Lancashire County Council

Cabinet

Friday 2\textsuperscript{nd} July 2004, in Cabinet Room ‘B’, County Hall, Preston at 10.30 a.m.

Agenda

Part 1 (Open to Press and Public)

1. Minutes of the Meeting held on the 10\textsuperscript{th} May 2004
   Copy enclosed.

2. Disclosure of Personal and Prejudicial Interests
   Members are asked to consider any Personal/Prejudicial Interests they may have to disclose to the meeting in relation to matters under consideration on the Agenda.

Matters for Decision

3. The Leader of the Council
   - County Councillor Hazel Harding
   (a) Consultation on The Draft Community Strategy for Lancashire (Ambition Lancashire)
   (b) The Northern Way Growth Strategy and its Implications for Lancashire
   (c) Appointments to Outside Bodies - 2004/05
   (d) Report of the Cabinet Committee on Performance Improvement

4. Cabinet Member for Children and Families
   - County Councillor Clive Grunshaw
   (a) Every Child Matters
      i) Consultation
      ii) Governance arrangements
      Reports to follow
4 (b) Youth and Community Service
   i) Ofsted Inspection Report
   ii) 2004/05 Budget
   iii) Devolved Financial Management

5. Cabinet Member for Education
   - County Councillor Alan Whittaker
     (a) The Annual Review of the Lancashire Education Development Plan 2003/04 and School Improvement Programme for 2004/05

6. Cabinet Member for Highways and Transportation
   - County Councillor Jean Yates
     (a) Local Transport Plan Annual Progress Report 2004

7. Cabinet Member for Urban and Rural Regeneration
   - County Councillor Brian Johnson
     (a) Lancashire Community Renewable Energy Programme

8. External Overview and Scrutiny Committee
   - Report of GM Crops and Food Task Group

Matters for Information

9. Report of action taken by the Cabinet Member for Resources under Standing Order No. 72

10. Report on Decisions on Additions and amendments to the Approved Capital Programme 2004/05

11. Reports of Key Decisions taken by Cabinet Members and the Environment Director
     (a) The Deputy Leader
     (b) Cabinet Member for Adult Services
     (c) Cabinet Member for Highways and Transportation
     (d) The Environment Director
Miscellaneous Matters

12. Sealing of Documents

Recommendation

The Cabinet is asked to authorise the Common Seal of the County Council being affixed to any necessary documents in connection with matters arising at this meeting.

13. Urgent Business

An item of urgent business may only be considered under this heading where, by reason of special circumstances to be recorded in the Minutes, the Chairman of the meeting is of the opinion that the item should be considered at the meeting as a matter of urgency. Wherever possible, the Chief Executive should be given advance warning of any Member’s intention to raise a matter under this heading.

14. Date of Next Meeting

The next meeting of the Cabinet is to be held on Thursday 5th August 2004 at 10 30 a.m. at the County Hall, Preston.

Chris Trinick
Chief Executive

County Hall,
Preston.
Lancashire County Council

Cabinet

Minutes of the Meeting held on Monday 10th May 2004 at 10.30 a.m.
at the County Hall, Preston

Present:

- County Councillor Hazel Harding - Leader of the Council (In the Chair)
- County Councillor Doreen Pollitt - Deputy Leader

Cabinet Members

- County Councillor Anne Brown
- County Councillor Chris Cheetham
- County Councillor Clive Grunshaw
- County Councillor Brian Johnson
- County Councillor Marcus Johnstone
- County Councillor Alan Whittaker
- County Councillor Jean Yates

County Councillors Bernard Whittle and David Whipp were also present in accordance with the provisions of Standing Order No. 60 (3).

Apologies were received from County Councillors Tony Martin and Michael Welsh

Confirmation of Minutes

107. Resolved: - That the Minutes of the meeting held on the 1st April 2004 be confirmed and signed by the Chairman.

Disclosure of Personal and Prejudicial Interests

County Councillor David Whipp disclosed a personal, but non-prejudicial interest in relation to consideration of the report on the Pilot Devolution Programme and the report of the Cabinet Committee on Performance Improvement (Items 3(a) and 3(b) respectively) as a Member of the Pendle Borough Council.

Pilot Devolution Programme

A report was presented outlining the next steps in the County Council’s vision under its Locality Focus Strategy for a devolution programme designed to enable the County Council to engage more closely with the District Councils and local people on local government service delivery. The report proposed the introduction of “Area Forums” on a pilot basis, which would allow the County Council to experiment with new ways of opening up its services for local influence and determination. Consideration was being given to an appropriate and meaningful brand name for the new structures. A phased roll out of the proposals was proposed to all district areas in the future.
108. Resolved: -

(a) That the approach for the devolution programme, as set out in the report now presented, be endorsed as the next logical step in the Council's locality focus programme, aimed at making the County Council and its services more responsive to local needs and views.

(b) That, subject to the formal agreement of the District Councils concerned, the devolution programme be piloted in West Lancashire, South Ribble, Hyndburn and Rossendale in order to gain operational experience before rolling the programme out on a phased basis to other Lancashire Districts.

(c) That, in each pilot district, the Full Council be asked to:

(i) Approve the establishment of an Area Forum comprising all locally elected County Councillors and normally the equivalent number of District Councillors reflecting the political balance of the District Council, and that each Forum be required to agree a protocol with Parish and Town Councils to ensure their full participation in the devolution programme.

(ii) Approve the proposed constitution of the Forums as set out in Appendix 1A of the report for consultation with the four District Councils.

(iii) Authorise the Leader, under the urgent business procedure, to make adjustments to the constitution of the Area Forums in order to improve their operation.

(d) That, subject to the Full Council approval at (c) above,

(i) The devolution to each Area Forum in the pilot areas of the executive functions identified in the Terms of Reference at Appendix 1B to the report be approved.

(ii) The Leader be authorised, on behalf of the Cabinet, to approve any changes, including additions, to the devolved functions in the pilot areas.

Report of the Cabinet Committee on Performance Improvement

A report was presented on matters considered by the Cabinet Committee on Performance Improvement at its meeting on the 1st April 2004.

The Committee had considered the following matters: the LPSA Target for a reduction in the under-eighteen conception rate; the Corporate Objective - Learn and Develop; an update on applications under the Beacon Council Scheme and a Timetable of Meetings for 2004.

109. Resolved: - That the report be noted.

A Corporate Framework for Equality and Diversity

A report was presented outlining the work that was taking place to bring about greater co-ordination of and direction to the County Council’s activities around promoting equality and diversity.
A cross party Equality and Diversity Member Working Group, chaired by the Deputy Leader, had been established to strengthen the Council's strategic approach and an Action Plan had been produced to develop a corporate framework for equality and diversity. A summary of the Action Plan and progress so far was presented at Appendix A to the report.

110. Resolved: - That the Action Plan to develop a corporate equality and diversity framework, as set out in the report now presented, be approved and that the work done so far by the Member Working Group be endorsed.

European Issues

(i) Lancashire County Council European Strategy Action Plan

A report was presented outlining an action plan for the European Team within the Policy Unit, which had been drawn up in line with the 2002 European Strategy. The action plan covered the next 12 – 18 months to reflect the remaining period of the current Corporate Plan. Once the new Corporate Plan had been prepared, a new European Strategy would be drawn up as appropriate.

The action plan was presented in two parts. The first identified the structures and processes that would need to be put in place to enable the European Team to achieve the aims set down in the European Strategy. These included a proposal to establish a cross-party member working group, the activities of which would include the operation of the action plan and key policy issues such as the structural funds debate.

The second part of the action plan identified the key European themes and priorities for the remaining half of the EU strategy.

111. Resolved: - That the European Strategy Action Plan as now presented, be approved.

Lancashire County Council Response to the European Commission’s Proposals for Structural Funds 2007 - 2013

It was reported that on the 18th February, the European Commission had presented the major orientations for structural funds from 2007-2013, which proposed the priorities for funding regional and cohesion policies for an expanded union of up to 27 member states. Although it was early in terms of knowing the exact details of the future structural funds, it was considered the right time for the County Council to have its voice heard in the EU institutions and in Whitehall on this important subject.

A report was presented summarising the Commission’s proposals and the Cabinet was asked to consider a proposed response statement as set out in Annex 1 to the report. In general, the Commission’s proposals were positive, but were as yet lacking precision. Whilst awaiting the publication of more detailed proposals, it was considered that the County Council should state its position and contribute to the debate.

The report also set out a lobbying strategy to accompany the response, which was aimed at shaping the proposals and the views of the decision makers and thus maximising the opportunities for the County Council and Lancashire for European funding in the 2007-2013 period. The target audience for this lobbying strategy included the UK government and the EU institutions, mainly the European Commission and the European Parliament.
112. **Resolved:** - That the County Council's proposed response to the European Commission’s proposals for Structural Funds 2007-2013 and the accompanying lobbying strategy, as set out in the report now presented, be approved.

**Budget Monitoring 2003/04 - as at end of March 2004**

A report was presented setting out the County Council's latest financial projection for 2003/04, as at the 31st March 2004. Although the 31st March was the final day of the financial year, the position presented to Cabinet remained a forecast at this stage. A final year-end position would be presented to the Cabinet in due course.

The headlines from the report were: -

- DFM balances were forecast to reduce overall by £2.743m,
- The County Care DSO was projected to incur a deficit of £0.250m,
- LCCS and LCES were projecting in year surpluses totalling £0.418m, and
- Central budgets were forecast to underspend by £2.2m, plus a forecast underspend on the Change Contingency of £1m. Of that £3.2m, some £1.6m had been committed to support the capital programme in 2004/05, and it was proposed to use a further £1m of that underspend to make an additional contribution to the liabilities provision.

113. **Resolved:** - That the Budget Monitoring Report for 2003/04, as now presented, be received and noted.

**Internal Overview and Scrutiny Committee**

**Response to report on the financial position of the Youth and Community Service**

It was reported that on the 20th February 2004, the Overview and Scrutiny Management Panel had agreed that the financial difficulties currently encountered by the Youth and Community Service should be referred to the Internal Overview and Scrutiny Committee. Accordingly, on the 30th March 2004, officers from the Education and Cultural Services Directorate had presented a report to the Internal Overview and Scrutiny Committee detailing the issues surrounding the budget shortfall in the Youth and Community Service. The report had contained the comprehensive position of the causes of the budget shortfall and steps being taken in that regard.

The Committee had expressed their concern regarding the failure of financial management systems and budget prioritisation issues within the Directorate and had asked that this be brought to the attention of the Cabinet.

113. **Resolved:** - That the Cabinet notes: -

a) The concern expressed by the Internal Overview and Scrutiny Committee.

b) That the interim measures taken to address the shortfall in the Youth and Community Service had resulted in a balanced budget for the Service.
c) That a report setting out the reasons for the problems in the Youth and Community Service Budget will be brought back to the Overview and Scrutiny Committee and the Cabinet.

Report of Urgent Business Action by the Leader on behalf of the Cabinet

115. Resolved: - That the report on urgent business action taken by the Leader, as now presented, be noted.

Report of Action Taken by Cabinet Member for Resources under Standing Order 72

116. Resolved: - That the report now presented on action taken by the Cabinet Member for Resources under Standing Order 72 be noted.

Report on Decisions on Additions to the Approved Capital Programme 2003/04

117. Resolved: - That the report on the decision taken by the Cabinet Member for Adult Services in respect of the addition of a scheme to the Approved Capital Programme 2003/04, as now presented be noted.

Reports of Key Decisions Taken by Cabinet Members and the Environment Director

118. Resolved: - That the reports now presented on Key Decisions taken by the Cabinet Members for Education, Highways and Transportation, Adult Services and by the Environment Director respectively, be noted.

Sealing of Documents

119. Resolved: - That the Common Seal of the County Council be affixed to any necessary documents in connection with matters arising at this meeting.

Date of Next Meeting

The Cabinet noted that its next meeting would be held on Thursday 3rd June 2004, at 10.30 a.m. at the County Hall, Preston.

Chris Trinick
Chief Executive

County Hall,
Preston.
Cabinet – 2\textsuperscript{nd} July 2004

Report of the Chief Executive

\begin{center}
\textbf{Part I - Item No. 3 (a)}
\end{center}

Electoral Division affected: All

Consultation on the draft Community Strategy for Lancashire (Ambition Lancashire) (Appendices ‘A’ and ‘B’ refer)

Contact for further information:
Andy Mullaney, 01772 533478, Office of the Chief Executive

\begin{center}
\textbf{Executive Summary}
\end{center}

The attached paper sets out a draft Community Strategy for Lancashire (called Ambition Lancashire), currently being developed by the Lancashire Partnership.

The Cabinet’s views on the draft are requested. Also attached are the observations of the County Council’s External Overview and Scrutiny Committee (Appendix B)

The aim is to ensure that the County Council’s plans and long-term aspirations are consistent with the vision. A key question for the Cabinet then is:

‘does the draft address the ‘big issues’ facing Lancashire; and does it capture the County Council’s ambitions for the future social, economic and environmental well-being of the County?’. 

\begin{center}
\textbf{Recommendation}
\end{center}

The Cabinet’s views are requested on the draft Community Strategy.

\begin{center}
\textbf{Background}
\end{center}

The attached paper sets out a consultation draft Community Strategy for Lancashire (called Ambition Lancashire). A key aspect of the draft is the strategic vision for the future of County. This sets out Lancashire’s social, economic and environmental ambitions for the long-term future of Lancashire.

The Lancashire Partnership is developing the Community Strategy, and the July meeting of the Partnership will involve a detailed exploration of this final draft. The County Council is of course a lead player in the development of the Partnership and, uniquely among the partners, the County Council has a statutory duty to prepare the Strategy through a multi-agency partnership.

This is the second round of consultation on the draft. The Partnership endorsed a first draft for wide consultation in December 2003. In early 2004, the County Council’s Cabinet and the External Overview and Scrutiny Committee commented on that first draft, as did Lancashire’s District Councils, LSPs and a range of other agencies. That first round of consultation generated a large number of responses. The vast majority of responses were supportive. But a key concern was that in some topics the draft’s focus needed sharpening,
both in terms of specific geographies and localities and in terms of sections of the population. This and other issues have now been addressed and the draft has undergone a fundamental rewrite. Importantly, the Lancashire Partnership adopted a number of headline priorities at its last meeting. These are now embedded in the draft.

A second round of consultation is now underway on the revised draft. The County Council, as a member of the Partnership, now has the opportunity to respond formally during the period of consultation, which ends in mid August 2004.

The County Council’s External Overview and Scrutiny Committee considered a working version of the revised draft at its May 2004 meeting, and the Cabinet now has the benefit of the Committee’s views (see Appendix ‘B’). In addition, the County Council’s service directorates have also commented on the draft.

What factors have shaped the draft?

The preparation of the draft Community Strategy has been informed principally by:

- The views of the Lancashire Partnership Executive.
- The ‘Imagine Lancashire’ strategic visioning event held in Autumn 2003, and attended by over 150 individuals from a broad range of agencies in the county.
- The ‘State of Lancashire’ report that analyses social, economic and environmental conditions in Lancashire.
- An analysis of the issues emerging from the Community Strategies of the twelve Local Strategic Partnerships in Lancashire.
- The strategic issues set out in a number of Lancashire level plans and sub regional strategies, together with regional and national level documents (eg the Regional Economic Strategy).
- The views of each LSP in Lancashire (consulted in November/December 2003 and again in April/May 2004)
- Views from 2,500 residents in the Life in Lancashire MORI survey
- Comments from Lancashire people in response to the winter 2003 consultation. These include: comments received following a front page article (and invitation to comment) in the ‘Vision’ newspaper; comments received via the Lancashire Partnership web site; comments received via a freephone telephone line.
- Comments from Parish and Town Councils. All Lancashire Parish and Town Councils were consulted.
- Comments received from the district level Community Networks.
- A special ‘Imagine Lancashire in 2024’ event for and by young people in the Lancashire Youth Council who told us what they wanted for the year 2024.

Implications for the County Council

The draft Community Strategy sets out a long-term vision for the future of Lancashire.

The aim is to ensure that the County Council’s plans and long-term aspirations are consistent with the vision.

A key question for the Cabinet then is:

‘does the draft address the ‘big issues’ facing Lancashire; and does it capture the County Council’s ambitions for the future social, economic and environmental well-being of the County?’
Directorate Comments

The following comments have been made by the Director of Social Services about aspects of the draft.

There is an issue about how vulnerable people are portrayed in the vision (people with physical disabilities, sensory impairments, learning disabilities, mental health problems). These are all covered under a "caring Lancashire". So even though there's a reference to job opportunities, training etc, the underlying assumption is that this is all about care. The vision should say something about the contribution these people can make to life in Lancashire.

There is also a broader issue about an ageing society in Lancashire over the longer term. Over the next 20 years, the County can expect significant medical advances (stem cell research, etc) that means that people with limiting long-term health conditions will have greater life expectancy. They will be able to manage their own conditions better and may need low-level types of help/support, but above all will be wanting to participate more in opportunities and lead as active a life as possible. They won't necessarily see themselves as needing care. The vision needs to acknowledge the contribution these people can make, in addition to the care aspect.

The draft should refer to children with disabilities. The issues will be about ensuring families get the right support with well-integrated services (social care, education, health).

There is also an issue about direct payments for people assessed as needing care. They now have the option to be given a weekly sum of money to buy their own care, instead of having it provided through Social Services Directorate. At present numbers are small but growing fast. If this continues to increase, the position could be reached where large numbers of people are employing their own care staff, either directly or through an agency. This could have a substantial impact on the care market, and the draft could usefully consider these issues.

Consultations

The comments of the County Council's External Overview and Scrutiny Committee are set out in Appendix 'B'. Directorates have also contributed. The draft has been shaped by the processes and organisations listed above.

Advice

As set out in the report.

Alternative options to be considered

N/A

Implications: e.g. Financial, Legal, Personnel, Human Rights, Crime and Disorder or Other

The draft is a major step in the implementation of the County Council's statutory duty to prepare a Community Strategy under the Local Government Act 2000.

Any representations made to the Cabinet Member prior to the issue being considered in accordance with the Public Notice of Forward Plans
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Paper</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Contact/Directorate/Ext</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| State of Lancashire report   | 2003 | Andy Mullaney/OCE/33478
|                              |      | [www.lancashirepartnership.co.uk](http://www.lancashirepartnership.co.uk) |
Ambition
lancashire

Strategic Vision for the Future of Lancashire

Working Draft for Consultation
Lancashire Partnership
June 2004
Appendix ‘B’
Lancashire County Council

External Overview and Scrutiny Committee
Meeting held on the 25th May 2004, at County Hall, Preston

Draft Community Strategy for Lancashire

The Committee were aware that the Lancashire Partnership were developing a Community Strategy and recalled that they had made comments on the initial draft.

The draft Strategy called 'Ambition Lancashire' was still a working draft that was to be the subject of formal consultation in June and July.

Andrew Mullaney, presented the Vision and asked whether the Committee felt the 'big issues' facing the County were captured in the working draft.

The Committee welcomed the 'signpost' document and recognised the need to work with partners as appropriate to achieve the objectives contained within the Vision.

