review of fees and charges has never been undertaken at South Ribble Council. The current approach to amending fees and charges is usually conducted independently by each service as and when it is required.
3. South Ribble Council does not have a definitive list of all the fees and charges it makes to its residents and service users. This policy will ensure that Fees and Charges are easier to access, are in similar formats and are up-to-date.
4. It is important that decisions are made consistently and adhere to the principles which are laid out within this document.

### **Aims of the Policy**

5. South Ribble Council's fees and charges policy has been developed to ensure the charges for services across the Council are constructed in a consistent manner and that they meet the needs of the Council's Corporate Priorities. In addition, the policy sets out the review process for fees and charges to ensure fees remain up-to-date and that they continue to meet legislative requirements.
6. The specific aims of the policy are:
  - to create a co-ordinated approach to charging for discretionary services, that is applied across all services
  - to outline the key principles for charging by South Ribble Council
  - to distinguish between statutory and discretionary fees and charges
  - to set out an annual review process for all discretionary charges
  - to outline the key requirements when introducing new charges

## Key Principles

7. Fees and charges are set to assist the Council in achieving its **Corporate Priorities**. Services must raise income wherever there is a duty to do so, and should raise income wherever there is a power to do so, unless the introduction of a charge would prohibit the achievement of specific corporate priorities.
8. In line with legislation, fees and charges are set to **recover full costs** including overheads, capital costs, indirect costs such as support services and costs of collection. Where the service user is subsidised by taxpayer this should be transparent and the reasons for this subsidy is made explicit.
9. Subject to restrictions, the council should aim to **maximise the potential to generate income**, for example, through differential charging.
10. Any **concessionary charges** for services should only be made available in the following circumstances:
  - To support a particular group(s) that enables the council to achieve its Corporate Priorities
  - To support low income users
  - To encourage take-up and therefore increase income overall
11. **New charges** should be considered a change in policy and therefore require equality impact assessments and approval by Full Council. This does not apply to the introduction of statutory charges.
12. Charges should be collected in a **simple** and **cost efficient** manner encouraging the use of direct debits and receiving payment at or prior to the point of service delivery
13. Charges should be **reviewed** by officers, where it is permissible and efficient to do so, on an **annual basis**, using clear and transparent evidence to set the level of charges. Where charges are not made for a service, or at a level below full cost recovery, the reasons for this should be considered as part of the review.
14. A comprehensive list of all the council's fees and charges should be published annually on the council's website



## Legislation

15. The Local Government Act 2003 provides clarity over charging powers and is clear that a local authority can charge for discretionary services on the basis of recovering the full costs of providing the service but that, taking one year with another, the charges do not exceed the full costs of provision.
16. Other legal statutes the charging policy must adhere to are
  - Section 17 of the Crime and Disorder Act which requires councils to consider the crime and disorder implications of all decisions, and
  - Equalities Act 2010 to both promote equality and avoid discrimination.

## Types of Fees and Charges

### *Statutory Fees*

17. Where fees and charges apply to statutory services these are often set nationally, for example some planning fees and some licensing fees. The majority of statutory services, Building Control being a notable exception, are not funded directly from fees and charges but instead from the Council's other main sources of revenue, i.e. government grants and local taxation.
18. In many cases there is scope to provide discretionary services over and above the statutory service with the introduction of a supplementary charge, for example pre-application planning advice.

### *Reasonable Charges*

19. Services that the council has a duty to provide and can make a 'reasonable' charge (for example commercial waste collection and disposal)

### *Discretionary Fees*

20. Local Government Act 2003 provides clarity over charging powers and is clear that a local authority can charge for discretionary services on the basis of recovering the full costs of providing the service but that, taking one year with another, the charges do not exceed the full costs of provision.

**The fees and charges policy will apply to any service that the council has a power and discretion to provide to the community, or has a statutory duty to provide, and has discretion to set a charge**

## Examples of Fees and Charges

### *Statutory Fees*

Development Control
Licensing (with some exclusions)
Environmental Health

### *Reasonable Charges & Discretionary Fees*

Building Control
Car Parking
CCTV
Cemeteries
Community Centres & Council Buildings
Council Tax & NNDR Summons
Credit Card Charges
Dog Wardens
Environmental Health
Events
Housing Standards
Land Charges
Open Spaces
Pest Control
Public Conveniences
Street Trading
Taxi Licenses
Waste and Recycling

## The Review Process

21. All charges within the Council's control should be reviewed on an annual basis by officers where it is permissible and efficient to do so. The council's **finance team will lead on the review in consultation with service managers and directors.**
22. It is proposed that a **review of fees and charges will be taken annually to Executive Cabinet in January** alongside the draft budget report. This will be after the approval of the council's Corporate Strategy therefore ensuring that fees and charges are consistent with the strategy.
23. If the review includes the introduction of **new charges** the report must be **approved by Full Council.**
24. The officer's annual review of charges should not just include an inflationary uplift; the full cost of providing the discretionary service, current market conditions and other council's charges should also be considered. In addition, the charges must assist the council in delivering its corporate strategy priorities
25. Where discretionary charges are not made for a service, or at a level below full cost recovery, the reasons for this should be considered as part of the review.

## Introducing New Charges

26. Charging can be an instrument to help the council achieve its corporate priorities, for example by targeting service users and influencing behaviour. In addition, the introduction of charges may allow a discretionary service to enhance its provision, thereby improving the offer to the service user.
27. The introduction of a new charge should be made in line with the key principles of the council's Fees and Charges Policy. If it represents a change in policy then it must gain approval by Full Council and include an equality impact assessment. This does not apply to the introduction of statutory charges.
28. The process of introducing of a new charge will be led by the relevant service and must be done in collaboration with the Policy and Governance Directorate.
29. There is no prescriptive process in calculating and introducing a new charge however listed in the table below are things officers should consider.

Question	Considerations
What corporate priorities will the charge meet?	Encourage access to services Discourage behaviours Fund new services or provide enhanced services
Who is using the service?	Socio-economic, age, gender, race Locations the service used The time the service is used
What impact will the charge have on service use and service users?	Encourage access to services Discourage behaviours Create new behaviours that increase costs to the Council e.g. fly tipping
What is the charging policy?	Break-even Subsidised – if so what are the reasons?
What is the impact on income?	Benchmarking How will a change in charge affect a change in demand?
What is the impact on expenditure?	Are there future cost pressures that need to be factored in? Are all costs including recharges included in the model? Consider the split of capital and revenue expenditure
What is the impact on the wider public?	Reputational risks to the Council

REPORT TO	ON
<b>COUNCIL</b>	<b>Wednesday, 25 November 2020</b>



TITLE	PORTFOLIO	REPORT OF
<b>Review of Car Parking</b>	<b>Cabinet Member (Environment)</b>	<b>Director of Neighbourhoods and Development</b>

Is this report a <b>KEY DECISION</b> (i.e. more than £100,000 or impacting on more than 2 Borough wards?)	<b>Yes</b>
Is this report on the <b>Statutory Cabinet Forward Plan</b> ?	<b>Yes</b>
Is the request outside the policy and budgetary framework and therefore subject to confirmation at full Council? This should only be in exceptional circumstances.	<b>No</b>
Is this report confidential?	<b>No</b>

## PURPOSE OF THE REPORT

1. To outline the proposals for changes to the current restrictions that apply to Council owned car parks following a review of provision and a consultation exercise.
2. To gain approval for the proposed changes to car parking charges and the designation of certain car parks.