County Councillor Jones mentioned the problems of Lancashire's current transport infrastructure particularly in East Lancashire and wondered whether mention should be made of the transition from poor in parts to first class.

County Councillor Murphy referred to the Forums of Faith and felt more emphasis should be placed on using their ability to assist with community cohesion.

County Councillor Sutcliffe felt that whilst the Vision was good it was a very weighty document. Andrew Mullaney reassured members that a summary version would be produced.

County Councillor Mrs D M Westell, spoke about the Vision for Older People as their Champion and did not feel that older people would have large disposable incomes and would be able to travel freely and easily. However it was hoped that they would have the ability.

County Councillor Holtom felt that more emphasis should be placed on tourism as the County's largest industry.

Andrew closed the session by explaining that following the input of the Committee and some fine tuning the document would be sent out for wider consultation.

Resolved: -
1) That the report be welcomed and the need to work with partners as appropriate to achieve the objectives contained within the Vision be recognised.
2) That it be noted that the Vision is to be the subject of formal consultation in June and July following fine tuning.
The Northern Way Growth Strategy and its Implications for Lancashire

Contact for further information:
Ricardo Gomez, (01772) 530616, Policy Unit, Office of the Chief Executive

Executive Summary

The Northern Way Growth Strategy was launched by Deputy Prime Minister (DPM) John Prescott in February 2004. Driven by the three Regional Development Agencies, the initiative has rapidly gathered momentum over the past few months. Much of this work has centred on strategies to promote the growth of eight ‘city regions’ – including Preston/Blackburn – whose performance is seen as critical to the success of the initiative. A formal submission to the Office of the Deputy Prime Minister (ODPM) containing proposals for the Northern Way is due at the end of July 2004.

This report sets out the key features of the Northern Way that have so far emerged and briefly assesses the potential opportunities and threats to Lancashire. It asks the Cabinet to consider the adoption of an interim position on behalf of Lancashire County Council.

This is deemed a Key Decision but is not included in the Forward Plan. In view of the pace of which developments are unfolding, the matter cannot await the next roll forward of the Plan and it is recommended that the decision be taken without delay for the reasons set out in the report. Standing Order 52(1) has been complied with.

Recommendation

The Cabinet is asked to determine the County Council’s interim response to the Northern Way proposals.

It is recommended that the decision taken by the Cabinet on this matter be designated as ‘urgent’ for the purposes of Standing Order 65. This is because the County Council’s interim response has to be submitted as early in July as possible.

Background

The ‘Northern Way’ concept first appeared as the title of the ODPM’s second progress report on the Sustainable Communities initiative. The report – Making it Happen: The Northern Way – was formally ‘launched’ by Deputy Prime Minister on 2 February 2004 in a speech in Manchester. The DPM called for a substantial improvement in the economic performance of
the north of England and for much closer collaboration between the three northern English regions. Linking together the Sustainable Communities Plan and the work of the Regional Development Agencies (RDAs) would ‘bring together a critical mass of economic activity’. Key players – particularly the three RDAs – have quickly responded and the initiative is gathering momentum.

Underpinning the Northern Way initiative is the assumption that efforts to improve economic performance should be spatially targeted. As further details of the proposals have emerged, it has become clear that the architects of the initiative are looking at 8 city regions. A pivotal role has been ascribed to cities and their surrounding areas in stimulating economic growth. This role in turn reflects the significant part played by the north’s core cities (Leeds, Liverpool, Manchester, Newcastle and Sheffield) in the initiative.

The proposed city regions are:

- Preston-Blackburn
- Merseyside
- Greater Manchester
- West Yorkshire (Leeds, Bradford, York)
- South Yorkshire (Sheffield, Doncaster)
- The Humber (Hull and the Humber Ports)
- Tees Valley (Middlesbrough, Hartlepool, Stockton, Darlington)
- Tyne and Weir (Newcastle, Gateshead, Sunderland, Durham)

**Decision Making Machinery**
The Northern Way is being led by a **Steering Group** with the following membership:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Steering Group</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Sir Graham Hall, Chair. (Ex Chair Yorkshire Forward)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Development Agencies: Brian Gray, North West Development Agency; Margaret Fay, One North East; Terry Hodgkinson, Yorkshire Forward.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Regional Assemblies: Peter Box, Chair, Regional Assembly Yorkshire and Humber; Bob Gibson, Leader, North East Regional Assembly; Tony McDermott, Leader, North West Regional Assembly.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Core City Lead Councillors: Tony Flynn, Newcastle; Keith Wakefield, Leeds; Richard Leese, Manchester.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Margaret Ford, Chair, English Partnerships.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• David Taylor, the ODPM (leading practitioner in Urban Regeneration and Economic Development, private sector).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Sir Ian Wrigglesworth, UK Land Estates (North east property investment and development company, private sector).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Ed Balls, Chief Economic Adviser, HM Treasury (personal representative of Gordon Brown and John Prescott).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Richard McCarthy, Director General, Sustainable Communities Group, ODPM (Observer).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Jonathan Blackie, Regional Director, Government Office North East (Observer).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Drummond Bone, Vice Chancellor, University of Liverpool (the academic expert).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A separate **Task Group** is working up proposals:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task Group</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Chair, Alan Clarke (One North East’s Chief Executive).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Pat Ritchie, Director of Strategy and Development, One North East</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Tom Riordan, Director, Yorkshire Forward.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Nick Gerrard, Head of Operations, North West Development Agency.
David Lunts, Director, Urban Policy, the ODPM.
Ros Dunn, Head of Devolved Countries and Regions Policy, the Treasury.
Bronwyn Hill, Department for Transport (Divisional Manager, Network Rail Division at end of 2002).
John Jarvis, Director, Regional Affairs, Government Office Yorkshire and Humber (representing Government Offices).
Bob Kerslake, Chief Executive, Sheffield City Council (representing the core cities).

A Communications Group comprising Stacy Hall (Head of Communications, One North East), Theresa Lindsay (Head of Marketing and Communications, Yorkshire Forward) and Peter Mearns (Director of Marketing, NWDA) is working on the presentational aspects of the initiative.

In the North East, an Advisory Group has been established which comprises local authority officers, representatives from the LSC, Job Centre Plus and North East universities, Government Office North East, Pat Ritchie (Director, One North East) and Stephen Barber (North East Assembly).

The Process

- A Progress Report was published in mid-May 2004 which identified the principal economic assets of the northern regions and some of the key issues to be addressed by the growth strategy (e.g. new housing provision; transport infrastructure; the knowledge economy and the university sector).
- Work is ongoing on an ‘asset register’ for the north, which includes its world class universities, airports, ports, ICT infrastructure and its key cities.
- Coordinated by the Regional Development Agencies, the 8 prospective city regions are currently compiling evidence about their boundaries, economic performance, assets, functional specialisations, linkages to other city regions and their overall vision. This evidence, along with a much broader range of proposals, should be submitted to the ODPM by the Steering Group in a report towards the end of July 2004.
- The ODPM will work with the Steering Group over subsequent weeks to finalise the content of the report. Other central government departments are also likely to respond during this period. The report should then become the basis for taking forward the Northern Way growth strategy.

The Northern Way and Lancashire

Opportunities
1) The Preston-Blackburn City Region
As one of the 8 Northern Way growth poles, a Preston-Blackburn city region would be expected to bring renewed economic dynamism to Lancashire. If its boundaries are broadly defined, it should ensure that the benefits of economic growth would be felt well beyond the core urban areas. Additionally, the centrality of city regions to the Northern Way initiative should ensure a Lancashire presence in key decision making forums.

2) New and Upgraded Transport Infrastructure
The development of transport infrastructure will be critical to the success of the Northern Way. New investment in transport projects across the region may have a positive effect on Lancashire. More specifically, there may be a new opportunity to raise the issue of the eastward extension of the M65. With the M62 corridor already faced with capacity problems, a strong case exists to consider alternatives. An M65 route – together with the M6 link –
could help to unlock the growth potential of the port of Heysham. There may also be economic dividends along the route, particularly for the urban areas of East Lancashire.

3) The Growth of Manchester and Liverpool
The expansion of economic activity in Greater Manchester and Merseyside is expected to have a strong impact on other areas of the North West. Parts of Lancashire may find themselves increasingly drawn into the travel to work areas of Manchester and Liverpool, which in turn may stimulate business activity.

Threats
1) Exclusion
As yet, there is little clarity about the position of those areas either on the margins or outside city regions and the Northern Growth Corridor zone. In Lancashire, this may include the Ribble Valley, Lancaster and parts of the west coast such as Morecambe, Heysham and Blackpool. One of the key purposes of the Northern Way is to strategically concentrate investment and public funding. The leveraging in of private investment by factors of 4, 5 or even 10 is projected in the Sustainable Communities Plan. The investment decisions of the private sector will determine whether or not this objective is achieved. Nevertheless, peripheral areas may find themselves disadvantaged in the bidding process.

2) Urban dominance
The emphasis on urban development in the Northern Way initiative may further marginalise rural areas in the north of England. The material so far available says little about where rural areas fit into the initiative beyond being among the drivers to help market the North as a tourism, business and relocation destination. Nor is there much sign so far that serious attention will be given to the important urban-rural interface.

3) North-South transport infrastructure
Much of the emphasis in the Northern Way initiative appears to be on east-west road and rail links. Questions might be raised about the likely impact on other strategically important routes, including the west coast main line and the M6.

4) Regional Planning
Beyond its specific transport implications the Northern Way is likely to have a broader and substantial impact on the planning process. The initiative may become a major feature of the review of current Regional Planning Guidance (RPG13) and the development of the Regional Spatial Strategies that will eventually replace RPG. Schemes associated with the Northern Way may be given preference over those in areas outside the NGC and city regions.

Consultations
Environment Directorate; Lancashire County Developments Limited.

Advice
As per the recommendation above.

Alternative options to be considered
N/A

Implications: e.g. Financial, Legal, Personnel, Human Rights, Crime and Disorder or Other
Any representations made to the Cabinet prior to the issue being considered in accordance with the Public Notice of Forward Plans

Name: Organisation: Comments:
None

Local Government (Access to Information) Act 1985
List of Background Papers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Paper</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Contact/Directorate/Ext</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Northern Way Steering Group, The Northern Way Growth</td>
<td>13 May 2004</td>
<td>Ricardo Gomez, Policy Unit, Office of the Chief Executive, Ext. 30616</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategy Progress Report: May 2004</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Cabinet – 2\textsuperscript{nd} July 2004

Report of the Chief Executive

\begin{center}
\begin{tabular}{|c|}
\hline
Part I - Item No. 3 (c) \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\end{center}

\begin{center}
\begin{tabular}{|c|}
\hline
Electoral Division affected: \\
All \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\end{center}

\textbf{Appointments to Outside Bodies - 2004/05} \\
(Appendix "A" refers)

Contact for further information: \\
Margaret Barton, Tel 01772 533572, Office of the Chief Executive

\begin{center}
\begin{tabular}{|c|}
\hline
Executive Summary \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\end{center}

The Cabinet approves the appointment of County Council representatives to various outside bodies.

Under the Constitution, Cabinet Members may fill casual vacancies on outside organisations, and make in-year appointments to District Liaison Committees and new outside organisations whose functions relate to their areas of responsibility, pending annual appointments to all such outside organisations by the Cabinet.

Attached at Appendix "A" is a comprehensive schedule of the various outside bodies to which the County Council appoints representatives. The schedule also includes Local Strategic Partnerships, other Partnerships with District Councils and Crime and Disorder Partnerships.

\textbf{Recommendation}

The Cabinet is asked to formally approve the appointments listed in Appendix 'A' for 2004/2005

\begin{center}
\begin{tabular}{|c|}
\hline
Consultations \\
N/A \\
\hline
Advice \\
N/A \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\end{center}

\begin{center}
\begin{tabular}{|c|}
\hline
Alternative options to be considered \\
N/A \\
\hline
Implications: e.g. Financial, Legal, Personnel, Human Rights, Crime and Disorder or Other \\
This item has the following implications, as indicated: \\
N/A \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\end{center}
## Local Government (Access to Information) Act 1985

### List of Background Papers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Paper</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Contact/Directorate/Ext.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nil</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix ‘A’

Appointments to Outside Bodies
Including Local Strategic Partnerships &
Other Partnerships with District Councils

Index

1. Appointments To Outside Bodies Page No.
   • Environment.................................................................................................................. 2
   • Education & Cultural Services..................................................................................... 7
   • Chief Executive............................................................................................................. 14
   • Social Services............................................................................................................. 18

2. Appointments to Local Strategic Partnerships................................................................. 22

3. Appointments to other Partnerships with District Councils
   (Including Highway Maintenance Partnerships)............................................................ 24