## PORTFOLIO RECOMMENDATIONS

3. That Council approve the introduction of the first hour free parking for all identified parking spaces, on all Council owned car parks (no return within 3 hours), provided a ticket is displayed.
4. That Council approve the re-designation of Churchill Way and Sumner Street car parks to short stay car parks, maximum stay 3 hours.
5. That Council approve the designation of King Street, Leyland and Hope Terrace, Lostock Hall as long stay car parks.
6. That Council approve the introduction of a simplified suite of charges for car parks that are subject to charging.
7. That Council approve the introduction of charges to East Street car park along with a resident permit scheme for residents of East Street.

8. That Council approve the introduction of a 2-hour maximum stay period (no return within 3 hours) between the hours 09.00 – 15.00 Monday to Friday term time only, on Worden Park.
9. That Council approve the replacement of all existing pay and display machines with machines that will allow contactless payments.

## REASONS FOR THE DECISION

10. To enable the Council to provide effective management and delivery of the car parks under its ownership within the borough.

## CORPORATE PRIORITIES

11. The report relates to the following corporate priorities:

An exemplary Council	X
Thriving communities	
A fair local economy that works for everyone	X
Good homes, green spaces, healthy places	

## BACKGROUND TO THE REPORT

12. South Ribble Borough Council owns over 50 car parks across the borough which includes town centre pay and display, car parks at public and council buildings, parks and open spaces and small car parks in residential areas. Parking charges within South Ribble have remained relatively constant since their introduction in 2004, in order to support local businesses.
13. An internal audit report carried out at the end of 2019 identified the need for a review of Car Parking to be carried out as a matter of urgency and in particular a review of fees and charges in order to meet the requirements of the council's financial regulations.
14. Section 2.3 of the Financial Regulations states "Chief Officers should review the fees and charges levied for council services and make appropriate recommendations to the appropriate Executive member for approval.
15. Charges are currently levied on six of the available car parks, the majority of which are in Leyland with one in Lostock Hall. The charges levied vary from car park to car park.
16. A consultation exercise was carried out in September 2020 via the Council's website. Views were also sought from interested parties and statutory bodies. Details of the replies received are attached in appendix A.

## **PROPOSALS (E.G. RATIONALE, DETAIL, FINANCIAL, PROCUREMENT)**

- 17.** The main issues consulted on were a simplification of the charges reducing the number of tariffs offered.
- 18.** It is proposed to introduce the first hour free parking on all car parks throughout the borough, (no return within 3 hours) but a ticket must be displayed.
- 19.** To re-designate the town centre car parks at Churchill Way and Sumner Street, Leyland to short stay car parks to create a flow of traffic to facilitate shoppers, introducing a flat rate charge of £1.00 for up to a maximum stay of 3 hours (no return within 3 hours).
- 20.** To simplify the charging structure on Leyland Market (Ecroyd Street) car park by introducing the following charges: up to 3 hours £1.00, up to 5 hours £3.00 and over 5 hours £10.00.
- 21.** To designate the car parks at Kings Street, Leyland and Hope Terrace, Lostock Hall as long stay car parks with the following charges, up to 3 hours £1.00, all day £3.00 and 7 consecutive days £12.00. This will provide those working within the town centre with a reasonably priced option to park all day if required.
- 22.** To retain the current charges on Leyland Railway Station, the ownership of this car park is shared with Network Rail and prices are set to encourage its use by commuters. The current charges are £1.00 per day or £4.00 for 7 consecutive days.
- 23.** To introduce charges on East Street Car Park in Leyland in conjunction with a resident permit scheme; this car park was originally built to accommodate the residents of East Street by the developer of the Helmsley Green Estate allowing construction traffic free access to the development site. Parking restrictions exist on East Street although until recently these have not been enforced due to illegible markings, these have now been renewed by LCC and enforcement recommenced. The proposal is to designate the car park as a short stay car park maximum stay 3 hours for £1.00 in conjunction with the introduction of a residents permit scheme for the residents of East Street.
- 24.** To amend the existing restrictions on Worden Park increasing the time allowed from the current level of 90 minutes to 2 hours and amend the period covered from 09.00 – 16.00 to 09.00 – 15.00, users will be required to obtain a ticket displaying the vehicle registration number, which will be free of charge. The restrictions do not apply at weekends or outside of term times. Worden Park is a popular facility attracting many visitors both local and from the wider North West Region and experience has shown that without the appropriate restrictions the car park becomes unavailable for genuine park visitors during term times. In order to assist visitors to the business tenants such as The Café on Worden Park, day permits are issued to enable visitors to the units to park for longer periods when the restrictions are in force.
- 25.** It is proposed to replace all ticket machines with new models which will facilitate the use of contactless payments, the current machines are over 16 years old meaning the ability to obtain spares has become increasingly difficult. In addition, the new software will allow remote monitoring of the machines allowing for more cost-efficient cash collection service and remote diagnosis of issues. A procurement exercise will be carried out via The Chest following the appropriate procurement procedures. Preliminary enquiries have identified the cost to provide replacement pay and display machines would be approximately £40,000.

## FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

- 26.** Note: All figures quoted in this section refer to the net income to the Council, after deducting VAT. For example, a charge of £1.50 only generates actual net income of £1.25, with £0.25 VAT.
- 27.** The current budget for car parking income is £119,600. The actual amount of income received in 2019-20 was slightly lower, at £115,800. The trend over the last 4 years is a steady increase in volume of customers, and a corresponding increase in income, as shown in the table below. The charges have not changed.

Year	Total Income (£)
2016-17	102,500
2017-18	107,200
2018-19	112,500
2019-20	115,800

- 28.** Since the charges to the Station are not proposed to be changed, the following analysis focuses on income and ticket volumes at the other car parks. There are 3 factors that will affect the income:
- a) The difference in pricing is for shorter length stays of up to 3 hours
  - b) Removing the 3 to 4 hour stay banding
  - c) Introducing charges at East Street
- 29.** The total number of tickets issued in 2019-20 was almost 116,000. The majority of tickets – 69,500 or 60% – were for a period of up to 2 hours, which generated income of £29,200. The proposal is for the first hour to be free. Therefore, a proportion of these tickets would no longer generate any income. However, the proposal is also to increase the charges from £0.50 to £1.00 for a period of up to 3 hours. Therefore, any tickets covering a period of between 1 and 2 hours would generate additional income.
- 30.** The two things are forecast offset each other but it is difficult to predict which one will outweigh the other because we do not know how many of the tickets covering a period of up to 2 hours were actually only for a 1 hour period. If there were more tickets covering a 1 hour period than a 2 hour period, then the income will be reduced.
- 31.** There were 9,800 tickets in the 3 to 4 hours banding, generating net income of £12,200. (Gross charge £1.50 and VAT £0.25.) The proposal is to remove the 3 to 4 hour banding and replace it with a banding of 3 to 5 hours. Under these charges the revised income generated from the same 9,800 tickets would be doubled to £24,400 i.e. an extra £12,200.
- 32.** The East Street car park has a capacity of 22 spaces. It is difficult to predict what the usage levels might be if charges are introduced. As an indication, if we assume the spaces were 50% full, and each car stays for the maximum 3 hours, then the number of tickets in one day would be around 25. This equates to annual income of £5,400.