4. Crime and Disorder Reduction Partnerships................................................................. 26

NB: Appointments are for one year only, unless otherwise stated.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Directorate (Contact Officer)</th>
<th>Outside Body/Group</th>
<th>Member Representatives and Appointment Details</th>
<th>Body to be Notified by:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Environment (Peter Kivell)    | Aerospace Industry Regional and Local Authority Network (AIRLINE) | 1 Lab/ 1 Con  
CC T E Burns  
CC B J Whittle | Democratic Services |
| Environment (Joyce Lynch)     | Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONBs)  
Armside/ Silverdale AONB Executive Committee  
Forest of Bowland AONB Advisory Committee | 1 Lab -  
CC L T Ormrod | Democratic Services |
| (Don McKay/Sharon Montgomerie) | National AONB Association | 2 Lab/1 Cons  
CC L T Ormrod  
CC R Pickup  
CC Mrs M Wilson | Democratic Services |
| Environment (Emergency Planning - David Howorth) | BNFL – Sellafield Local Liaison Committee (Observers Only) | 3 Lab/1 Con/1 Lib Dem.  
CC K Ellard  
CC Y Patel  
CC A E Pimblett  
CC W Thompson  
CC S Wilkinson | Democratic Services |
| Environment (Emergency Planning – Bernard Kershaw) | BNFL – Springfields Local Liaison Committee | 1 Cons  
CC B J Whittle | Democratic Services |
| Environment (Emergency Planning – Bernard Kershaw) | British Energy -Heysham Nuclear Power Station Local Community Liaison Council | 2 Lab/1 Con  
CC D B Stanley  
CC A H Thornton  
CC W Thompson | Democratic Services |
| Environment (Steve Turner)    | Burnley Environmental Forum | 2 Lab  
CC J Cavanagh  
CC Mrs M I Roberts | Democratic Services |
| Environment (Richard Watts)   | Carnforth Station & Railway Trust | 1 Lab  
CC Ms J E Yates | Directorate |
| Environment (Steve Turner)    | Chorley Environmental Forum | 2 Lab  
CC V J Murphy  
CC D C Lloyd | Democratic Services |
| Environment (Clive Grimshaw)  | Civic Trust Local Authority Partnership | 1 Lab – CC Mrs J Battle | Democratic Services |
| Environment (Joyce Lynch)     | Coastal Zone Planning - Ribble Estuary/ Ribble “Source to Sea” Standing Conference  
Morecambe Bay Standing Conference | 1 Lab – CC K R Ellard  
1 Lab – CC A H Thornton | Directorate  
Democratic Services |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Directorate (Contact Officer)</th>
<th>Outside Body/Group</th>
<th>Member Representatives and Appointment Details</th>
<th>Body to be Notified by:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Environment (Lancaster City Council)</td>
<td>Crook O’ Lune Advisory Committee</td>
<td>1 Cons- CC D S Wood</td>
<td>Democratic Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environment (Alisdair Simpson)</td>
<td>Cyclepoint, Lancaster - ‘Budgie Bike’ Scheme, Management Board</td>
<td>1 Lab- CC A H Thornton</td>
<td>Directorate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environment (Dominic Rigby)</td>
<td>Eccleston Millennium Green Trust</td>
<td>1 Lab – CC A Whittaker</td>
<td>Democratic Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environment (Clive Grimshaw)</td>
<td>Groundwork Trusts – Boards of Management: East Lancashire, Lancashire West, Rossendale, Wigan &amp; Chorley (+ Project Group)</td>
<td>1 Lab on each</td>
<td>Democratic Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environment (Peter Isles)</td>
<td>Heritage Trust for the North West</td>
<td>2 Lab</td>
<td>Democratic Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environment (Richard Kirkby)</td>
<td>Hyndburn Prospects Forum and Foundation</td>
<td>1 Lab – CC G W Slynn</td>
<td>Democratic Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environment (Clive Grimshaw)</td>
<td>Irish Sea Forum</td>
<td>2 Lab / 1 Con</td>
<td>Directorate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environment/ Cultural Services</td>
<td>Irwell Terrace Bridge Project, Bacup – Steering Group</td>
<td>1 Lab</td>
<td>Democratic Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environment (Phil Megson)</td>
<td>Joint Advisory Committee with Blackburn with Darwen and Blackpool Borough Councils on Strategic Planning Matters</td>
<td>5 Lab/2 Con/1 Lib Dem.</td>
<td>Directorate</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Directorate (Contact Officer)</th>
<th>Outside Body/Group</th>
<th>Member Representatives and Appointment Details</th>
<th>Body to be Notified by:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Environment (Clive Weake)     | Jumbles/ Wayoh/ Entwistle Recreation Management Zone – Advisory Committee | 2 Lab/ 1 Con  
CC J Cavanagh  
CC D W Easton  
CC Mrs K M Holt | Democratic Services |
| Environment (Steve Browne)     | Lancashire Environmental Fund Limited | 1 Lab  
CC B M Johnson | Directorate |
| Environment (Steve Turner)     | Lancashire Environment Partnership: - Steering Group | 1 Lab  
CC B M Johnson | Directorate |
| Environment (Cliff Matthias/Ian Hornby) | Lancashire Highways Partnership  
Full Partnership  
(Area Board representation as shown in brackets) | **CC A Atkinson (R Valley)**  
CC G Davies (S Ribble)  
CC Mrs W B Dwyer (H'burn)  
CC D Easton (Rossendale)  
CC B M Johnson (Preston)  
CC S J Large (Burnley)  
CC L T Ormrod (Pendle)  
CC K V Riley (Wyre)  
CC A H Thornton (L'caster)  
CC B J Whittle (Fylde)  
CC F J Williams (W. Lancs)  
CC D Yates (Chorley)  
CC Ms J Yates (P'ship Chair) | Directorate |
| Environment (Reg Morley)       | Lancashire Landscape and Wildlife Group | 3 Lab/ 1 Con  
CC S J Large  
CC K J Riley  
CC F J Williams  
CC W Thompson | Directorate |
| Environment (Clive Weake/Nick Osborne) | Lancashire Local Access Forum | 2 Lab/1 Con  
CC A Atkinson  
CC L T Ormrod  
CC W G Roberts | Directorate |
| Environment (Margaret Barton)  | Lancashire Playing Fields Association | 1 Lab/ 1 Con  
CC W G Roberts  
CC D M O'Toole | Democratic Services |
| Environment (Andy Ashcroft)    | Lancashire Rural Policy Partnership  
Programme Management Committee | 1 Lab/1 Con/1 Lib Dem  
CC M J Hindley  
CC Mrs J Stuart  
CC D M Whipp | Directorate |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Directorate (Contact Officer)</th>
<th>Outside Body/Group</th>
<th>Member Representatives and Appointment Details</th>
<th>Body to be Notified by:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Environment (Steve Browne)    | Lancashire Waste Partnership | **2 Lab/1 Cons**  
CC M J Hindley  
CC B M Johnson  
CC B J Whittle | Directorate |
| (Sue Proctor/John Geldard)    |                     |                                                 |                        |
| Environment (Joyce Lynch)     | Lancaster Canal – Northern Reaches Restoration Group | **1 Lab/1 Con**  
CC A H Thornton  
CC Mrs. S M D Fishwick | Democratic Services |
| (Steve Turner)                |                     |                                                 |                        |
| Environment                   | Local Agenda 21: Lancashire-Gulu Link NGO | **CC Ms J E Yates** | Directorate |
| (Stuart Perigo/Rob Hope)      |                     |                                                 |                        |
| (Ciaran McInness)             |                     |                                                 |                        |
| (Simon Pridow)                |                     |                                                 |                        |
| (Jonathan Haine/Andy Denton) |                     |                                                 |                        |
| (Rob Hope)                    |                     |                                                 |                        |
| (Stuart Perigo)               |                     |                                                 |                        |
| Environment                   | Local Liaison Committees | **CC Mrs J Stuart**  
Westby  
Clifton Marsh  
Horncliffe  
**Leaper’s Wood, Dunald Mill, Back Lane and High Roads**  
Rigby House  
Waddington Fell Quarry | Directorate |
| (Emergency Planning)          |                     |                                                 |                        |
| Environment                   | NIPA (Clariant) Laboratories Oswaldtwistle | **1 Lab - CC Mrs W B Dwyer** | Directorate |
| (Peter Kivell)                |                     |                                                 |                        |
| Environment                   | North West Aerospace Alliance | **1 Lab – CC T E Burns** | Directorate |
| (Environment Agency)          |                     |                                                 |                        |
| Environment                   | North West Coastal Forum | **2 Lab/1 Con/1 Lib Dem.**  
CC D B Stanley  
CC J S Sutcliffe  
CC B J Whittle  
CC D Yates | Democratic Services |
| (Tony Gregson)                | Nuclear Free Local Authorities Full English Forum | **2 Lab /1 Con**  
CC W Thompson  
CC Mrs J E Yates  
CC D Yates  
CC J Cavanagh (Reserve) | Democratic Services |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Directorate (Contact Officer)</th>
<th>Outside Body/Group</th>
<th>Member Representatives and Appointment Details</th>
<th>Body to be Notified by:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Environment (Clive Weake)     | Public Rights of Way and Access Forum | 3 Lab/1 Con/1 Lib Dem.  
CC J Cavanagh  
CC D W Easton  
CC C J Holtom  
CC W G Roberts  
CC D M Whipp | Directorate |
| Environment (Stuart Wrigley)  | Public Transport Consortium of Non-Metropolitan Authorities (LGA Special Interest Group.) | CC C Waite  
CC D Yates  
CC K A Young | Directorate |
| Environment (Cumbria Wildlife Trust) | Red Alert North West Partnership– (Squirrel Initiative) | 1 Lab  
CC J Cavanagh  
CC C Waite | Democratic Services |
| Environment                    | Ribble Link Trust Co-ordinating Committee | 1 Lab – CC D Yates | Democratic Services |
| Environment (Clive Weake/ Richard Camp) | Rivington Terraced Gardens & Lever Park – Members’ Steering Group | 1 Lab – CC D Yates | Democratic Services |
| Environment (Joyce Lynch)      | Standing Conference of South Pennine Authorities (SCOSPA) | 2 Lab/ 1 Con  
CC L T Ormrod  
CC G W Slynn  
CC C J Holtom | Democratic Services |
| Environment (Chris Anslow)     | Trans-Pennine Rail Group | 1 Lab/ 1 Con  
CC D Yates  
CC K A Young | Directorate |
| Environment (Chris Anslow – Public Transport) | West Coast Rail 250: - General Council | CC G W Slynn  
CC D Yates  
CC K A Young  
CC D Yates | Directorate |
| Environment (Dominic Rigby)    | West Lancashire Canal Partnership | CC W G Roberts  
CC W W Trickett | Directorate |
| Environment (Clive Weake)      | West Pennine Moors Members Area Management Committee | 2 Lab/1 Con  
CC D Easton  
CC D Yates  
CC Mrs V M Wilson | Directorate |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Directorate (Contact Officer)</th>
<th>Outside Body/Group</th>
<th>Member Representatives and Appointment Details</th>
<th>Body to be Notified by: Directorate (D)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Education and Cultural Services (Mark Elliott) | The Arthur Edmonson Quinn Bequest | CC Mrs M I Roberts  
CC M Johnstone  
*Appointment – No fixed term | D |
| Education and Cultural Services (Mark Elliott) | Bispham Durnings Endowed | CC F J Williams  
*Appointment – No fixed term | D |
| Education and Cultural Services (Mark Elliott) | Brierfield Mansfield High Educational Foundation | CC Mrs S R Derwent  
*Appointment – No fixed term | D |
| Colleges’ Governing Bodies | Adult and Continuing Education Service (Central Zone) | CC K R Ellard  
CC S Wilkinson  
CC A Atkinson | D |
| Education and Cultural Services (Andrea Betley) | The Adult College, Lancaster | CC Ms N D Penney  
CC K V Riley  
CC S M D Fishwick  
*2 year term – end Sept 2005 | D |
| Education and Cultural Services (Andrea Betley) | Alston Hall College | CC A Atkinson  
CC V A Patel  
CC Mrs D Westell  
*2 year term – end Sept 2005 | D |
| Chief Executive | Blackburn College Corporation Board | CC M J Hindley | OCE Democratic Services |
| Education and Cultural Services | Cardinal Newman College | CC S Wilkinson  
*till 31 Mar 2006 | D |
| Education and Cultural Services (Andrea Betley) | Lancashire College, Chorley | CC D Yates  
CC M Tomlinson  
CC Mrs M E Livesey  
*2 year term – end Sept 2005 | D |
| Education & Cultural Services | St Martin’s College, Lancaster | CC Ms J E Yates  
*4 year term - Oct 2005 | D |
| Education & Cultural Services (Gov. Services) | Preston College | Mr. R Hooper | D |
| Education and Cultural Services | District Liaison Committee Lancaster | CC Dr R B Henig  
CC A Thornton  
CC D S Wood  
CC Ms N D Penney (co-opted) | D |
| Education and Cultural Services | District Liaison Committee Wyre | CC C Grunshaw  
CC G W Roper  
CC J S C Shedwick | D |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Directorate</th>
<th>Outside Body/Group</th>
<th>Member Representatives and Appointment Details</th>
<th>Body to be Notified by: Directorate (D)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Education and Cultural Services | District Liaison Committee Ribble Valley | CC A Atkinson  
CC C W R Parkinson  
CC Mrs M Wilson | D |
| Education and Cultural Services | District Liaison Committee Fylde | CC Mrs J Stuart  
CC W Thompson  
CC C Walton | D |
| Education and Cultural Services | District Liaison Committee Preston | CC K R Ellard  
CC A L Hackett  
CC V A Patel | D |
| Education and Cultural Services | District Liaison Committee South Ribble | CC G Davies  
CC M Tomlinson  
CC K A Young | D |
| Education and Cultural Services | District Liaison Committee West Lancashire | CC R H Shepherd  
CC W W Trickett  
CC F J Williams | D |
| Education and Cultural Services | District Liaison Committee Chorley | CC Mrs M E Livesey  
CC D C Lloyd  
CC V J Murphy  
CC A Whittaker | D |
| Education and Cultural Services | District Liaison Committee Hyndburn | CC Mrs J Battle  
CC G W Slynn  
CC Mrs D Westell | D |
| Education and Cultural Services | District Liaison Committee Burnley | CC J Cavanagh  
CC Mrs M I Roberts  
CC S J Large | D |
| Education and Cultural Services | District Liaison Committee Pendle | CC Mrs S R Derwent  
CC Mrs D Ormrod  
CC C Waite | D |
| Education and Cultural Services | District Liaison Committee Rossendale | CC D W Easton  
CC Mrs K M Holt  
CC R Pickup | D |
| Education and Cultural Services | Dukes Playhouse Board of Directors | CC Ms N D Penney  
CC A Whittaker  
CC Ms J E Yates  
CC R H Shepherd | D |
| Education and Cultural Services (Early Years) | Early Years Development and Childcare Partnership | CC C Grunshaw  
CC A Whittaker  
CC Mrs M P Case  
*No appointment details | D |
| Education and Cultural Services | Children’s First | CC C Grunshaw  
CC Mrs M P Case  
CC A E Pimblett | |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Directorate (Contact Officer)</th>
<th>Outside Body/Group</th>
<th>Member Representatives and Appointment Details</th>
<th>Body to be Notified by: Directorate (D)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Education and Cultural Services (Carol McNulty – Ethnic Minority Achievement)</td>
<td>Ethnic Minority Achievement Consultative Body</td>
<td>CC D W Easton, CC Y Patel, CC Mrs D Westell, CC Mrs S R Derwent *No appointment details</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education &amp; Cultural Services (Records Office)</td>
<td>Executive Committee of the Friends of Lancashire Archives</td>
<td>CC M Johnstone *No fixed term</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education and Cultural Services</td>
<td>Herbert Norcross Scholarship Fund</td>
<td>CC W G Roberts, CC Mrs D Westell</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education and Cultural Services</td>
<td>Horse and Bamboo Theatre</td>
<td>CC R Pickup</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education and Cultural Services</td>
<td>Integration and Care Working Group</td>
<td>CC Mrs M E Livesey</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education and Cultural Services</td>
<td>Lancaster City Museums P’ship Joint Advisory Cttee</td>
<td>CC Ms N D Penney, CC Ms J E Yates</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education and Cultural Services</td>
<td>Lancaster Ripley CE Educational Trust</td>
<td>Rev’d Canon P J Ballard</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education and Cultural Services (Mark Elliott)</td>
<td>Livesey’s Exhibition Endowment</td>
<td>CC R Pickup *Appointment - No fixed term</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education and Cultural Services</td>
<td>Mid-Pennine Arts Association</td>
<td>CC D W Easton, CC M J Hindley, CC J S Sutcliffe, CC R H Shepherd</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education and Cultural Services</td>
<td>Arts Council England (formerly NW Arts Board)</td>
<td>CC Mrs J E Yates</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education &amp; Cultural Services</td>
<td>CITE (formerly Irwell Valley Sculpture Trail</td>
<td>CC R Pickup</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education and Cultural Services</td>
<td>North West Museums Service: • Board of Management Trustees • Council for Museums and Art Galleries in the North West</td>
<td>}CC Mrs W B Dwyer *(5 year term –2 Jan 2006)</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education and Cultural Services (Helen Hockedy)</td>
<td>Ormskirk School Foundation Governors</td>
<td>Mr. F J Williams] To Sept Mr. C R Baily ] 2006 Mr. D J Burns – To Feb 04</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education and Cultural Services (Mark Elliott)</td>
<td>Peter Latham Charity</td>
<td>CC R H Shepherd *4-year term - Jan 2006.</td>
<td>Directorate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Directorate (Contact Officer)</strong></td>
<td><strong>Outside Body/Group</strong></td>
<td><strong>Member Representatives and Appointment Details</strong></td>
<td><strong>Body to be Notified by:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Education and Cultural Services  | Robert Windle’s Foundation | CC D M Whipp  
*Appointment – no fixed term | Directorate |
| (Gov. Services)                  |                        |                                                 |                             |
| Education and Cultural Services  | Roper Educational Foundation | No LCC Representation  
Cllr. Mrs D Challoner (Preston BC)  
*Appointment - No fixed term | Directorate |
| (Mark Elliott)                  |                        |                                                 |                             |
| Chief Executive                  | Standing Advisory Council for Religious Education (SACRE) | 3 Lab/2 Cons  
CC V A Patel  
CC A H Thornton  
CC F J Williams  
CC Mrs K M Holt  
CC K A Young  
*4 year term - June 2005 | Democratic Services |
| (Gordon Whittle)                |                        |                                                 |                             |
| Chief Executive                  | School Organisation Committee | 4 Lab/2 Con/1 Lib Dem  
CC V A Patel (Nov 05)  
CC D W Easton (Aug 04)  
CC S J Large (Aug 04)  
CC Mrs M E Livesey (April 06)  
CC A L Hackett }  
CC W Thompson (June 05)  
CC A Whittaker }  
(All 3 year terms of office) | Democratic Services |
| (Gordon Whittle)                |                        |                                                 |                             |
| Education and Cultural Services  | Stocks Massey Bequest | 2 Lab/2 Cons  
CC Mrs S R Derwent  
CC A C P Martin  
CC Mrs M I Roberts  
CC K A Young | Directorate |
| (Helen Hockedy)                 |                        |                                                 |                             |
| Lancaster City Council           | Storey Gallery Board, Lancaster | 1 Lab  
CC Jean Yates | Directorate |
| Education and Cultural Services | Sure Start  
North Lancaster  
Preston – Ribbleton  
Hyndburn | CC Ms N D Penney  
CC K R Ellard  
CC Ms D Pollitt  
(Appointments – no fixed term) | N/A (by invitation) |
| Contact Direct                  | Pre-School Learning Alliance | CC A Whittaker  
(Substitute Member  
CC Mrs D Ormrod) | D |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Directorate</th>
<th>Outside Body/Group</th>
<th>Member Representatives and Appointment Details</th>
<th>Body to be Notified by: Directorate (D)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Education and Cultural Services</strong></td>
<td><strong>Youth &amp; Community Service</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>D</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Mark Woodruff)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Education and Cultural Services</strong></td>
<td><strong>District Youth &amp; Community Service &amp; Connexions Advisory Committees:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Miss Turner</strong></td>
<td><strong>Lancaster</strong></td>
<td>CC Dr R B Henig</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CC Ms N D Penney</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CC W R Parkinson</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sue Taylor</strong></td>
<td><strong>Wyre</strong></td>
<td>CC C C Grunshaw</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CC R Mutch</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CC Mrs V M Wilson</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Katrina Moore</strong></td>
<td><strong>Ribble Valley</strong></td>
<td>CC A A Atkinson</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CC C C Holtom</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CC J S Sutcliffe</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CC Mrs M Wilson</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sue King</strong></td>
<td><strong>Fylde</strong></td>
<td>CC Mrs J Stuart</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CC W Thompson</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CC C C Walton</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mark Piotrowski</strong></td>
<td><strong>Preston</strong></td>
<td>CC A L Hackett</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CC W R Parkinson</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CC V A Patel</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pat Brierley</strong></td>
<td><strong>South Ribble</strong></td>
<td>CC Mrs A Brown</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CC C G Davies</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CC K A Young (4 year appointments)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Lisa Cunliffe</strong></td>
<td><strong>West Lancashire</strong></td>
<td>CC C W Cheetham</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>District Admin Officer</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>CC R H Shepherd</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Chorley</strong></td>
<td>CC D C Lloyd (2 vacancies)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CC A C P Martin</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Georgina Lawrence</strong></td>
<td><strong>Hyndburn</strong></td>
<td>CC Mrs J Battle</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CC C C Holtom</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CC Mrs D Westell</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Brenda Gaynor</strong></td>
<td><strong>Burnley</strong></td>
<td>CC T E Burns</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CC A C P Martin</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Pendle</strong></td>
<td>CC Mrs S R Derwent</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CC D M Whipp</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Hilary Bradshaw</strong></td>
<td><strong>Rossendale</strong></td>
<td>CC Mrs H Harding</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CC Mrs K M Holt</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Steve Roman</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>CC R Wilkinson</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Directorate (Contact Officer)</td>
<td>Outside Body/Group</td>
<td>Member Representatives and Appointment Details</td>
<td>Body to be Notified by: Directorate (D)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **Education & Cultural Services (Y & C Service)** | Lancashire Youth & Community Service & Connexions Advisory Committee (LYCSCAC) | **3 Lab/1 Cons**  
  CC C Grunshaw  
  CC Ms N D Penney  
  CC Mrs D Westell  
  CC W R Parkinson | D |
| **Education and Cultural Services (John Goffee)** | Voluntary Youth Services | CC Ms N D Penney | D |
| **Youth & Community Centres** | | | |
| **Education & Cultural Services (John Gordon)** | Lancaster: -  
  **Barton Road Youth & Community Centre**  
  Heysham Youth & Community Centre (Community Assoc.)  
  Marsh Community Centre Trust (Voluntary sector)  
  Morecambe Woodhill Lane Community Centre (Community Assoc.)  
  Skerton Youth & Community Centre (Voluntary sector) | **Vacancy**  
  CC Ms J E Yates  
  1 Member vacancy  
  Michael Gibson  
  CC Ms J E Yates  
  CC Ms N D Penney | D |
| **Education and Cultural Services (Mark Piela)** | Wyre District  
  **Fleetwood, Milton Street Community Centre**  
  Preesall and Knott End Steering Group | CC C Grunshaw  
  CC R Mutch | D |
| **Education and Cultural Services (Bill Taylor)** | Ribble Valley,  
  **Longridge Youth Centre**  
  **Trinity BOM** | CC Mrs M Wilson  
  CC R Pickup | D |
| **Education & Cultural Services (Bren Cook)** | Preston  
  Moor Nook Comm. Association  
  Plungington Comm. Association | CC K R Ellard  
  CC B M Johnson | D |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Directorate (Contact Officer)</th>
<th>Outside Body/Group</th>
<th>Member Representatives and Appointment Details</th>
<th>Body to be Notified by: Directorate (D)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Education &amp; Cultural Services (Barry Emmett)</td>
<td>Hyndburn&lt;br&gt;OsvaldTwistle Youth and Community Centre&lt;br&gt;Belmont Community Centre&lt;br&gt;Briercliffe Youth Centre&lt;br&gt;Brunshaw Youth Centre&lt;br&gt;Gannow Community Centre&lt;br&gt;Padiham Youth Centre&lt;br&gt;Stoneyholme &amp; Daneshouse&lt;br&gt;Stoops/Hargher Clough Youth &amp; Community Centre</td>
<td>CC Mrs D Westell&lt;br&gt;CC Mrs J Battle&lt;br&gt;CC T E Burns&lt;br&gt;CC T E Burns&lt;br&gt;Mr. A Fulledge&lt;br&gt;CC S J Large&lt;br&gt;CC A C P Martin&lt;br&gt;CC A C P Martin&lt;br&gt;CC M Johnstone&lt;br&gt;Cllr M Najib (Burnley BC)&lt;br&gt;CC Mrs M I Roberts</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education &amp; Cultural Services (Lili Rushton)</td>
<td>Burnley&lt;br&gt;Burnley Youth &amp; Community Centre&lt;br&gt;Belmont Community Centre</td>
<td>CC T E Burns&lt;br&gt;CC T E Burns&lt;br&gt;Mr. A Fulledge&lt;br&gt;CC S J Large&lt;br&gt;CC A C P Martin&lt;br&gt;CC A C P Martin&lt;br&gt;CC M Johnstone&lt;br&gt;Cllr M Najib (Burnley BC)&lt;br&gt;CC Mrs M I Roberts</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education and Cultural Services (Y &amp; C Service)</td>
<td>Rosendale&lt;br&gt;Bacup Youth Centre&lt;br&gt;Crawshawbooth Youth &amp; Community Centre&lt;br&gt;Rawtenstall Youth &amp; Community Centre&lt;br&gt;Whitewell Bottom Youth &amp; Community Centre</td>
<td>CC Mrs K M Holt&lt;br&gt;CC Mrs H Harding&lt;br&gt;CC Mrs H Harding&lt;br&gt;CC D Easton</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Directorate (Contact Officer)</td>
<td>Outside Body/ Group</td>
<td>Member Representatives and Appointment Details</td>
<td>Body to be Notified by:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chief Executive (Margaret Barton)</td>
<td>Blackpool Airport Consultative Committee</td>
<td>1 Lab CC K V Riley</td>
<td>Democratic Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chief Executive (Margaret Barton)</td>
<td>Buckshaw Village Member Steering Group</td>
<td>2 Lab CC D C Lloyd CC D Yates</td>
<td>Democratic Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chief Executive (Margaret Barton)</td>
<td>Burnley Daneshouse Access Point Partnership Board</td>
<td>1 Lab CC J Cavanagh</td>
<td>Democratic Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chief Executive (Margaret Barton)</td>
<td>Bushell House Charity (Goosnargh)</td>
<td>1 Lab CC R Pickup</td>
<td>Democratic Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chief Executive (Democratic Services)</td>
<td>Chorley Town Centre Forum</td>
<td>1 Lab CC D Yates</td>
<td>Democratic Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chief Executive (Roy Jones)</td>
<td>Community Futures</td>
<td>3 Lab/1 Cons CC G Davies CC DC W Easton CC R Pickup CC J S C Shedwick</td>
<td>Democratic Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chief Executive (Richard Thresh, Policy Unit)</td>
<td>East Lancashire Housing Market Renewal Initiative (Elevate) Shadow Board Reference Group</td>
<td></td>
<td>Democratic Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CC Ms D Pollitt Deputy – CC B M Johnson</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CC J Cavanagh CC A C P Martin CC L T Ormrod</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chief Executive (Margaret Barton)</td>
<td>Environment Agency: Environment Group - Central Area</td>
<td>1 Lab/1 Con/1 Lib Dem. CC J Cavanagh CC J S Sutcliffe CC B J Whittle</td>
<td>Democratic Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chief Executive (Margaret Barton)</td>
<td>Environment Agency – Flood Defence Committees: - North West Region Central Area Advisory Committee</td>
<td>1 Lab – CC Ms J E Yates (until May 2005)</td>
<td>Democratic Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3 Lab/1 Cons CC J Cavanagh CC D W Easton CC V J Murphy CC A Atkinson (until 31/10/05)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Directorate (Contact Officer)</td>
<td>Outside Body/ Group</td>
<td>Member Representatives and Appointment Details</td>
<td>Body to be Notified by:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chief Executive (Sarah Murray)</td>
<td>Eurotira Working Group</td>
<td>1 Lab&lt;br&gt;CC M J Hindley</td>
<td>Policy Unit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chief Executive (Margaret Barton)</td>
<td>James Bond/Henry Welch Trust (Administered by Lancaster CC)</td>
<td>Mrs E Bush</td>
<td>Democratic Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LCDL (Steve Dean)</td>
<td>Heysham Mossgate Development Company</td>
<td>CC Ms J Yates</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chief Executive (Glenn Johnson)</td>
<td>Lancashire Leaders and Chief Executives Group</td>
<td>1 Lab&lt;br&gt;CC Mrs H Harding</td>
<td>Democratic Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chief Executive (Graham Leigh)</td>
<td>The Lancashire Partnership Against Crime Limited</td>
<td>1 Lab&lt;br&gt;CC R Wilkinson</td>
<td>Democratic Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chief Executive (Glenn Johnson)</td>
<td>Liverpool Airport Consultative Committee</td>
<td>1 Lab&lt;br&gt;CC W W Trickett</td>
<td>Democratic Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chief Executive (Clive Giddings)</td>
<td>National Association of Black and Asian Ethnic Minority Committees</td>
<td>CC V A Patel&lt;br&gt;CC Y Patel</td>
<td>Human Resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chief Executive (Graham Leigh)</td>
<td>New Era Trust Limited</td>
<td>CC Mrs D Westell&lt;br&gt;Mr J Goffee</td>
<td>Democratic Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chief Executive</td>
<td>North West Coastal Issues Group</td>
<td>CC R Pickup</td>
<td>Democratic Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chief Executive (Sarah Murray Policy Unit)</td>
<td>North West Objectives 2 &amp; 3 Programmes - Programme Monitoring/Regional Committee&lt;br&gt;North and West Lancashire Priority 1 Action Plan - Partnership Board</td>
<td>CC Ms N D Penney&lt;br&gt;CC A C P Martin</td>
<td>Policy Unit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chief Executive (Margaret Barton)</td>
<td>NW of England and Isle of Man Reserve Forces and Cadets Association</td>
<td>CC D Yates&lt;br&gt;CC D M O’Toole</td>
<td>Democratic Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chief Executive (Jane McLeod)</td>
<td>North Western Local Authorities’ Employers’ Association</td>
<td>CC Mrs J Battle&lt;br&gt;Sub – CC A C P Martin</td>
<td>Human Resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chief Executive (Ian Liptrot)</td>
<td>North Western and North Wales Sea Fisheries District Joint Committee</td>
<td>2 Lab /1 Con&lt;br&gt;CC C Grunshaw&lt;br&gt;CC K V Riley&lt;br&gt;Mr. M Hamer</td>
<td>Democratic Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Directorate (Contact Officer)</td>
<td>Outside Body/Group</td>
<td>Member Representatives and Appointment Details</td>
<td>Body to be Notified by:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Universiies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Democratic Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chief Executive (Roy Jones)</td>
<td>Lancaster (Court)</td>
<td>CC Mrs J Battle</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lancaster (Council)</td>
<td>CC Ms N D Penney</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CC R Hodge</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CC W Thompson</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(3 year term)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Liverpool (Court)</td>
<td>1 Lab CC D B Stanley</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(3 year term)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 Lab / 1 Con</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CC W G Roberts</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CC R H Shepherd</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(3 year term expiring 30/6/05)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Manchester (Court)*</td>
<td>2 Lab / 1 Con</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CC D Yates</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CC Mrs M P Case</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CC D C Lloyd</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(3 year term expiring 31/8/04)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manchester University*</td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>CC M Johnstone</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CC L T Ormrod</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>University of Manchester Institute of Science &amp; Technology (UMIST)*</td>
<td><strong>CC D Yates</strong> (till 31/8/04)</td>
<td>Democratic Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Salford (Court)</td>
<td>1 Lab</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CC D Yates appointed (to 31/08/08)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Lab / 1 Con</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CC M J Hindley</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CC J Cavanagh</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CC G W Roper</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(4 year term)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Directorate (Contact Officer)</td>
<td>Outside Body/ Group</td>
<td>Member Representatives and Appointment Details</td>
<td>Body to be Notified by</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chief Executive (Roy Jones)</td>
<td>Valuation Tribunals</td>
<td>4 Lab / 1 Con&lt;br&gt;Mr L Atkinson (non-LCC)&lt;br&gt;Mr A Pierce (non-LCC)&lt;br&gt;CC R Pickup&lt;br&gt;Mr K Richardson (non-LCC)&lt;br&gt;<strong>Mr I S Thompson (non-LCC)</strong>&lt;br&gt;3 vacancies (2 Lab 1 Cons)&lt;br&gt;(9 year term till 31 March 2009)</td>
<td>Democratic Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chief Executive (Roy Jones/ Margaret Barton)</td>
<td>West Lancashire Trade Union, Community &amp; Unemployed Resource Centre Management Committee</td>
<td>2 Lab&lt;br&gt;CC F J Williams&lt;br&gt;CC W W Trickett</td>
<td>Democratic Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Directorate (Contact Officer)</td>
<td>Outside Body/ Group</td>
<td>Member Representatives and Appointment Details</td>
<td>Body to be Notified by: Directorate (D)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Services</td>
<td>Age Concern, Lancashire</td>
<td>CC C W Cheetham</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Services</td>
<td>Alcohol and Drug Services (formerly GMLCA)</td>
<td>CC D Easton</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Services</td>
<td>Carers' Forum:-</td>
<td></td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Burnley/Pendle/Rosendale</td>
<td>CC Mrs D Ormrod</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hyndburn</td>
<td>CC Mrs W B Dwyer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Preston</td>
<td>CC Y Patel</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Chorley/South Ribble</td>
<td>CC M Tomlinson</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>West Lancashire</td>
<td>CC W W Trickett</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>North Lancashire</td>
<td>CC A H Thornton</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fylde</td>
<td>CC Mrs J Stuart</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Services</td>
<td>Controlled and Assisted Community Homes Day Centre Forum (18)</td>
<td>1 Member for each</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sunnybank, Kirkham,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Park View, Lytham,</td>
<td>CC Mrs J Stuart</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bymbrig, Bamber Bridge</td>
<td>CC W Thompson</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Crossways, Leyland,</td>
<td>CC M Tomlinson</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Moor Park Special Care, Preston</td>
<td>CC Mrs A Brown</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Enfield Centre, Accrington</td>
<td>CC V A Patel</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pendleton Brook, Clitheroe</td>
<td>CC Mrs J Battle</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ecroyd Centre, Colne</td>
<td>CC J S Sutcliffe</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Meadowbank Centre, Burnley</td>
<td>CC Mrs D Ormrod</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CC J Cavanagh</td>
<td>Appointed for 4 year term of the CC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Directorate (Contact Officer)</td>
<td>Outside Body/ Group</td>
<td>Member Representatives and Appointment Details</td>
<td>Body to be Notified by: Directorate (D)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Social Services               | Council for Voluntary Services (CVS)                     | CC K V Riley  
CC Mrs. D Ormrod  
Lab vacancy  
CC Mrs W B Dwyer  
CC A H Thornton  
CC K R Ellard  
CC F J Williams                                                                 | D                                      |
|                               | Blackpool, Wyre & Fylde                                  |                                                                                                              |                                        |
|                               | Burnley, Pendle & Rossendale                             |                                                                                                              |                                        |
|                               | Chorley and South Ribble                                 |                                                                                                              |                                        |
|                               | Hyndburn & Ribble Valley                                 |                                                                                                              |                                        |
|                               | Lancaster                                                |                                                                                                              |                                        |
|                               | Preston                                                  |                                                                                                              |                                        |
|                               | West Lancashire                                          |                                                                                                              |                                        |
| Social Services               | District Liaison Committees (3 Members on each)          |                                                                                                              |                                        |
| Social Services               | **District Liaison Committee**                           | CC A H Thornton  
CC Ms N D Penney  
CC Mrs S M Fishwick                                                                 | D                                      |
|                               | Lancaster                                                |                                                                                                              |                                        |
| Social Services               | **District Liaison Committee**                           | CC K V Riley  
CC R Mutch  
CC K G Tebbs                                                                 | D                                      |
|                               | Wyre                                                     |                                                                                                              |                                        |
| Social Services               | **District Liaison Committee Ribble Valley**             | CC A Atkinson  
CC C J Holtom  
CC Mrs M Wilson                                                                 | D                                      |
|                               | Fylde                                                    |                                                                                                              |                                        |
| Social Services               | **District Liaison Committee**                           | CC A W Jealous  
CC Mrs J Stuart  
CC C Walton                                                                 | D                                      |
|                               | Preston                                                  |                                                                                                              |                                        |
| Social Services               | **District Liaison Committee**                           | CC V A Patel  
CC Mrs N Ward  
CC K R Ellard                                                                 | D                                      |
|                               | Preston                                                  |                                                                                                              |                                        |
| Social Services               | **District Liaison Committee**                           | CC G Davies  
CC M Tomlinson  
CC K A Young                                                                 | D                                      |
|                               | South Ribble                                             |                                                                                                              |                                        |
| Social Services               | **District Liaison Committee**                           | CC W G Roberts  
CC R H Shepherd  
CC W W Trickett                                                                 | D                                      |
|                               | West Lancashire                                          |                                                                                                              |                                        |
| Social Services               | **District Liaison Committee**                           | CC D C Lloyd  
CC D Yates  
1 Cons vacancy                                                                 | D                                      |
|                               | Chorley                                                  |                                                                                                              |                                        |
| Social Services               | **District Liaison Committee**                           | CC Mrs W B Dwyer  
CC Mrs J Battle  
CC Mrs D Westell                                                                 | D                                      |
<p>|                               | Hyndburn                                                 |                                                                                                              |                                        |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Directorate (Contact Officer)</th>
<th>Outside Body/ Group</th>
<th>Member Representatives and Appointment Details</th>
<th>Body to be Notified by: Directorate (D)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Social Services**            | District Liaison Committee  
Burnley                     | CC J Cavanagh  
CC S J Large  
CC Mrs M I Roberts          | D                                      |
| **Social Services**            | District Liaison Committee  
Pendle                           | CC Mrs S R Derwent  
CC Mrs D Ormrod  
CC L T Ormrod               | D                                      |
| **Social Services**            | District Liaison Committee  
Rosendale                      | CC R Pickup  
CC Mrs K M Holt  
CC D W Easton                | D                                      |
| **Social Services**            | Integrated Commissioning Boards  
(re Adults with Learning Disabilities) Joint with PCTs | CC A H Thornton  
CC K V Riley  
CC Mrs M Wilson  
CC C Walton  
CC S Wilkinson  
CC G Davies  
CC F J Williams  
CC D Easton                  | D                                      |
| Julie Dockerty                 | Lancaster/Morecambe  
Wyre                           | CC S Wilkinson  
CC Mrs M Wilson                |                                        |
| Dave Spencer                   | Hyndburn/Ribble Valley  
Fylde                          |                                            |                                        |
| Kim Haworth                    | Preston                      |                                            |                                        |
| Dave Spencer                   | Chorley/South Ribble  
West Lancs                     |                                            |                                        |
| Mubarak Darbar                 | Burnley, Pendle & Rossendale |                                            |                                        |
| Ian Crabtree                   |                              |                                            |                                        |
| Tim Thaczuk                    |                              |                                            |                                        |
| Terry Mears                    |                              |                                            |                                        |
| **Social Services**            | Lancaster Diocese Catholic Caring Services (The Wellington Road Children’s Home – Management Group) | CC S Wilkinson  
CC Mrs M Wilson            | D                                      |
| **Social Services** (Peter Sharrock) | PCT Areas – Continuing Care Independent Review Panels (IRPs): -  
Burnley, Pendle & Rossendale  
Fylde                          | CC R Pickup  
CC Mrs J Stuart  
CC C Walton  
CC K V Riley  
CC Mrs D Westell  
CC Mrs M Wilson  
CC Mrs S M D Fishwick  
CC K R Ellard                  | D                                      |
|                               | Chorley & South Ribble  
Hyndburn & Ribble Valley       |                                            |                                        |
<p>|                               | Morecambe Bay               |                                            |                                        |
|                               | Preston                      |                                            |                                        |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Directorate (Contact Officer)</th>
<th>Outside Body/ Group</th>
<th>Member Representatives and Appointment Details</th>
<th>Body to be Notified by: Directorate (D)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Social Services</strong></td>
<td>PCT Areas – Continuing Care Independent Review Panels (IRPs): <em>(Contd.)</em></td>
<td>Vacancy CC Mrs V M Wilson</td>
<td><strong>D</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>West Lancs Wyre</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Services</td>
<td>Royal Association for Disability and Rehabilitation (NW Regional Forum)</td>
<td>1 Lab/1 Con CC Mrs W B Dwyer CC A W Jealous</td>
<td><strong>D</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Services</td>
<td>Sir CC Grundy’s Charity for the Poor</td>
<td>CC C Grunshaw <em>(4 year term)</em></td>
<td><strong>D</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Services</td>
<td>Social Services North West (NWASSA)</td>
<td>CC C Cheetham (Member) CC C Grunshaw (Member) CC Mrs D Ormrod (Deputy) CC D W Easton (Deputy) CC C J Holtom (Member) CC Mrs M Wilson (Deputy)</td>
<td><strong>D</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Services</td>
<td>South Lancashire Health Authority: Health Improvement Development Group</td>
<td><strong>CC D C Lloyd</strong></td>
<td><strong>D</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Services</td>
<td>Substance Abuse Advisory Committee – Blackburn, Hyndburn and Ribble Valley Health Authority</td>
<td>2 Lab nominees CC Mrs J Battle CC Mrs W B Dwyer <em>(4 year term of the CC)</em></td>
<td><strong>D</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Services</td>
<td>West Lancashire Association for the Disabled</td>
<td>CC W G Roberts</td>
<td><strong>D</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Local Strategic Partnerships

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Portfolio (Contact Officer)</th>
<th>District/Partnership</th>
<th>Member Representatives and Appointment Details</th>
<th>Body to be Notified by</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Chief Executive (Wendy Thompson, District Partnership Officer) | Lancaster | 3 Lab/2 Cons  
CC A P Jones  
CC Ms N D Penney  
CC A H Thornton  
CC Ms J E Yates  
CC Mrs S M Fishwick | Policy Unit |
| Chief Executive (Mark Wardale, District Partnership Officer) | Wyre | CC K G Tebbs | Policy Unit |
| Chief Executive (Jan Styan, District Partnership Officer) | Ribble Valley | 3 Cons/1 Lib Dem  
CC A Atkinson  
CC C J Holtom  
CC J S Sutcliffe  
CC Mrs M Wilson | Policy Unit |
| Chief Executive (Debbie Thompson, District Partnership Officer) | Fylde | 1 Cons  
CC B J Whittle | Policy Unit |
| Chief Executive (Alison Thies, District Partnership Officer) | Preston | 2 Lab/1 Cons.  
CC B M Johnson  
CC V A Patel  
CC M J Welsh | Policy Unit |
| Chief Executive (Harry Ballantyne, District Partnership Officer) | South Ribble Partnership: Steering Group  
Partnership Forum | CC Mrs A Brown  
CC G Davies  
CC A E Pimblett  
CC T E Sharratt  
CC M Tomlinson  
CC K A Young | Policy Unit |
| Chief Executive (Ben Spinks, District Partnership Officer) | West Lancashire Forum | 3 Lab/2Cons  
CC C W Cheetham  
CC R Hodge  
CC W G Roberts  
CC F J Williams  
CC R H Shepherd | Policy Unit |
| Chief Executive (Cindy Lowthian, District Partnership Officer) | Chorley Partnership | 2 Lab  
CC D C Lloyd  
CC A Whittaker | Policy Unit |
| Chief Executive (Mike Ormerod, District Partnership Officer) | Hyndburn First | 3 Lab  
CC Mrs J Battle  
CC Mrs W B Dwyer  
CC Mrs D Westell | Policy Unit |
### Local Strategic Partnerships (Contd.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Portfolio (Contact Officer)</th>
<th>District/Partnership</th>
<th>Member Representatives and Appointment Details</th>
<th>Body to be Notified By:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Chief Executive</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Jackie Flynn, District Partnership Officer)</td>
<td>Burnley</td>
<td>3 Lab</td>
<td>Policy Unit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CC J Cavanagh</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CC M Johnstone</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CC S J Large</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Chief Executive</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Jackie Mason, District Partnership Officer)</td>
<td>Pendle Partnership</td>
<td>3 Lab/1 Lib Dem</td>
<td>Policy Unit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CC A P Davies</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CC Mrs D Ormrod</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CC L T Ormrod</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CC C Waite</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Chief Executive</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Jerry Smith, District Partnership Officer)</td>
<td>Rossendale Partnership</td>
<td>2 Lab/1 Cons</td>
<td>Policy Unit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CC Mrs H Harding</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CC Mrs K M Holt</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CC R Pickup</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Other District Partnerships