33. Combining all 3 factors together, the amount of income is expected to increase by around £15,000 to £20,000.

## **CONSULTATION CARRIED OUT AND OUTCOME OF CONSULTATION**

34. A consultation exercise was carried out between 27<sup>th</sup> August and 20<sup>th</sup> September 2020, the consultation elicited a total of 114 responses from 86 individuals, the majority of these responses related to the proposal affecting Worden Park.
35. All Pay and Display Car Parks, a total of 15 responses were received which addressed all car parks and the proposals in general. The majority of these were in favour of the introduction of a blanket first hour free, although some felt this should be increased to two hours.
36. One response was received in relation to King Street, this agreed with the proposals to make it a long stay car park.
37. Hope Terrace, a total of twelve responses were received, six of which supported the first hour free, three felt the car park should be free and one felt the charges should be increased.
38. Two responses were received in relation to Sumner Street, both from the same individual, referring to annual passes and the reduction of one-hour free spaces. No responses were received in response to proposals relating to Churchill Way.
39. Ecroyd Street, three response were received, one felt that the free period should be increased to ninety minutes, one was opposed to any change to the charging structure and the final response felt £10 was too expensive for over five hours.
40. Worden Park, a total of seventy eight responses were received from sixty two individuals of these forty three felt ninety minutes was not long enough, suggestions ranging from two – four hours. A further twenty responded that the introduction of these restrictions would lead to parking in residential streets, in spite of on-street restrictions currently being in place. A further ten respondents referred to issues relating to the use of the car park by students of Runshaw College and a further five suggested pay and display restrictions should be introduced.
41. East Street, six residents responded to the suggestion of a residents parking scheme, of these five would purchase a permit, no objections would be received.
42. The consultation responses are summarised in appendix 1.

## **ALTERNATIVE OPTIONS CONSIDERED AND REJECTED**

43. The option to retain the existing restrictions and pay and display machines was considered however it was felt this would not allow the most efficient and effective management of the car parks under Council control.

## **AIR QUALITY IMPLICATIONS**

44. Consideration will be given to the installation of vehicle charging points on the car parks as and when the opportunities allow.

## **RISK MANAGEMENT**

45. The introduction of the first hour free parking to all parking bays could have a negative effect on the income generated through the car parks, however it is likely to have a positive effect on the numbers of visitors using the car parks and visiting the town centres.

## **EQUALITY AND DIVERSITY IMPACT**

46. There are no equality or diversity impacts as a result of the proposals.

## **COMMENTS OF THE STATUTORY FINANCE OFFICER**

47. The effect of the changes outlined in this report are forecast to be budget neutral, with the offer of 1 hour free being outweighed by the new banding and the East Street car park charges. The income from car parks, alongside other income sources, will be monitored closely as part of the budget monitoring process.

## **COMMENTS OF THE MONITORING OFFICER**

48. From the contents of the report it is apparent that an extensive consultation exercise has been carried out in respect of the proposed changes to car parking charges. This of course is crucial. Proper consideration should be given to the consultee responses.
49. If Council approve the proposed changes then Legal Services will ensure that all necessary legal steps are carried out to enable the proposed changes to car parking charges are made.

## **BACKGROUND DOCUMENTS**

There are no background papers to this report.

## **APPENDICES**

Appendix 1 Consultation comments received.

LT Member's Name Jennifer Mullin  
Director of Neighbourhoods and Development

Report Author:	Telephone:	Date:
Andrew Richardson (Assistant Director of Neighbourhoods)	01772 625674	22/10/2020

## Car Parking Consultation Results

A number of changes have been proposed to the charging structure, designation of certain car parks and changes to the current restrictions. In order to gain the views of residents and users of the facilities a consultation exercise was undertaken via the South Ribble Website, running between 27<sup>th</sup> August and 20<sup>th</sup> September 2020. A total of 114 responses were received from 86 individuals, the proposals and the results for the individual car parks are detailed below.

### **King Street, Leyland and Hope Terrace, Lostock Hall**

Proposal:

1 hour free (no return within 3 hours), a ticket must be displayed

Up to 3 hours £1.00

All Day £3.00

7 days £12.00

### **King Street – Comments**

1. Proposal would make King Street preferred long stay and free up other car parks for shoppers and visitors.

### **Hope Terrace, Lostock Hall – Comments**

1. Wasn't aware of free parking - avoided Lostock Hall
2. Should be no charge, large amount of free parking in Bamber Bridge
3. Charges should be dropped, to stop workers parking in residential areas
4. What are the restrictions?
5. Reinstate the 1 hour free parking with blue lines
6. Should be £4 for all day and £15 for 7 days
7. 1 hour free bays should be retained, weekly ticket is a great idea
8. If 1 hour free is with displayed ticket will blue lines be removed
9. Agree in general, but should be strictly limited number of all day spaces
10. Make it free so we can do park and ride, would also sort out the Just Eat using DYL
11. Excellent idea
12. Disappointed not consulted directly. Concerns about proposal to increase charges to businesses and residents in spite of giving 1st hour free