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Directorate (Contact Officer)</th>
<th>District/Partnership</th>
<th>Member Representatives and Appointment Details</th>
<th>Body to be Notified by:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chief Executive (Jackie Flynn, District Partnership Officer)</td>
<td>Burnley Regeneration Management Committee</td>
<td>1 Lab CC Mrs M I Roberts</td>
<td>Democratic Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chief Executive (Wendy Thompson, District Partnership Officer)</td>
<td>Carnforth and Area Regeneration Partnership</td>
<td>1 Lab CC Mrs J Yates</td>
<td>Policy Unit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chief Executive</td>
<td>East Lancashire into Employment</td>
<td></td>
<td>Policy Unit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chief Executive (Deborah Haydock)</td>
<td>East Lancashire Partnership:  - Executive Board  - Partnership Forum  - Enterprising Rural Communities</td>
<td>1 Lab CC Mrs H Harding 1 Lab CC Mrs H Harding Sub Members: CC A C P Martin CC L T Ormrod 1 Lab CC L T Ormrod</td>
<td>Democratic Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chief Executive (Paul Hussey, Policy Unit)</td>
<td>East Lancashire Together Executive</td>
<td>1 Lab CC M Johnstone</td>
<td>Policy Unit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chief Executive</td>
<td>Fleetwood Regeneration Partnership/Executive Committee</td>
<td>1 Lab CC C Grunshaw</td>
<td>Policy Unit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chief Executive (Graham Leigh)</td>
<td>Lancashire and Blackpool Tourist Board Ltd. – Destination Management Organisation (DMO) Board</td>
<td>3 Lab CC Mrs W B Dwyer CC B M Johnson CC Ms N D Penney (appointed thro’ LCDL Board)</td>
<td>Legal Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LCDL (Rob Wilsher)</td>
<td>Lancashire’s Hill Country Consortium</td>
<td>2 Lab CC Mrs W B Dwyer CC L T Ormrod</td>
<td>Democratic Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chief Executive (Graham Leigh)</td>
<td>Lancashire Tourism Partnership</td>
<td>1 Lab/ 1 Con CC Mrs W B Dwyer CC C J Holtom</td>
<td>Democratic Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chief Executive (Policy Unit)</td>
<td>Lancashire West Partnership</td>
<td>1 Lab: -CC B M Johnson Sub: - CC Ms J E Yates</td>
<td>Policy Unit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chief Executive (Wendy Thompson, District Partnership Officer)</td>
<td>Lancaster Multi Agency Partnership for Eliminating Discrimination (MAPfED)</td>
<td>2 Lab CC Dr R B Henig CC A H Thornton</td>
<td>Democratic Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Directorate (Contact Officer)</td>
<td>District/Partnership</td>
<td>Member Representatives and Appointment Details</td>
<td>Body to be Notified by:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chief Executive (Wendy Thompson, District Partnership Officer)</td>
<td>Lancaster Regeneration Partnership</td>
<td>2 Lab – CC Ms N D Penney CC Ms J Yates</td>
<td>Policy Unit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environment (Joyce Lynch)</td>
<td>Morecambe Bay Partnership</td>
<td>1 Lab CC A H Thornton</td>
<td>Democratic Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chief Executive (Wendy Thompson, District Partnership Officer)</td>
<td>Morecambe, West End Partnership</td>
<td>1 Lab: - CC Ms J Yates</td>
<td>Policy Unit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chief Executive (Wendy Thompson, District Partnership Officer)</td>
<td>Poulton (Morecambe) Neighbourhood Management Pathfinder</td>
<td>1 Lab: -CC A H Thornton</td>
<td>Policy Unit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chief Executive (Ben Spinks, District Partnership Officer)</td>
<td>Skelmersdale (Social Inclusion) Partnership Board:</td>
<td>1 Lab –CC C W Cheetham</td>
<td>Policy Unit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Directorate (Contact Officer)</td>
<td>District</td>
<td>Member Representatives</td>
<td>Substitute</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Chief Executive Policy Unit</strong> (Robert Ormerod/ Pam Smith)</td>
<td>Lancaster</td>
<td>CC A P Jones, Ms J E Yates</td>
<td>CC A H Thornton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Wyre</td>
<td>CC C Grunshaw</td>
<td>CC K V Riley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ribble Valley</td>
<td>CC C J Holtom</td>
<td>CC Mrs M Wilson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fylde</td>
<td>CC Mrs J Stuart</td>
<td>CC C Walton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Preston</td>
<td>CC V A Patel</td>
<td>CC K R Ellard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>South Ribble</td>
<td>CC G Davies</td>
<td>CC M Tomlinson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>West Lancashire</td>
<td>CC W G Roberts, CC F J Williams, CC D M O'Toole</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Chorley</td>
<td>CC V J Murphy</td>
<td>CC D Yates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hyndburn</td>
<td>CC Mrs J Battle</td>
<td>CC G W Slynn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Burnley</td>
<td>CC M Johnstone</td>
<td>CC Mrs M I Roberts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pendle</td>
<td>CC Mrs D Ormrod, CC L T Ormrod</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rossendale</td>
<td>CC R Pickup</td>
<td>CC R Wilkinson</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Executive Summary

A report which describes the outcome of the consultation upon the development of a response to Every Child Matters: Next Steps and the Children Bill.

Recommendation

The Cabinet is asked to note the report and to endorse the recommendations listed below:

(a) To receive further reports on the areas of activity listed in Section 1 of this report;

(b) To authorise the Cabinet Members for Children and Families and Education to agree amendments to the Vision and Key Principles in Section 2 in the light of consultees comments, and then included in Lancashire's Local Preventative Strategy;

(c) To agree the timetable for appointing a Director of Children's Services as proposed in Section 3;

(d) To agree the timetable for designating a Lead Member for Children and Families as proposed in Section 3;

(e) To approve the recommendations listed in Section 4 of the report on developing integrated Children's Services.

Background

This report is structured as follows:

Section 1 deals with general issues arising directly from the consultation;
Sections 2-4 describe issues arising from the proposals contained in the 1 April Cabinet Reports.

Key recommendations are located as appropriate through the report.

1. CONSULTATION

At its meeting on 1 April 2004 the Cabinet considered three reports on the implementation of a response to Every Child Matters. Cabinet agreed to consult upon the proposals contained in the three reports, which included specific proposals on:

- the vision for children's services;
- approaches taken to achieve the vision;
- appointment of a Director of Children's Services;
- responsibilities of a Lead Member for Children's Services;
- governance arrangements;
- the development of integrated targeted services.

The consultation was directed at teams and services within the County Council and at relevant partner organisations from the statutory and voluntary sectors. A summary of the responses received can be found in Appendix 'A' and the process adopted for the consultation, including circulation of the consultation document and the briefing meetings attended, is described in Appendix 'B'. A full set of responses will be available on CD ROM on request. The County Council received 112 responses to the consultation, within the agreed timescale. Those responses received after the agreed date, although not reported to Cabinet, will be considered in the next stage of the process.

There was substantial and widespread support for the County Council's proposals. The responses received were of a high quality, containing many thoughtful and constructive comments. All of the material received will be used by the County Council's Every Child Matters Project Teams to inform developments in the next stages of the process.

There are several key issues from the consultation that do not directly relate to the issues raised in the earlier reports which should be highlighted at this stage. These are:

(a) Working with partner agencies

It is evident that partners would welcome additional detail on the direction of travel taken by the County Council. Many have expressed a desire to be involved in the process as early as possible. This applies in particular to health service partners but is not exclusive to them. Specific proposals are made later in this report which should help to address this concern.
(b) Teams defined as targeted in the consultation

The 1 April Cabinet reports proposed the integration of several teams from Education and Cultural Services and Social Services Directorates which were defined as Targeted Children's Services. Staff from these teams will be directly affected by the proposals in the consultation initially through changes in line management and subsequently by reconfiguration into locality teams. The responses from these teams indicated that they agreed in general with the proposals but wished to see a greater amount of detail about the proposals as early as possible. In their responses they also concentrated upon what they thought should be reflected in the next stage of the process. It will be vital to involve these teams fully throughout the process and to give full consideration to the points already made.

The consultation highlighted a number of issues about the teams or services that might properly be included in this integrated structure. These responses will also be considered during the next stage of the process.

(c) Voluntary Community and Faith Sectors (VCFS)

It is accepted that the Government failed to include the VCFS sufficiently in its initial thinking around Every Child Matters. This comment has also been made in respect of the County Council's initial proposals and therefore it will be essential to agree how this might be addressed in later stages of the process. This will be done in the context of the County Council's Compact with the VCFS and the proposal currently being developed for the establishment of an overarching policy framework.

(d) Definitions

Many respondents indicated that they found some of the terminology used in the consultation confusing. The section dealing with Governance proved particularly difficult to follow for some respondents and care will need to be taken at subsequent stages in the process to make the language used more transparent.

Respondents found the use of the word “targeted” unsatisfactory, both as applied in connection with the concept of universal services, when defining different groups of children, but also when describing the proposed service within the County Council. Further steps will need to be taken to clarify the use of these terms, especially when dealing with people from outside the County Council. It is therefore proposed that the new integrated service should be referred to as a Children's Service rather than a Children's Targeted Service (see Section 4(a)). This replacement term is used for the remainder of this report.

(e) Children, Young People and their Families

The importance of involving children and young people in the design and delivery of services is a strong theme in Every Child Matters and is a key element in the County Council’s vision for working with children, young people and families. A separate consultation with children, young people and families was not carried out at this first stage of the development of a response to Every Child Matters. The County Council already has access to several strategies for engaging with children, young people
and their families and it is intended that these will be used to promote involvement in
the specific proposals that are to follow. Special efforts will be made to reach those
communities with whom it is often difficult to engage. The strategies will include
calling upon both small scale consultations (for example School Councils or the
Looked After Young People’s Panel) and larger, county wide opportunities.

(f) Service thresholds

The existing services which will be brought together to make up the new Children’s
Services Team provide support to the most vulnerable children in Lancashire. They
are resourced only to meet this level of need. In creating an integrated service there
may be expectations from key partners, including children, young people and
families, that there will be access to a wider range of services. Although in principle
this would be a positive service development, in reality it can only occur if additional
resources are available.

(g) Black and Minority Ethnic Communities (BME)

An extensive range of organisations with an interest in Black and Minority Ethnic
issues was included in the consultation (see Appendix 'B'). Additional steps are
being taken to involve these organisations, through a series of meetings arranged on
a locality basis. The views expressed at these meetings will be taken into account in
the next stage of the process.

(h) Youth Offending Team

The Youth Justice Board has confirmed its support for the County Council's direction
of travel in respect of Every Child Matters. The Youth Offending Team in its
response to the consultation has also indicated that it supports the inclusion of Youth
Offending Team in the group of services defined as targeted. The Youth Offending
Team is regarded as unique within this list of services in that it is a multi-agency
managed resource which is statutorily composed. As a service it is committed to the
County Council's key principles for children, young people and their families. As with
other services there will need to be a period during which discussions take place
around the precise position of the Youth Offending Team in the development of a
response to Every Child Matters.

(i) County Council Services

The creation of a new Children Services Group within the County Council will have
an impact on other areas of activity, particularly within the Education and Cultural
Services Directorate and the Social Services Directorate. It will be vital to ensure
that all staff, not just those in the services most directly affected, are fully informed
about the further development of proposals. Significant aspects of work will continue
to operate outside the new Children's Services Group.

(j) Universal Services

The consultation demonstrated a strong measure of support for widening
participation in the next stages of the implementation of Every Child Matters. In
addition to the responses received from schools, in the region of 250 primary school headteachers attended briefing meetings. Respondents emphasised that the linkages between universal services and targeted services should be seamless. It was also pointed out that structural change is insufficient unless accompanied by cultural change.

**It is recommended that:** The position in each of the above sub-sections is noted and that further reports are prepared, where appropriate.

### 2. VISION AND KEY PRINCIPLES

The County Council proposed five key principles for all services working with Children and families; that they:

- Involve children and families fully;
- Genuinely listen and learn;
- Aim to provide the best possible outcomes;
- Are responsive and flexible;
- Respect diversity and promote equality of opportunity.

The County Council also suggested five measures for making the vision a reality:

- A parallel commitment to the maintenance of high quality services as a safeguard for those children most in need;
- A commitment to placing responsibility for service delivery at a locality level whenever this is possible, subject to the efficient use of resources;
- An emphasis on positive co-working with partners, including statutory agencies, the voluntary sector and schools;
- A commitment to working with children, young people and families in the design and delivery of services;
- Taking measures to ensure that all staff are fully involved in the change process.

There was very strong support for the five key principles and the measures to make the vision a reality. Some respondents suggested minor alterations to the proposals, for example replacing 'genuinely' with 'actively'. Also some respondents made reference to the need for a link with the United Nations Convention on the Rights of a Child. The principles will be reviewed in the light of these proposals.

**It is recommended that:** Amendments be made to these key principles in the light of the views of consultees and then included in Lancashire’s Local Preventative Strategy.

### 3. ACCOUNTABILITY FOR CHILDREN’S SERVICES

The Cabinet Reports from 1 April 2004 described three ways in which the County Council intended to ensure that leadership and accountability arrangements for
Children and Young People were fully in place through the implementation of Every Child Matters. These were:

- The timetable for appointing a Director of Children's Services;
- Designating a Lead Member for Children's Services;
- Putting in place appropriate Governance Arrangements.

The recommendations for each of these areas are described below.

(a) **Director of Children's Services**

The reports approved by Cabinet at the meeting on 1 April advised delaying the appointment of a Director of Children's Services until such time as the model for developing an integrated approach to Children's Services had been more fully established. It was anticipated that the County Council would be in the position to move to an appointment by 2006. A majority of respondents expressed a view on this issue. However, no consensus as to the timing of the appointment was reached but some respondents wanted more information about and clarity around the Director's role.

It is now proposed that the process for appointing a Director of Children's Services is brought forward. The pace of development within Children's Services is such that an earlier move to a single point of accountability at Chief Officer level has become an urgent priority. Delaying until 2006 or beyond could create additional difficulties or tensions within the County Council.

It is therefore recommended that, with effect from 1 April 2005, the Director of Education and Cultural Services will be accountable for the statutory duties for children and families that are currently the responsibility of the Director of Social Services. It is anticipated that the two Directors would act as 'mentors' to each other and to the Head of Children’s Services (see below) for an initial period of up to two years.

This proposal will require detailed discussions in respect of the precise areas of responsibility for each post. These discussions will need to have been completed by the end of December 2004 at the latest.

**It is recommended that:** The proposed timetable for establishing a Director of Children's Services with effect from 1 April 2005 is adopted.

(b) **Lead Member for Children's Services**

The April Cabinet report proposed delaying the designation of a Lead Member for Children's Services until such time as further guidance on the responsibilities of Lead Members, which had been promised by the Government, was available. Some respondents wanted more information about and clarity around the Lead Member's role. However, in the light of the proposal to appoint a Director of Children's Services with effect from 1 April 2005 and the continued absence from Government of a date for providing the guidance, it is now recommended that the designation of a Lead Member should be implemented with effect from no later than 1 April 2006.
This timescale will allow for a transitional period of a year during which existing responsibilities are maintained and further action can take place to define specific areas of accountability. These discussions will relate to the responsibilities of the Cabinet Members for Children and Families, Education and Community and Partnerships.

**It is recommended that:** The timetable for designating a Lead Member for Children's Services is brought forward to 1 April 2006.

(c) **Governance Arrangements**

The proposals for Governance Arrangements are reported elsewhere on the agenda.

4. **DEVELOPING INTEGRATED CHILDREN'S SERVICES**

This section of the consultation dealt with the development of an Integrated Children's Targeted Service. It proposed bringing together several teams from across the County Council into an integrated service which would ultimately be based in localities.

(a) **The name of the Children’s Services Group**

A number of responses referred to the unsuitability of the term Children's Targeted Services. Many respondents felt that this created a separateness about the Service that was unhelpful in an inclusive, universal environment. Respondents felt that it created an inappropriate impression of the focus of the new service. It is proposed to use the title Children's Services to describe the new team.

**It is recommended that:** The new service is called the Children’s Services Group.

(b) **Shadow and Interim Arrangements**

The consultation drew a distinction between a 'shadow' phase of the development of the new integrated service (during which existing line management would be maintained) and an 'interim' phase (when there would be a single line manager for all teams). Many respondents pointed out that the proposed timescale for shadow and interim phases could prove unworkable, not least because the consultation process inevitably reduced the time allocated to the shadow element. Some responses also questioned why it was necessary to make the distinction between shadow and interim at all given that the distinction centred solely on the line management arrangements.

The vast majority of responses were in agreement with the principle behind the concept of a Children's Service. Some concerns were expressed about the teams that had been identified as forming part of the Service (those included as well as those excluded) and there was a general feeling that detailed discussions in the interim stage of the process would be critical to a successful outcome. It was also noted by respondents that detailed discussion could not take place until the outcome of the referendum on regional government is known. This inevitably would lead to some delays in the development of integrated teams.
For these reasons, it is proposed that the shadow stage of the process is removed and that the County Council moves to interim line management arrangements as soon as any human resource issues can be satisfactorily resolved. Further, it is proposed that the proposals to create locality footprints should be re-scheduled to take place over the period January 2006 – September 2006 and not September 2005 – March 2006. This will allow opportunity for proposals to be developed following decisions around the referendum. Finally, in order to reflect the views of partners, it is proposed to involve them fully in this process as soon as possible.

| It is recommended that: The interim arrangements take effect from 1 August 2004 and that the development of locality teams is re-scheduled to 2006. |

(c) Head of Children's Services

In the light of the proposal to remove the shadow phase, it is necessary to agree the revised arrangements for line management of the amalgamated service. It will be critical to the success of the new Children's Service to have continuity of line management as soon as possible.

| It is recommended that: The post of the Head of Children's Services is established with effect from 1 August 2004. |

(d) Workforce Planning

In response to the concerns expressed during the consultation, a task group accountable to the two Directors has been established with a brief to look in detail at the implications of the overall proposals on workforce planning. The task group would aim to prepare an interim report to Members by the end of November. This action is related to the Government's wider workforce reform expectations as described in Every Child Matters: Next Steps. A number of respondents also emphasised the importance of collaborative working and the need to seek out every opportunity for joint approaches to workforce development across sectors.

| It is recommended that: A further report on workforce planning will be prepared in the Autumn. |

(e) Reference group and partnerships

One of the proposals in the 1 April Cabinet report was the establishment of a Reference Group to assist with the implementation of Every Child Matters. It was suggested that the Reference Group would play a key role in the development of a universal approach to children's services and that, therefore, membership should be broadly based. This view was reflected in the responses to the consultation.