### **Churchill Way and Sumner Street, Leyland**

Proposal:

1 hour free (no return within 3 hours), a ticket must be displayed.

Up to 3 hours - £1.00 (no return within 3 hours)

### **Churchill Way – No comments received**

### **Sumner Street, Leyland – Comments**

1. Will annual permits be available?
2. Should be left as it is, possibly reduce 1 hour spaces

### **Ecroyd Street, Leyland**

Proposal:

1 hour free (no return within 3 hours), a ticket must be displayed.

Up to 3 hours £1.00

Up to 5 hours £3.00

Over 5 hours £10.00

### **Ecroyd Street, Leyland – Comments**

1. Should be a free periods 60-90 minutes to encourage shopper to the market and high street
2. Opposed to any increase or changes on Ecroyd Street. Asda has 2 hours free parking why can't we have the same?
3. Proposed £10 charge for over 5 hours seems excessive, however if this is to discourage all day parking, we understand

### **All Pay and Display Car Parks – General Comments**

1. Should be free
2. Agree
3. Feel in order to stimulate local economy first hour should be free
1. Proposals are on the whole a good ideas
2. Object to increased charges. Would like to see 2 -3 hours free parking
3. Need to encourage shopped to stay longer - 2 hours free
4. Should be a reasonably priced all day parking for people who work
5. A free hour is good, enough time to go to the bank or pick up a snack, 2 hours would encourage people to shop as well
6. Weekly/monthly ticket should be available for King Street
7. Good to keep one hour free parking, don't think it's a good idea to get a ticket, waste of paper, energy and people will have to touch machine
8. Agree with all apart from Worden Park
9. I agree with proposal 1st hour free, no return within 3 hours
10. First hour free on all car parks a good idea, insisting on a ticket doesn't make sense - cost of ticket/ink
11. Parking charges appear to be quite reasonable. More should be done to discourage people from illegal parking on Hough Lane (Chicken BBQ)
12. Free hour in town a great idea
13. I approve of the 1 hour free parking proposals
14. Charges proposed across all the car parks are good and should encourage people to into the town centre to shop
15. 1 hour free, agree with this proposal it will encourage people to use the town centre facilities

### **Worden Park Main Car Park**

Proposal:

No charge – Confirm the existing 90 minutes waiting restriction, no return within 3 hours (between the hours of 9.00am and 3.00pm, Monday to Friday, term time only) – a ticket must be displayed

### **Worden Park - Comments**

1. 90 minutes completely unsuitable
2. Should be 2 hours
3. 90 minutes not long enough to enjoy the park