Elsewhere on this agenda a report on Governance proposes the establishment of a Children's Strategic Partnership as the lead multi-agency partnership body for the development of children's services in Lancashire. If it is agreed to pursue this option then the precise role of the Reference Group will need to be considered further.
It is recommended that: No decision is taken in respect of the role and function of the Reference Group until such time as decisions have been reached about a Children's Strategic Partnership.

(f) Locality

No further action has been possible on defining locality footprints. Many respondents expressed a wish for further clarification of the meaning of the term locality and the practicality of delivering a locality model. The consultation showed that there is a willingness to be involved in the debate on the scope and extent of the footprints, especially on the part of other statutory agencies. Preparatory work on the models that might be used will continue in advance of the regional assembly/local government reorganisation referendum.

It is recommended that: A further report will be prepared following the outcome of the referendum.

(g) Safeguarding

Separate proposals for the development of a Safeguarding Board are being prepared in conjunction with the Area Child Protection Committee. Further guidance is anticipated from the Government on the role of the new Safeguarding Board. Until this is available, final decisions around the new Board cannot be taken.

It is recommended that: A further report is received in the Autumn.

Consultations

The report is based to a significant extent on the consultation exercise agreed at the 1 April Cabinet.

Advice

Advice has been taken from regional and local forums and support groups.

Alternative options to be considered

Alternative options were discussed prior to the April Cabinet and have been further reviewed in the light of the consultation.

Implications: e.g. Financial, Legal, Personnel, Human Rights, Crime and Disorder or Other

This item has the following implications, as indicated:

There are no financial or legal implications attendant upon this report other than those listed at the last report.
**Local Government (Access to Information) Act 1985**

**List of Background Papers**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Paper</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Contact/Directorate/Ext</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Every Child Matters: Next Steps (DfES)</td>
<td>March 2004</td>
<td>Geoff Hiscox/Education and Cultural Services/31760</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
EVERY CHILD MATTERS

A REPORT ON THE CONSULTATION UNDERTAKEN APRIL 2004 – JUN 2004

Introduction

It is important to reiterate that this consultation exercise represents, in effect, the beginning of the process of consultation on the County Council’s proposals for the development of services for children, young people and their families. The main aim of the consultation was to establish whether the initial proposals outlined in the consultation document were perceived to be heading in the right direction.

Efforts will be made at every opportunity in the coming months to continue to seek the views of County Council staff, our partners, schools, and from children and young people and their families, as developments unfold. Special efforts will be made to reach those communities with whom we often fail to engage; this is a key outcome in Every Child Matters. Discussions are already underway to make specific arrangements to seek the views of black and minority ethnic organisations and communities, in addition to the efforts already made in the distribution of the consultation document, as detailed in Appendix ‘B’ to this report.

It is also important to note, specifically in relation to the views of staff, that it was not intended to cover the impact of these proposals on individual services during this consultation exercise; this will be addressed and consulted upon extensively during Phase 4.

It was apparent from a significant number of responses that staff in some services, particularly those identified as targeted services, are, understandably, already considering aspects of the shape of future services at a level of detail beyond the questions raised in the current consultation process. Their ideas and comments will be captured and built upon during the next phases of development. It is recognised that the involvement of staff in the development of these proposals is vital.

General points on the responses received

There has been a high quality response to the consultation, providing a wealth of views and constructive comments for future stages. In general, the responses received suggest that there is substantial and widespread support for the general proposed direction of travel. There is recognition of the many difficult and complex tasks and challenges ahead - that turning these proposals into reality will not be easy. It was felt by many respondents that it is crucial to develop robust systems both for delivery and for the measurement of effectiveness and quality, and that clear, positive outcomes need to be identified for children, young people and families; that the proposals need to be specific in that they cover young people as well as children. The importance of building on the widespread good practice and the wealth of experience that exists across agencies and services was stressed.

It was obvious that for many respondents, their level of commitment to the proposals was necessarily tempered by the need for greater clarity and more information and detail about the proposals, one important example of this being the need for clarification both of definition and role in relation to universal and targeted services. Achieving widespread, clear understanding of the proposals as they are developed, will be an important area of work to be addressed throughout future phases.
Many respondents clearly saw the importance and benefits of, and barriers to, partnership working, and a recurring theme was the need for work to begin with partners at the earliest possible stage in the process. A number of respondents also emphasised the importance of collaborative working and the need to seek out every opportunity for joint approaches to workforce development across sectors.

The vital role for the voluntary, community and faith sectors (VCFS) in the development and delivery of the proposals was recognised throughout.

The whole issue of timescales and timetables was frequently referred to alongside concerns as to the possible effect on the proposals of the referendum on regional government.

Summary of responses

The summary set out below is intended to give a flavour of the responses received in the consultation period. The complete text of all responses received will shortly be available on compact disc, on request.

Where more than one respondent has made the same point or comment in relation to the same question, these have been highlighted as ‘key issues’ against that question. Where respondents have expressed a view that neither agreed nor disagreed, these have been counted as ‘neutral’.

In response to many of the questions, individual respondents have made a wide range of constructive comments and some very specific suggestions; these have been collated into a schedule which is being developed into an important themed, working document which will be used to inform developments in the early stages of the interim phase. Also incorporated into the working document, will be the comments on the proposals made by Cabinet and other Elected Members at the Cabinet meeting in April.

A total of 127 have been received, of these, 15 of applications were received after the closing date of 20 June and although these have not been covered in the summary of key issues below, comments made will be captured in the working document described above and taken forward into the next stage.

It became apparent at the end of the consultation process that technical difficulties had been encountered by some respondents when responding on-line via the County Council’s consultation site; these difficulties will be addressed in any future consultation exercise.

Summary of key issues:

A total of 112 responses have been summarised below.

**Question 1 focused on the five proposed key principles in relation to services for children and families.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>expressed view</th>
<th>agreed</th>
<th>disagreed</th>
<th>neutral</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>98</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Key issues :**

- the importance of the need for real integrated working
- the key principles need to be firmly embedded throughout the relevant organisations
there needs to be ‘active’ rather than ‘genuine’ involvement of children, young people and families
the need to recognise the voice of the child
the importance of measuring how extensively the principles are being adopted in practice
speed and flexibility of response is vital, supported by protocols
link or adapt the principles to the UN Convention on the Rights of the Child
the principles are fairly broad

Question 2 asked if any other principles should be adopted in relation to services for children and families.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>made suggestions</th>
<th>no suggestions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Key issues:
- translate these principles into practice
- stress the importance in the principles, of partnership working
- services should be responsive and timely and there should be equality of access for all irrespective of where they live
- involve the VCFS
- add ‘young people’
- the emotional well-being of the child is crucial
- ensure that the voice of the child is heard
- supporting parents is the way to achieve the best outcomes for the child
- the need to share information
- there needs to be a commitment to measure outcomes
- proactively seek to reach those we often fail to engage
- the accountability of partner agencies and services to deliver and monitor high quality services
- the importance of early intervention
- the principles should apply to all children and all services
- reflect ‘inclusion’ in the principles
- recognition needed that 10 – 18 year olds form a significant proportion of both court throughput and of victims

Question 3 focused on the principle that the most effective provision for children at risk of failing to achieve positive outcomes is through universal services with the support of targeted services.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>expressed view</th>
<th>agreed</th>
<th>disagreed</th>
<th>neutral</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>94</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Key issues:
- respondents identified the need for more clarity on this proposal
- turn these proposals into reality
- there needs to be seamless and coordinated provision
- young people should be safeguarded in the criminal justice system until 18
- avoid stigma for children and young people
- identify and build on good practice
- address requirements around the establishment of the Safeguarding Board
• choice should still be available for families
• ensure that there are no gaps in service provision
• early identification and intervention is needed linked to the Local Preventative Strategy
• work collaboratively and to be aware of others’ agendas and vested interests
• the relationship, linkages and referral arrangements, between targeted and universal services need to be carefully developed and managed
• services need to be well resourced and securely funded, accessible and joined-up
• resources need to be efficiently and sensitively applied and regularly reviewed
• there needs to be good communication
• outcomes need to be SMART
• monitoring is essential
• concerns were expressed around the capacity of universal services to respond

Question 4 focused on the principle that high quality targeted services must be maintained as a safeguard for those children most in need.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>expressed view</th>
<th>agreed</th>
<th>disagreed</th>
<th>neutral</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>91</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Key issues:
• have different levels of assessment and intervention
• work towards high quality standards
• the importance of high quality staff
• monitor
• ensure that VCFS organisations are fully involved in the process
• the need for a smooth transition
• get preventative strategies in place to prevent families reaching crisis point
• targeted services should be increased, improved and developed
• the need for more agreed definitions and transparent and agreed thresholds for access
• ensure that targeted services do not stigmatised
• clarification is needed of the interface between universal and targeted services
• specification needed of quality, costs and outcomes
• keep ‘the locality’ to a realistic size.

Question 5 focused on the principle that responsibility for service delivery should rest, as far as possible, at a locality level.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>expressed view</th>
<th>agreed</th>
<th>disagreed</th>
<th>neutral</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>95</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Key issues:
• the need for equality of access
• have monitoring arrangements which track equality of access
• local flexibility is necessary, it should be needs led – not a ‘one size fits all’ solution
• the need for devolved budgets
• a definition of locality is needed
• clarification of who will coordinate statutory and non-statutory services
• the need for joint strategic direction
the need for central oversight and functions: over-arching monitoring to ensure consistency, quality of access/ provision of service
services should be readily available, when required, at a locality level
integration with area and regional policies
transparency of funding allocations will be needed
the practicalities of delivering a locality model for service delivery including issues around economies of scale and quality
issues around ‘post-coding’
the local model leads to improved knowledge of local services
keep locality to a realistic size
avoid bureaucracy

Question 6 focused on the principle that there should be an emphasis on co-working with partners, including statutory and voluntary sector and schools.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>expressed view</th>
<th>agreed</th>
<th>disagreed</th>
<th>neutral</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>93</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Key issues:
- respondents clearly saw the importance and benefits of, and the barriers to, partnership working
- parents and children should be considered as partners
- the early active involvement of other key partnerships is essential
- explore opportunities for shared/joint workforce development
- the important role of schools and the definite need for their involvement, was raised throughout
- effective co-working needs side-by-side delivery
- there need to be explicit thresholds
- Sure Starts should be involved in future developments
- all partners need similar information and action plans for each individual case
- issues around finance, resources and staffing need to be addressed
- clarification is needed of definition of co-working, roles, responsibilities, accountability, confidentiality
- the important role of the VCFS was recognised
- concerns were expressed about the track record of statutory and voluntary sector organisations working cooperatively together
- effective information sharing across agencies is essential
- confidentiality must be respected but redefined to respect the child

Question 7 focused on the principle that there should be a commitment to work with children & families in the design & delivery of services.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>expressed view</th>
<th>agreed</th>
<th>disagreed</th>
<th>neutral</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>94</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Key issues:
- essential to involve children, young people and families in the design and delivery of services
- recognise the resource implications of involving all families
- a range of involvement mechanisms is necessary and they need to be accessible, transparent and well-reported
- include user group consultation
- it needs to be a real commitment, not lip service
- involvement encourages ownership
- arrangements need to include young people
- those families most in need should be encouraged to participate
- avoid underestimating the scale and time needed to implement this activity;
- children and families should have access to independent support if necessary

Question 8 focused on the principal that all staff should be fully involved in the change process.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>expressed view</th>
<th>agreed</th>
<th>disagreed</th>
<th>neutral</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>97</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Key issues:
- the need for a strategy to be developed to achieve the genuine involvement of all staff
- do not underestimate the valuable contribution that all staff can make to the development process
- involve all staff at all stages and recognition of the difficulties this may present
- early involvement of health is essential
- that change management handled properly will require extensive culture change, target setting and review
- the importance of building on existing knowledge, experience and widespread good practice
- centrally fund training and support for staff
- the need for ownership to foster commitment
- clearer definition needed of which staff to be involved
- include and involve all existing statutory and VCFS staff currently seconded
- staff must have input to and influence next stages - they need dedicated time to be able to do this
- concerns as to whether the timescales are achievable

Question 9 asked for additional comments on the six areas of activity identified so far.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>expressed view</th>
<th>agreed</th>
<th>disagreed</th>
<th>neutral</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>90</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Key issues:
- the need for more detailed information about the proposals
- the importance of workforce development
- workforce development needs to include partners’ staff
- the importance of cooperative working to achieve effective integration
- the need for more information to be made available as soon as possible on Children’s Trusts and how such a model would look in Lancashire
- the need for words to become actions – proposals to be translated into reality
- accountability is key

Question 10 asked for any other key areas of activity which should be included.
made suggestions | no suggestions
---|---
42 | 70

**Key issues:**
- the need for clarification of the key areas of activity
- clarify the relationship between universal and targeted services
- involve families and carers as a preventative/protective measure
- include schools and ensure good linkages to schools;
- the provision of advocacy services
- the timescales appear too short
- universal services should be integrated not just targeted services
- develop high quality standards of service
- have inclusive processes for children, young people and families
- the importance of recruitment, development and retention of staff
- explore the potential for multi-agency training
- the inclusion of all aspects of health services - to include physical and mental well-being
- the need for the proposals to be reviewed as the Children Bill progressed through Parliament
- develop data systems and protocols

**Question 11 focused on the approach being taken in respect of a single Director for Children’s Services and on the post’s remit.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>expressed view</th>
<th>agreed</th>
<th>disagreed</th>
<th>neutral</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>97</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Key issues:**
- some respondents want more information about and clarity around, the Director’s role
- the immensity of the task was recognised and the possibility of support for the post being needed
- the need for the proposals to be developed from both education and social services perspectives
- the importance of joined-up communication across Education and Social Services Directorates
- joint responsibility should be maintained temporarily
- an immediate appointment should be made

**Question 12 focused on the approach being taken in respect of the designation of a Lead Member for Children’s Services.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>expressed view</th>
<th>agreed</th>
<th>disagreed</th>
<th>neutral</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>83</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Key issues:**
- some respondents want more information about and clarity around the respective roles of Director and Lead Member
- recognition that the scope of the role is very wide and perhaps should be shared
- the need for the portfolio holder to have authority
• an earlier appointment should be made

**Question 13** focused on the proposals being made with regard to Governance arrangements for Children’s Services.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>expressed view</th>
<th>agreed</th>
<th>disagreed</th>
<th>neutral</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>85</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It was apparent that some respondents found this question confusing and clarification is required in setting out what the County Council wants to achieve in respect of Governance arrangements.

**Key issues:**
- key agencies need to be reflected in the process
- monitor and evaluate the effectiveness of the arrangements
- avoid increased bureaucracy
- involve schools
- address the difficulties of getting young people involved
- to include young people would be tokenism
- include the police and Probation Service
- include advocacy support
- clarification is needed of the effects of the proposals on the future role of the Quality Protects Panel
- some respondents felt that the proposed arrangements looked unwieldy and that this could impact on effectiveness
- the arrangements could result in competing priorities
- innovation and creativity are needed to make it all happen

**Question 14** focused on the definition of targeted services which led to the identification of those to be included in the shadow arrangements. Were there any other services to be included? Are there any services included in the proposed model which should be defined as targeted services?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>expressed view</th>
<th>agreed</th>
<th>disagreed</th>
<th>neutral</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>85</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Key issues:**
- all relevant services should be listed for clarity and to cover the multi agency implications
- the role of VCFS services
- the emphasis on targeted services could be to the detriment of universal services
- take account of the unique position of the Youth Offending Team;
- some respondents questioned how a seamless integration of a large group of services would be achieved
- young people should be involved in the shadow arrangements
- schools should be represented in the shadow arrangements
- targeted services should be linked to deprivation
- suggestions were made, by more than one respondent, as to specific services which could be included: Youth and Community Service; health services, VCFS organisations, police, Youth Offending Team, Connexions, Travellers’ Education Service, Lancashire Pupil Reintegration Service, Drug Action Team, Sure Starts
Question 15 focused on the proposed reference group responsibilities relating to targeted services and what should form its terms of reference.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>made suggestions</th>
<th>no suggestions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Some respondents focussed on service delivery rather than terms of reference and membership issues.

**Key issues:**
- the early involvement of health services in all phases is essential
- the need for confidentiality and respect
- to recognise the implications of the wider agenda for other agencies
- incorporate objectives and outcomes
- the development of decision-making and information-sharing systems and protocols
- develop clear lines of accountability
- joint working to include responsibility and accountability, pooled budgets and the compatibility of legislative responsibilities
- ensure linkages to existing work and contemporary issues, for example, the Government’s cross-cutting agenda, the Local Preventative Strategy and Crime and Disorder Reduction Partnerships
- safeguarding and child protection need to have a prominent focus
- the need for information-sharing systems and protocols
- ensure effective linkages between existing services to avoid gaps in provision during the transition
- a definition is needed of targeted services including a definition of ‘at risk’
- communication across services is essential

Question 16 focuses on other aspects of the proposals being made in respect of the Phase 3 ‘Shadow’ arrangements.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>expressed view</th>
<th>agreed</th>
<th>disagreed</th>
<th>neutral</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>63</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Key issues:**
- the early involvement of health services is essential
- involve trades unions and professional associations at an early stage
- continued effective consultation with staff and partners is paramount
- milestones are needed to check progress
- timescales are considered to be too short
- clarification is needed as soon as possible of the likely positioning of the Youth Offending Team
- Connexions should be included
- concern about the potential impact of the referendum on regional government

Question 17 focuses on proposals being made in respect of Phase 4 Interim arrangements.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>expressed view</th>
<th>agreed</th>
<th>disagreed</th>
<th>neutral</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>80</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Key issues:
- involve health services in all phases
- the early involvement of partners is essential
- it is important to define locality structures at the earliest opportunity
- ensure that existing services remain focussed
- the need for early action and a smooth transition
- an emphasis needs to be placed on conditions of service issues when the workforce development stage commences
- the need for close involvement of human resources teams at the outset and throughout
- moving towards the new service will have massive training implications
- important not to underestimate the size of the task
- this phase will take time and effort in the face of competing priorities
- there are issues around resources
- appoint the Head of Children’s Targeted Services immediately
- the need to review proposed timescales

Question 18 focuses on proposals for the structure as outlined for Phase 5.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>expressed view</th>
<th>agreed</th>
<th>disagreed</th>
<th>neutral</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>75</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Key issues:
- the need for overarching structures to take the strategic overview and in particular take account of quality and performance issues
- responsibility for service delivery should rest locally
- have the right staff with the right skills in the right place
- include young people
- the referendum on regional government could effect the proposals
- address staffing, pay structures, conditions of service, commissioning and organisational development to move towards integrated services
- the timetable is challenging

Question 19 focuses on the balance between locality-based functions & specialist support at County level.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>expressed view</th>
<th>agreed</th>
<th>disagreed</th>
<th>neutral</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>81</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A number of points on locality issues are already covered at Question 5 above.

Key issues:
- more information is needed
- decision-making needs to be at a local level
- locality based services need to be the priority
- there need to be flexibility to match services with local need
- there needs to be advice and support from the centre but reduced bureaucracy
- there needs to be an overview for consistency and equity across localities;
- ensure that neither the management structure nor specialist support are ‘top heavy’
for the locality model to work it needs to have staff with multi-disciplinary backgrounds
service provision needs to be adequate and easily accessible
local elections and the referendum on regional government could effect the proposals

Question 20 focuses on other aspects of the proposals being made in respect of Phase 5 – an Established Model.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>expressed view</th>
<th>agreed</th>
<th>disagreed</th>
<th>neutral</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Key issues:
all partners, children, young people and families should be involved;
there needs to be agreement about which services are located centrally;
link to the role of schools;
recruit staff with appropriate skills and knowledge;
the proposals should be revisited following the result of the referendum on regional government.

Q21 focuses on which services and partners should be involved in an Integrated Services Model.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>expressed view</th>
<th>agreed</th>
<th>disagreed</th>
<th>neutral</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>81</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Key issues:
the linkages between universal and targeted services need to be seamless
the need for the early involvement of all key partners during the interim phase; those listed, by more than one respondent, were: schools, all health services, including CAHMS, district councils including housing services, VCFS, police, the Probation Service, early years services, Drug Action Teams, Connexions, Sure Starts, the Learning and Skills Council and all education providers
more consideration is needed of work with the VCFS and their potential role as deliverers of public services

Question 22 focuses on the overall phrased approach, including the timing of the phases, proposed for Developing Integrated Targeted Children’s Services.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>expressed view</th>
<th>agreed</th>
<th>disagreed</th>
<th>neutral</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>72</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Key issues:
the need to seek the early involvement of all partners
structural change is not enough, culture change is needed for truly integrated services
a phased approach is welcomed as essential
the VCFS need to be part of developments
should aim for minimum disruption as each phase is introduced
a pilot, possibly the Children’s Trust model, is needed to test out integrated structures
many respondents felt that the timetable for implementation was a significant issue: some respondents felt time-scales too short, others, too long

the referendum on regional government could effect the proposals

A final question allowed further comments on any aspect of the proposals.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>made comments</th>
<th>no comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Key issues:

- the need for more detailed information as many of the proposals are still unclear
- the need to involve all partners before restructuring begins
- the need for the effective and timely involvement of PCTs both strategically and operationally
- concern about the impact of the proposals on those VCFS organisations working with children and young people
- involve fully schools and school governors in the proposals
- the need for plain language to be used in all documents

EVERY CHILD MATTERS - PROGRESS REPORT

A REPORT UPON THE CONSULTATION UNDERTAKEN
FROM APRIL 2004 - JUNE 2004

1. CIRCULATION OF CONSULTATION DOCUMENTS

The Cabinet at its meeting on 1 April 2004 agreed to consult upon the proposals contained in the three reports on Every Child Matters. The consultation was directed to teams and services within the County Council and to relevant partner organisations. Circulation of the consultation pack commenced in late April 2004. The pack contained a covering letter giving details of the consultation arrangements, a list of partners to be consulted, the consultation document and a standardised response form. The pack was distributed electronically, wherever possible, to those listed below. However, a hard copy of the pack was also made available for those who had difficulties accessing the information electronically. There was agreement to a process whereby managers throughout the County Council would cascade this information. It was inevitable that partners who received the information directly also received the information through their membership of different Partnerships and organisations. Copies of the pack plus background information were also made available on the County Council’s website (www.lancashire.gov.uk/corporate/consultation). The covering letter gave contact details for anyone wishing to obtain copies of the consultation document in another format or language. The main circulation of the consultation documents was completed by the end of April 2004.
Circulation List

LANCASHIRE COUNTY COUNCIL

Education and Cultural Services Directorate
Executive Management Team

Senior Manager - Adult and Continuing Education
Senior Manager - Budget and Financial Services
Senior Manager - Buildings and Development
Senior Manager - Committee and Office Services
Senior Manager - CMS
Senior Manager - County Arts Unit
Senior Manager - County Library and Information Service
  - County Information Centres
  - Libraries
Senior Manager - County Museum Service
Senior Manager - Early Years Development and Childcare
Senior Manager - Education Welfare Service
Senior Manager - Enterprise and Partnership
Senior Manager - Governor Services
Senior Manager - ICT Team
Senior Manager - Lancashire Record Office
Senior Manager - Learning Excellence
  - Lancashire Education Inclusion Service
  - Lancashire Professional Development Service
Senior Manager - Performance Management and Review
Senior Manager - Personnel
Senior Manager - Policy and Planning (Inclusion and SEN)
Senior Manager - Pupil Access
Senior Manager - School Effectiveness Service
  - Ethnic Minority Achievement Service
Senior Manager - School Financial Services
Senior Manager - School Policy and Operations
Senior Manager - SEN Assessment and Educational Psychology Service
Senior Manager - Service for Learners Out of School
  - Lancashire Education Medical Service
Senior Manager - Service Review
Senior Manager - Youth and Community Service
All Lancashire Maintained Schools – Headteachers and Chairs of Governing Bodies

Social Services Directorate

Senior Management Team
Children and Families Business Unit Management Team
  - Team Managers - Family Placement

Team Managers - Family Support
Team Managers - Family Support Resources
Team Managers - Initial Assessment
Team Managers - Permanence
Business Support Services
Children’s Residential Establishments
Children’s Residential Managers
Children with Disabilities
Emergency Duty Team
Circulation List

Family Support Centres
Finance
Human Resources
Leaving Care Co-ordinators
Local Social Services Offices (21)

Quality and Policy Development Group

All County Councillors
Environment Directorate
Office of the Chief Executive
Corporate Communications
  Democratic Services
  Policy Unit

Resources Directorate
Youth Offending Team

PARTNERSHIPS

Area Child Protection Committee
Child and Adolescent Mental Health Strategy (CAMHS) Steering Groups

Chorley and South Ribble
  East Lancashire
  Morecambe Bay
  Preston
  The Fylde Coast
  West Lancashire

Children’s Fund Partnership
Compact Working Group
County Children’s Services Planning Group
County SEN Forum
County Youth Justice Chief Officer Steering Group
Crime and Disorder Reduction Partnerships (CDRPs)
Crime and Disorder Chief Officer Group
District Liaison Committees – Education (12)
District Liaison Committees – Social Services (12)
Early Years Development and Childcare Partnership (EYDCP) - Children First
Foster Carer Forum
Lancashire Criminal Justice Board
Lancashire Drug Action Team
Lancashire Healthy Schools Strategy Group
Lancashire Partnership Executive Committee
Locality Children’s Services Groups

East Lancashire
  Morecambe Bay
  North West Lancashire
  South Lancashire
Local Strategic Partnerships
Sure Start Management Boards
Teenage Pregnancy Partnership
Youth Justice Board
EXTERNAL PARTNERS

Acute and Hospital Trusts
Chief Probation Officer
Children and Family Court Advisory and Support Service (CAFCASS)
Commission for Social Care Inspection (CSCI)
Connexions
Criminal Courts
Diocesan Authorities
District Councils in Lancashire
Ethnic Minority Organisations
  Accrington Asian Community Forum
  Ahmadiyya Muslim Association
  Al Hira Community College
  Andhra Social and Cultural Organisation
  Anglo Pakistan Society
  Asian Business Federation
  Asian Community Forum
  Baitulmakarum Mosque and Community Centre
  Bangladesh Community Council
  Bangladesh Welfare Association
  Bangladesh Welfare Association Community Development Trust
  Caribbean Sports and Social Club
  CentrePeace
  Chorley Muslim Welfare Society
  Community Advice Centre – Hyndburn
  County Equalities Co-ordinator
  East Lancashire Development Unit
  Ghausia Mosque
  Ghausia Rizvia Jamia Mosque and Islamic Centre
  Gujarati Hindu Centre
  Guru Nanak Cultural and Recreational Centre (Temple)
  Hindu Society – Lancaster and Morecambe
  Hyndburn Asian Women’s Association (HAWA)
  ITHAAD Advisory Service
  Jalgos Sports and Social Club
  Jinnah Community Development Trust
  Lancashire BME Pact
  Lancashire Council of Mosques
  Masjid-E-Bilal and Islamic Centre
  Nguzo Saba Centre
  Pakistan Islamic Centre
  Pakistan Welfare Association and Pendle Community Health Shop
  Pendle Pakistan Welfare Association
  Preston and Western Lancashire REC
  Preston Bangladesh Association
  Preston Muslim Forum
  Preston Muslim Society
  Preston Sikh Cultural Association
  Raza Mosque
  Sahara in Preston
  Shah Jalal Mosque and Islamic Cultural Centre
  Shree Prajapati Association
  Swaminarayan Hindu Mission
The Canalside Centre Limited
Lancashire Children's Rights Service
Lancashire Constabulary
Lancashire Members of Parliament (MPs)
Learning and Skills Council
Neighbouring Local Authorities
  Blackburn with Darwen Borough Council
  Blackpool Borough Council
  Bolton Metropolitan Borough Council
  Bury Metropolitan Borough Council
  Calderdale Metropolitan Borough Council
  City of Bradford Metropolitan District Council
  Cumbria County Council
  Knowsley Metropolitan Borough Council
  North Yorkshire County Council
  Rochdale Metropolitan Borough Council
  Sefton Metropolitan Borough Council
  St Helens Metropolitan Borough Council
  Wigan Metropolitan Borough Council
Primary Care Trusts (PCTs)
  Blackburn-with-Darwen Primary Care Trust
  Burnley, Pendle and Rossendale Primary Care Trust
  Chorley and South Ribble Primary Care Trust
  Fylde Primary Care Trust
  Hyndburn and Ribble Valley Primary Care Trust
  Morecambe Bay Primary Care Trust
  Preston Primary Care Trust
  West Lancashire Primary Care Trust
  Wyre Primary Care Trust
Recognised Trade Unions
Strategic Health Authority
Teacher Associations
Voluntary Sector Organisations
  Barnado’s – North West Regional Office
  Lancashire Council for Voluntary Youth Services
  NCH North West
  Spurgeon’s Child Care
  The Children’s Society – North West Regional Office
  Young Carers’ Groups

A summary of the responses to the consultation can be found in Appendix ‘A’. A full set of the responses is available on CD ROM on request from [contact details].

2. BRIEFING MEETINGS

The report presented to Cabinet on 1 April 2004 gave certain commitments about the involvement of stakeholders in the consultation process. In light of this, a briefing protocol was agreed and a number of trained officers attended meetings across the County. As an alternative to presentation by one of the trained briefers, some meetings used the consultation packs themselves to generate discussion. The list of meetings shown below is not exhaustive but highlights those meetings identified by the Core Project Team as key meetings.
Three sets of standard briefing notes were prepared to cater for the differing requirements of the groups to be briefed, as follows:

i. A ‘mini’ briefing note (approximate duration 5 minutes)
ii. A ‘midi’ briefing note plus PowerPoint presentation (approximate duration 30 minutes)
iii. A ‘maxi’ briefing note plus PowerPoint presentation (approximate duration 60 minutes)

The ‘midi’ briefing was used in the majority of cases. Copies of the briefing notes and PowerPoint presentations are available on request from Geoff Hiscox (01772) 531760.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Meeting</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>22 April</td>
<td>Teacher Associations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Diocesan Authorities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26 April</td>
<td>Teenage Pregnancy Executive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27 April</td>
<td>Fylde District Liaison Committee (Social Services)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28 April</td>
<td>Wyre and Fylde Primary Care Trust</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29 April</td>
<td>Compact Working Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 April</td>
<td>East Lancashire Chief Executive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 May</td>
<td>Preston Primary Care Trust</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 May</td>
<td>Special School Headteachers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 May</td>
<td>Morecambe Bay Primary Care Trust</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Area SEN Forum (North)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Morecambe Bay CAMHS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 May</td>
<td>Preston Primary Care Trust Local Implementation Team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 May</td>
<td>Preston Crime &amp; Disorder Reduction Partnership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lancaster District Liaison Committee (Social Services)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Youth Justice Board</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 May</td>
<td>County Youth Justice Chief Officers’ Steering Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Wyre Professional Executive Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Crime and Disorder Chief Officers’ Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>East Lancashire CAMHS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 May</td>
<td>Hyndburn &amp; Ribble Valley Professional Executive Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 May</td>
<td>Chorley &amp; South Ribble CAMHS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 May</td>
<td>Burnley Crime &amp; Disorder Reduction Partnership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fylde District Liaison Committee (Social Services)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 May</td>
<td>Fylde Professional Executive Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 May</td>
<td>Children First (Early Years Development and Childcare Partnership)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Healthy Schools Strategy Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 May</td>
<td>East Lancashire - Chief Executive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>County Children’s Services Planning Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24 May</td>
<td>CAMHS County Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>North West Lancashire Locality Children’s Services Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Morecambe Bay Locality Children’s Services Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>West Lancashire Primary Care Trust</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hyndburn District Liaison Committee (Social Services)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Primary Cluster (East)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 May</td>
<td>Preston CAMHS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lancashire Partnership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Primary Cluster (East)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Chorley and South Ribble Primary Care Trust</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>West Lancashire District Liaison Committee (Social Services)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Burnley District Liaison Committee (Social Services)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lancaster Local Strategic Partnership Children and Families Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26 May</td>
<td>Primary Cluster (East)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27 May</td>
<td>Area SEN Forum (South)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Full County Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Social Services JNCC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28 May</td>
<td>Area Child Protection Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ribble Valley District Liaison Committee (Social Services)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 June</td>
<td>Looked After Young People’s Panel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 June</td>
<td>Preston Strategic Partnership Children, Young People and Families Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Black Workers Development Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 June</td>
<td>Lancaster Crime &amp; Disorder Reduction Partnership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>South Ribble District Liaison Committee (Social Services)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Preston District Liaison Committee (Social Services)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 June</td>
<td>Teenage Pregnancy Executive Board</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 June</td>
<td>Burnley, Pendle and Rossendale Primary Care Trust</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 June</td>
<td>Area SEN Forum (East)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Wyre Professional Executive Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>East Lancashire Locality Children’s Services Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 June</td>
<td>Hyndburn &amp; Ribble Valley Professional Executive Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 June</td>
<td>South Ribble District Liaison Committee (Education)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lancashire Drug Action Team Executive Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pendle District Liaison Committee (Social Services)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ribble Valley District Liaison Committee (Education)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Wyre Local Strategic Partnership Board</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Burnley Action Partnership Co-ordination Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 June</td>
<td>Young Carers Workers’ meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fylde Primary Care Trust</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Primary Cluster (North)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 June</td>
<td>Drug Action Team Executive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fylde Professional Executive Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pendle District Liaison Committee (Education)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Primary Cluster (North)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ribble Valley Local Strategic Partnership Children and Families Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>West Lancashire District Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 June</td>
<td>Lancaster District Liaison Committee (Education)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>South Lancashire Locality Children’s Services Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Primary Cluster (South)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Primary Cluster (North)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 June</td>
<td>Fylde District Liaison Committee (Education)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Primary Cluster (South)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>West Lancashire Local Strategic Partnership</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PS/PP/NB
25 June 2004
Every Child Matters: Governance

Contact for further information:
Gill Rigg, (01772) 534237, Social Services Directorate
Geoff Hiscox, (01772) 531760, Education and Cultural Services Directorate

Executive Summary

A report which describes proposals for revised governance arrangements following consultation on draft proposals considered by the Cabinet on the 1st April.

Recommendation

The Cabinet is asked to note the report and to agree the following recommendations:

(a) to approve the establishment of a Children's Services Panel and a Steering Group;
(b) to agree the process for establishing a Children's Strategic Partnership for Lancashire.

1. BACKGROUND

At its meeting on 1 April, Cabinet received a report which outlined expectations in relation to Developing Accountability for Children's Services. The report included four issues: the appointment of a Director of Children's Services; the role of the Lead Member for Children's Services; governance in respect of the Overview and Scrutiny functions of the County Council and the establishment of a Children's Targeted Services Advisory Board.

The current position with regard to each of these issues is as follows:

- Proposals about the appointment of a Director of Children's Services is dealt with elsewhere on this agenda;
- Proposals about defining the responsibilities of the Lead Member for Children and Families is also dealt with elsewhere on this agenda;
The O & S Management Panel will be asked to consider that Overview and Scrutiny functions in respect of all aspects of Children's Services be dealt with by the Internal Overview and Scrutiny Committee.

The remainder of this report is to do with the creation of a Children's Services Panel made up of Elected Members, along with representatives of partner organisations, carers and young people, and how it might relate to the wider partnership function. In the Cabinet report in April this forum was described as the Children's Targeted Services Advisory Board but it is now felt more appropriate to rename it the Children's Services Panel. This title is used in the rest of the report.

It was suggested in the 1 April Cabinet report that such a Panel would make recommendations as appropriate to Cabinet, or Cabinet Members, on decisions before them in respect of a range of issues to do with children and young people. The examples given in respect of the duties of the proposed Panel included responsibilities around the County Council's role as a corporate parent. The role of the Quality Protects Panel, along with Quality Protects funding, has now been superseded as part of the modernisation agenda and the Panel is now no longer appropriate.

Responses received during the consultation showed there to be a strong measure of support for the development of such a Panel, especially the meaningful involvement of parents/carers and young people in this process. Some responses pointed out that the involvement of children and young people can sometimes present as tokenistic and that this needs to be guarded against. It is acknowledged that the Quality Protects Panel has fulfilled a valuable function around vulnerable children, young people and their families over several years. It has played a major part in transforming Children's Social Services in Lancashire. It was felt that, in the current climate, it would be vital that any proposals around the setting up of such a Panel should take account of the wider children's services context and in particular the importance of setting a clear strategic direction.

The proposals below describe the Children's Services Panel but also illustrate how the Panel might relate to a wider partnership function. These proposals are a further development of the proposals made at the 1 April Cabinet and therefore do not relate to the consultation exercise.