4. 90 minutes is not sufficient to take children to the park
5. 90 minutes is too stingy, penalises genuine users of the park
6. 90 minutes too short, 2 hours would be better
7. Should be no need to time parking to 90 minutes, plenty of room with the overspill car park
8. 90 minutes is not long enough for football matches
9. Students have to park, so will find alternative places
10. 90 minutes is not enough to enjoy the park, needs to be a max 3 hours. If proposal is to reduce students another solution needs to be found
11. Feel there should be a minimum of 2 hours free stay on Worden Park at weekends
12. 90 minutes not long enough, 90 minutes free then pay for an extra hour
13. 90 minutes detrimental to pleasurable activity. Maybe 1 hour free than a charge would be a good compromise
14. We understand the need for changes to regulations due to large number of students, this will lead to parking violations in Ennerdale Close
15. A lot of visitors wish to stay longer than 90 minutes, 1st hour free then £x for up to 3 hours, £y all day
16. Issue permits for the overflow car park to students - generate funds
17. Limit parking to 90 minutes will only encourage students/patrons of the park to use local streets
18. Reference notification leaflet - I agree some form of regular monitoring and enforcement for the estate and road in area
19. 90 minutes penalises families, far too short a time. Four hours would be more practical
20. Time limit far too short, will result in the road of estate becoming an alternative car park
21. Hope the changes to parking restriction do not have an adverse effect on the surrounding street
22. Students from Runshaw should NOT be allowed to use Worden Park car park
23. 90 minutes restriction really affects the users of this excellent facility
24. As a local resident we back the change, but we have concerns over how this is going to be policed
25. Object to time limit, unless legal restrictions where placed on Parkgate Drive
26. Concerned parking changes, Edale Close may become a car park for students
27. Concern that parking restrictions will mean students will park on the estate roads
28. Students and parents already use Cairndale Drive as an 'extended car park' leaving engine running.
29. Agree with the changes but hope the current yellow lines and access only will be adhered to
30. 90 minutes is too short for an "allowed stay"
31. 90 minutes ridiculous, should be at least 3 hours
32. Formally object to the introduction of 90 minutes parking restrictions.
33. Rather alarmed at the proposal to limit car parking to 90 minutes. People come to the park to relax not clock watch
34. Better to apply a £1 charge for up to three hours and then a further charge for longer
35. We already have problems with students disregarding the yellow lines on our road and leaving litter. Yellow lines need to be re-instated and enforcement
36. Disappointed to see SRBC considering applying a time limit to park. 90 minutes isn't long enough
37. 90 minutes ridiculous, families with pre-school children being penalised
38. 90 minute parking limit is just not long enough
39. In principle agree with the restrictions to the parking remains for the park users rather than students. I would suggest 2 hour parking rather than 90 minutes
40. I can understand why the 90 minute limit is proposed, I do feel it is too short for visiting the park. May I suggest 2 hours between 9am and 3pm
41. 90 minutes will impact on the Folly café
42. Problems with students parking in residential streets
43. The new 90 minute parking is simply not long enough

44. Concerned that the proposed changes will increase the illegal use of Worden Close by both students and park users
45. Where do they go when the car park is full - our road (Ennerdale Close) Please open the overflow car park
46. Further amendment to the time restriction could impact on residential streets, permits could be issued to residents to allow their visitors to park
47. Disagree with proposal to limit 90 minutes parking
48. Parking not a personal issued as I live within walking distance to the park
49. The blame for parking problems lies with the Planning Department for allowing college to build on car park
50. Overflow car park should be dedicated to student parking and permits hold - may even turn over a profit
51. The sixth form college should have provided adequate car parking before being allowed to expand. Not noticed traffic problems only at weekends
52. No logical reason to change for car parking, the cost of employing wardens is likely to be greater than the parking fees collected
53. 90 minute limit is clearly aimed at students but will cause resentment from other people
54. 90 minute restriction - 1. Impact on visitors to the park, 2. Impact on residents on the Worden estate and surrounding residential roads
55. If 90 minute limit was introduced this would be concern to us and other SR residents
56. 90 minute restriction is going to adversely affect the enjoyment of the park for our residents
57. Against the proposed change
58. If this time limit is being introduced to stop students parking, then it is local residents and park users who will be penalised
59. This seems an attempt to prevent students parking with no consideration given to any alternative car parking provision for visitors or students
60. 90 minutes is not the amount of time needed to enjoy the park
61. Concerned that the 90 minute restriction will encourage visitors and students to park on the surrounding residential streets
62. The 90 minute restriction will surely force students to park on the surrounding roads. 90 minutes also restricts people who are using the park and facilities
63. Totally disagree that parking should be restricted to 90 minutes. Understand issues with students parking, unreasonable that the general public should have their access reduced
64. Runshaw College has failed to provide adequate car parking
65. Reducing the student cars in the park would be welcomed and long overdue if it can be achieved
66. The park is for the use of people of Leyland who will be seriously inconvenienced as 90 minutes is not long enough for families to fully use the facilities
67. Broadly supportive in principle in order to prevent abuse by students, though detrimental effect of the taking of the small businesses
68. Potential impact on the adjacent residential roads - a 3 hour restriction on parking would be far more appropriate
69. Why spend money on the overflow car park then discourage people, especially students from using it. Could P&D be considered to help fund overflow expansion?
70. Concerned about the potential problem to surrounding streets if restrictions are implemented
71. We do not consider 90 minutes is enough time to people to make use of the extensive facilities in the park. Two hours would be more reasonable
72. The problem is that the 'overspill' car park is not in use, this is understandable with the state of it and well know that some students tended to use it as a playground
73. Have you reached the 90 minute parking according to the class times at the college?
74. The 90 minute stay will have an effect on those of us who use the park daily, also effect the trade at the café
75. I am very concerned that the proposal will discourage students from parking but result in increased congestion on the Worden Park estate

76. I think that this option does not showcase Worden Park to its full advantage, looking as it is an overflow carpark for students
77. Welcome the universal charging, ticket display and supervision of all car parks
78. Many residential issues with Worden Park vehicle parking, the time limits need to be more specific and reflect the extensive opening time of the college

## **East Street, Leyland**

Additionally it is proposed to introduce the following restrictions on East Street Car Park, Leyland (currently no charge or restriction)

1 hour free (no return within 3 hours), a ticket must be displayed.

Up to 3 hours £1.00 (no return within 3 hours)

Except for permit holders (permits restricted to the residents of East Street, at a cost of £28.60 per annum).

The residents of East Street were all consulted, 6 residents forwarded their comments:

**Do you have problems parking-** YES = 4, NO = 2

### **Where do you currently park:**

Round the back of the flats

Anywhere I can find – layby, car park

On road

Where ever we can

Spring Street

At the side of my house on Spring Street

**Would you be interested in Residents Parking Permit –** YES = 5, NO = 1

### **Other comments:**

I have said YES, however I do not believe I should have to pay when there are no further options to park. The lay-by is restricted times and we cannot park on single yellow lines. Therefore I have no choice but to park on the car park and I do not see why I should have to pay to park where I live. I would maybe suggest residents obtain a free permit and visitors follow the above proposal

Even though I only have one car, with only 1 permit per household this may cause problems as I know a few residents have two cars and would probably oppose this due to them having nowhere to park the other car

Unfair that the Spring Street residents should park free

Car park needs regular cleaning and monitoring as non stop drug dealing going on at car park



By virtue of paragraph(s) 3, 4 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A  
of the Local Government Act 1972.

Document is Restricted

This page is intentionally left blank

By virtue of paragraph(s) 3, 4 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A  
of the Local Government Act 1972.

Document is Restricted

This page is intentionally left blank

By virtue of paragraph(s) 3, 4 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A  
of the Local Government Act 1972.

Document is Restricted

This page is intentionally left blank

By virtue of paragraph(s) 3, 4 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A  
of the Local Government Act 1972.

Document is Restricted

This page is intentionally left blank



By virtue of paragraph(s) 3, 4 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A  
of the Local Government Act 1972.

Document is Restricted

This page is intentionally left blank

By virtue of paragraph(s) 3, 4 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A  
of the Local Government Act 1972.

Document is Restricted

This page is intentionally left blank

By virtue of paragraph(s) 3, 4 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A  
of the Local Government Act 1972.

Document is Restricted

This page is intentionally left blank

By virtue of paragraph(s) 3, 4 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A  
of the Local Government Act 1972.

Document is Restricted

This page is intentionally left blank