2. ADVISORY AND PARTNERSHIP FUNCTIONS

The proposals that have emerged anticipate three complementary forums to deliver an appropriate advisory function. In order to avoid any confusion a different name is used for each forum. It is also important at the outset to make clear that the forums will facilitate two-way communication within the tiers. It is anticipated that the initial structure will be introduced on a phased basis.
### (a) Children's Services Panel

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The function of the Panel will be:</th>
<th>The role of the Panel will be:</th>
<th>Membership</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| To provide advice to Cabinet Members to assist them in meeting duties and responsibilities for children and young people who require additional support and/or who are vulnerable | - To promote positive outcomes and life chances for children  
- To discharge the County Council's role as a corporate parent (including regulation 33 visits)  
- To consider issues relating to the duties around identification and assessment of children with SEN  
- To exercise powers and duties under Schedule 1 LASSA 1970  
- To promote safe and effective integrated working  
- To fulfil other statutory requirements relating to children's services for vulnerable children and young people, as appropriate  
- To consider the cost effectiveness of any such services | Full Members  
- County Councillors  
Co-opted Members:  
- Relevant officers from the statutory, voluntary and community sectors  
- Young people  
- Carers  

The Panel would be serviced by the Head of Children's Services Group

This Panel should be regarded as the equivalent of the proposal for a Children's Targeted Services Advisory Board made in the 1 April report. It is expected that the Children's Services Panel will identify further task related groups that will report to it. For example, it would be important to retain the valuable contributions that the Fostering Forum and LAC Young People's Panel currently make.
(b) **Steering Group**

The Steering Group is an addition to the structure proposed in April. It is an internal County Council forum the main purpose of which is to provide guidance to the relevant Cabinet Members.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The function of the Steering Group will be:</th>
<th>The role of the Steering Group will be:</th>
<th>Membership</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| To provide guidance to the Cabinet Member for Children and Families on issues relating to the provision of services to children and young people | • To prepare reports on matters relating to children's services  
• To advise on the impact of changes in legislation  
• To identify strategies for developing the agenda | • Cabinet Member (Children & Families)  
• Cabinet Member (Education)  
• Cabinet Member (Community and Partnerships)  
• Director of Education and Cultural Services  
• Director of Social Services  
• Head of Children's Services  
• Chair of the Children's Services Panel |

(c) **Children and Young People's Strategic Partnership**

The Cabinet Report in April acknowledged that an early area for future consideration under the Every Child Matters agenda was the new duty laid upon all local authorities to make partnership arrangements with key partners. The Government's commentary upon the Children Bill, Every Child Matters: Next Steps, describes briefly the expected scope of such a partnership and refers to the placing of reciprocal duties to co-operate which will, in due course, be placed upon key partners and relevant agencies. The recent guidance 'Every Child Matters: Inspecting Services for Children and Young People' also refers to the important role played by a Children's Strategic Partnership in responding to Area Reviews. The Government has promised to issue joint departmental guidance on the requirements that the partnership will have to meet in due course. In the meantime it has confirmed the broad approaches as:

- To identify the needs, circumstances and aspirations of children and young people;
- To agree outcome goals and priorities for children and young people;
- To agree the contribution each agency should make to meeting these goals, including through the effective sharing of information at a strategic level and about individual children and young people;
• To oversee arrangements for agencies to work together in the commissioning, delivery and integration of services, as appropriate.

[From: Every Child Matters: Next Steps]

There are two options for developing a Children's Strategic Partnership:

(i) To adapt the terms of reference and membership of the existing County Children Services Planning Group;
(ii) To create a new Children's Strategic Partnership.

Although the County Children Services Planning Group has in many respects acted as a Strategic Partnership it does not have any executive powers and membership is not always at a level to meet the approaches listed above. Although it may be possible to make the alterations, it is felt that the preferred route would be to create a new Partnership.

It is essential that partners are fully involved in this proposal and it is suggested that the County Council co-ordinates an event before the end of October at which key players can begin to shape a Children's Strategic Partnership for Lancashire. The Cabinet Member for Children and Families would lead this event. Attendance would have to be of a seniority that would allow decisions to be agreed on the day in respect of constitutional issues, including terms of reference and membership. Consideration could then be given to the continuing role of the Children's Services Planning Group and to the proposals for a Reference Group.

A key issue for early discussion will be to identify how the County Children's Strategic Partnership will promote involvement in Children's Services at a locality level. Many existing countywide partnerships have addressed the need for locality groups by establishing multi agency forums either based on organisation boundaries, such as district councils, or other criteria, such as service areas. One approach would be to encourage each Local Strategic Partnerships to establish a Children's Services sub group, ideally with broadly similar terms of reference and able to provide a point of reference for items of joint interest.

(d) The Lancashire Partnership

It is necessary to ensure that Children's Services are considered at the highest level in partner organisations across Lancashire and that links are made with other community initiatives. It is proposed that a link made with The Lancashire Partnership for this purpose. The Lancashire Partnership is planning to have "daughter" groups reporting to it on cross-cutting themes and it is proposed that the Children's Strategic Partnership is regarded as one cross-cutting theme.
Consultations

The consultation on Every Child Matters which took place during April-June 2004.

Advice

Advice has been taken from regional and local Forums and support groups.

Alternative options to be considered

N/A

Implications: e.g. Financial, Legal, Personnel, Human Rights, Crime and Disorder or Other

This item has the following implications, as indicated:

Local Government (Access to Information) Act 1985

List of Background Papers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Paper</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Contact/Directorate/Ext</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Every Child Matters: Next Steps</td>
<td>March 2004</td>
<td>Geoff Hiscox/Education and Cultural Services/ 31760</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Cabinet – 2nd July 2004

Report of the Director of Education and Cultural Services

Youth and Community Service – Ofsted Inspection Report
(Appendix 'A' refers)

Contact for further information:
John Goffee, (01772) 531792, Education and Cultural Services Directorate

Executive Summary

Ofsted introduced new inspection arrangements for Youth Services from 1 January 2004. Lancashire’s was one of nine local authority Youth Services to be included in the first wave of inspections, which will be part of a four-year cycle.

Inspectors visited Lancashire from 23 to 27 February 2004 and judged the service to be a very good service providing satisfactory value for money.

Of the nine local authorities’ youth services inspected, no other service received such a high grade and only two services last year achieved this level of judgement. The report also included some recommendations which need to be developed into an action plan. Work is now in hand to prepare the plan.

Recommendation

The Cabinet is recommended to note the report.

Background

New inspection arrangements were introduced from 1 January 2004 for Youth Services and Lancashire’s was selected as one of nine local authority youth services to be inspected in the first wave. It is expected that all Youth Services will now be inspected on a four year cycle.

The final Inspection Report was published on 11 June 2004.

The inspection team found that the service had many more strengths than weaknesses and was impressed by the range and quality of the provision. Major strengths included:
• Excellent strategic and operational management reflecting national and council priorities.

• Standards of young people's achievements were good and on occasion exemplary.

• The Service works with large numbers of young people, often with multiple and complex needs.

• Effective strategies have been developed to ensure young people’s participation in appropriate strategic decision making.

• Advice and guidance services are good.

• Youth workers are committed, highly motivated and have good local knowledge and are well managed.

• There is effective partnership working.

• The Service is well funded by the County Council.

• The Service is committed to achieving corporate and national objectives.

The Inspection team also made several recommendations to the County Council to further enhance its provision and these are now in hand and will form the basis of the action plan which will need to be submitted to Government Office North West following approval by Cabinet.

A copy of the Inspection Report is included as Appendix 'A'.

Consultations  N/A

Advice  N/A

Alternative options to be considered  N/A

Implications: e.g. Financial, Legal, Personnel, Human Rights, Crime and Disorder or Other

This item has the following implications, as indicated: None

Local Government (Access to Information) Act 1985
List of Background Papers

Paper Date Contact/Directorate/Ext

N/A
b. youth and community appendix a
Executive Summary

The report sets out a series of options for dealing with the projected overspend of £489,000 within the Youth and Community Service for 2004/05. The issues were considered in detail within a Decision Conferencing exercise involving senior Members on 14 May 2004.

The Youth and Community Overview and Scrutiny Task Group met on the 15 June to consider the options and make recommendations to the Cabinet; these are set out in the report.

Recommendation

The Cabinet is requested to consider the options detailed in the report on how to meet the projected short fall within the 2004/05 budget for the Youth and Community Service.

Background

The financial position of the service for both the 2003/04 and 2004/05 financial years has improved considerably since the previous report to Cabinet.

In 2003/04 the position is set out in the table below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Budget 2003/04 £000</th>
<th>Cabinet 06/01/04 £000</th>
<th>Final Outturn £000</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gross Expenditure</td>
<td>14,553</td>
<td>15,459</td>
<td>17,314</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income</td>
<td>3,832</td>
<td>4,343</td>
<td>6,475</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net Expenditure</td>
<td>10,721</td>
<td>11,116</td>
<td>10,839</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variation from Budget</td>
<td></td>
<td>395</td>
<td>118</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
There are two principal reasons for the improved financial position compared to that report previously to Cabinet.

Firstly, in response to the Cabinet resolution, the Youth & Community Steering Group has been scrutinising carefully requests from the service to fill vacant posts, and commit other major elements of expenditure, e.g. building refurbishment, large print runs. In reaching conclusions about which posts should be filled and which held vacant, the steering group has sought to balance the need to maintain front line service provision, against the need for savings to be made in the cost of the service. As a result of this action by the Steering Group, the service is currently holding vacancies equivalent to a gross annual cost of £500,000 pending final decisions about the future direction of the service. These vacancies will enable staff to be redeployed once these decisions have been made and thus minimise the need for redundancies.

Secondly, over £2m of additional income has been generated by the service, from a variety of sources and whilst this has been offset by expenditure commitments, it has overall had a beneficial impact on the service’s financial position.

The projected position for 2004/05, before the impact of any actions proposed in this paper, is set out below. The Cabinet should note that the budget figures have been adjusted to reflect the budget decisions made by the Cabinet on the 29th January, particularly in respect of Decision Conferencing. The figures in the Cabinet 6/1/04 column have been adjusted to reflect these decisions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Budget 2004/05 £000</th>
<th>Cabinet 06/01/04 £000</th>
<th>Current Projection £000</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gross Expenditure</strong></td>
<td>14,575</td>
<td>15,452</td>
<td>16,420</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Income</strong></td>
<td>3,525</td>
<td>3,599</td>
<td>4,881</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Net Expenditure</strong></td>
<td>11,050</td>
<td>11,853</td>
<td>11,539</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Variation from Budget</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>803</td>
<td>489</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In order to address the situation and to analyse the full range of budgetary issues relating to the whole of the Service, it was agreed to implement a variant of the Decision Conferencing system which has been used successfully within the County Council for two years as a part of its budget management arrangements. This took place with the Cabinet Member for Children and Families, other senior Members, and officers from the Education and Cultural Services Directorate on 14 May, 2004 at Myerscough College.

An analysis took place of the entire Youth and Community budget and a detailed review of the full range of services currently provided was undertaken. Cabinet Members considered that certain core services such as support for the After Care service, front-line youth work, etc were of such importance that no reductions should
be considered under these headings. From the remainder of the services, whilst they were assessed as being of a high priority, Members requested that options be explored for budgetary reductions in the following areas:

1. **Youth Participation and Youth Council work**

   The involvement by the service in the youth participation and citizenship agenda currently involves one full-time participation worker in each of Lancashire's twelve Districts, together with one central co-ordinator. The programme was originally to have been funded from the Transforming Youth Work budget but, as has been reported on previous occasions, the DfES allocation was subsequently significantly reduced. Full details were provided in the report to Cabinet on 6 January 2004.

   It is felt that the development of the Youth Council and its associated works has been extremely successful but that consideration could be given to linking Districts thereby reducing the number of participation workers required. Some vacancies are currently being held within the programme.

   Option: reduction in the programme of 6 FTE level 2 workers

   - £180,000

2. **Community Use of Schools**

   The Community Use of Schools programme operates in conjunction with local community associations to provide additional facilities and support for young people at six principal school sites: Carr Hill, Kirkham; Glenburn, Skelmersdale, Ormskirk School; Barden, Burnley; Alder Grange, Rossendale and Norden, Rishton. Whilst the scheme is both long running and successful, by its very nature, effectiveness is obviously limited to the small number of sites through which it operates.

   Schools now have considerable autonomy in the allocation of their budgets and it is felt that, together with Community Associations, savings to this aspect of the budget could be considered. This could be either through the withdrawal of some aspect of the service, the closure of a specific site, or, through an increase in income by charging for all or part of current provision.

   Option: reduction in support for Community Use of Schools

   - £80,000

3. **General Youth and Community Support for work with schools**

   The Youth and Community Service currently provides wide ranging and valuable support to a high proportion of the 88 secondary schools in Lancashire. This normally takes the form of targeted work in the lunch break or out-of-core-time activities, together with specific provision of support to some classroom activities - in particular work with personal and social education.
At present most of this work is not charged to school budgets and is therefore funded directly through the Youth and Community Service. It is suggested that it is not unreasonable in the current budgetary climate to charge schools for the work which takes place under classroom support. Should that not prove possible then the reduction of some elements of the service could be considered.

Option: reduction of 4 FTE youth workers
- £120,000

4. New ways of Working

A wide ranging review is currently being undertaken of all service spending and operating costs. This includes such issues as telephones, stationery and furniture, use by outside groups of premises for meetings, relationship with the Voluntary Sector in use of transport, etc. It is felt that a combination of increased income and some savings reductions in this wide area should be considered.

Option: new ways of working
- £100,000

5. Outdoor Education and International Work

The Service currently operates the "Movin Up" and PAYP programmes as well as a wide range of outdoor education, residential experiences and international opportunities as part of the full range of services for young people. A reduction in this area would therefore limit the activities that are currently available particularly to those young people from disadvantaged areas where such opportunities are extremely limited.

Option: Consideration of reduction in outdoor education and international work opportunities
- £30,000

6. Accreditation of Learning and Achievement

Under the Transforming Youth Work Agenda, all Youth Services will have to meet targets of having to work with at least 25% of the young people in their area aged between 13 and 19; in Lancashire there are 107,000 young people in this category. There are additional more detailed targets for dealing with accredited and recorded outcomes that the service will also be expected to meet from April 2005. Currently the Service has allocated two sessions of a youth workers time in each District together with some central co-ordination and development. It would be possible to defer the development of this work, or scale down the current provision.
7. Review of Learning Centres Programme

The service has been developing ICT based Learning Centres in each District. They are specifically aimed at disadvantaged groups and hard to reach young people who may have little opportunity to engage in ICT activity. It is regarded as a key element in meeting corporate e-government targets. However, costs could be reduced by taking advantage of some recent networking developments and through closer working with by the People's Network in public libraries and the existing Information Shops - this is becoming more appropriate as closer working relationships with such services as Connexions is established.

Option: savings within ICT Learning Centres' Programmes
- £30,000

8. 'What Now'

The 'What Now' service provides a wide range of information and advice opportunities for young people ranging from the well known annually produced book to a full range of telephone/text/e-mail helplines. The service is sold to a number of other Authorities and was highly commended in the recent inspection by OFSTED. However, with the introduction of the much delayed national Connexions helpline many of the Authorities which previously used the service were required by Connexions to withdraw their subscription which resulted in a drop in income of c£150,000 per annum. Further detailed work is currently being undertaken on the financial position of 'What Now' but indications are that increased marketing could result in many of the previous organisations re-registering with perhaps additional users also using the service. It is also important that, given the scale of 'What Now', further detailed work on the full range of budget options continues.

Option: review of 'What Now' including increased income
- £40,000

In addition to the above recommendations there are a number of medium and long term issues which could have a significant effect on the budgetary position of the Service. These include the development of a far closer working relationship with Connexions within the Every Child Matters developments; the possibility of reviewing the District-based structure of the Service which, whilst it has many advantages for the County Council for such issues as the Locality Agenda and Crime and Disorder, is expensive to maintain; reviewing the significant contribution made by Youth and Community to the delivery of a number of specialist services undertaken for other Directorates for which only a partial cost recovery is made. However, it is suggested that whilst these issues are important they will not effect the position for 2004/05, but
need to be reviewed in the light of wider decisions that will be taken in the
development of Children's Services and Every Child Matters.

As previously stated, the projected overspend for the Service is estimated at £489,000 for 2004/05: the above options amount to savings of £640,000. However, this needs to be set against the continuing work of the Steering Group which is carefully scrutinising all vacancies which arise within the Service. Whilst this process will need to continue it is felt that a more structured and long-term position is required and the Cabinet are therefore requested to review the options as detailed in the report arising from the Decision Conferencing exercise.

Consultations

The Youth and Community Overview and Scrutiny Task Group considered the above options on the 15 June and have made the following recommendations to the Cabinet to meet the projected shortfall within the 2004/5 budget for the Youth and Community Service.

“That: -

1. savings of £180,000 be made through Option 1: Youth participation and Youth Council work

2. savings of £30,000 be made through Option 2: Community use of schools and that these savings should be made through an increase in income by charging for all or part of current provision. The Task Group does not support the closure of one specific site

3. savings of £50,000 be achieved though Option 3: General Youth and Community support for work with schools

4. savings of £100,000 be achieved via new ways of working described in Option 4

5. savings of £10,000 be made through Option 5: Outdoor Education and international work and that the bulk of these savings should be made through a reduction in international work

6. savings of £60,000 be achieved through Option 6: Accreditation of learning and achievement

7. savings of £30,000 be made through Option 7: Review of Learning Centres programme, but only if those savings can be made by technical savings alone, whilst protecting the service provision

8. that a review of the ‘What Now’ service be undertaken as outlined in Option 8, resulting in savings and increased income amounting to £40,000”

The total potential saving as recommended by the Task Group was therefore £500,000. The Task Group also recommended that the Cabinet Member for Children and Families be invited to a future meeting of the Internal Overview and Scrutiny
Committee to report on the above recommendations and the decisions taken regarding the options to be taken forward.

**Advice**

N/A

**Alternative options to be considered**

N/A

**Implications**: e.g. Financial, Legal, Personnel, Human Rights, Crime and Disorder or Other

This item has the following implications, as indicated:

N/A

**Local Government (Access to Information) Act 1985**

**List of Background Papers**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Paper</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Contact/Directorate/Ext</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nil</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Executive Summary
This report sets out the work of the Youth and Community Steering Group to analyse the issues that have caused the budget difficulties in the service and the actions taken to address those issues.

Recommendation
The Cabinet are recommended to note the report and action plan.

Background
At its meeting on 6 January 2004, the Cabinet considered a report on the budget position of the Youth and Community Service. The Cabinet resolved:

(a) That the authority to operate a Devolved Financial Management Scheme (DFM) be withdrawn from the Youth & Community Service until the Cabinet is fully satisfied that:
   (i) all of the causes of the budget overspend have been identified
   (ii) measures have been taken which will bring the budget under control and achieve the robust financial management of the service.

(b) That further reports be made to the Cabinet on the implementation and impact of the measures in the report with any further recommendations that may be deemed appropriate.

Since then a Steering Group consisting of the Heads of Business Services, Lifelong Learning & Cultural Services and Community & Youth Services from the Education & Cultural Services Directorate and the Head of Finance from the Resources
Directorate have been meeting regularly as a steering group to oversee the service’s budget and to investigate the reasons for the budget difficulties.

On the 10th May 2004, the Cabinet were informed that the Internal Overview and Scrutiny Committee had expressed their concerns in relation to the failure of financial management systems and budget prioritisation issues within the Directorate.

The Cabinet resolved to note:

c) The concern expressed by the Internal Overview and Scrutiny Committee.
d) That the interim measures taken to address the shortfall in the Youth and Community Service had resulted in a balanced budget for the Service.
e) That a report setting out the reasons for the problems in the Youth and Community Service Budget would be brought back to the Overview and Scrutiny Committee and the Cabinet.

The financial position for the service for both 2003/04 and 2004/05 is set out fully in the previous report at Item 4-(b) (ii).

This report identifies and confirms a number of issues within the service that represent the causes for the budget problems.

The work of the Youth & Community Steering Group has identified and confirmed a number of issues within the service that represent the causes for the budget problems. These can be summarised as:

- Growth in non-core funded activities
- Lack of clarity in Management Delegation
- Over-reliance on key individuals
- Inadequate Management Information

**Growth in Non-core funded activities**

The last few years have seen a significant increase in the levels of external funding (both grants and income) attracted by the service. The table below sets out the changes in income levels for the service.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>2001/02 £000</th>
<th>2002/03 £000</th>
<th>2003/04 £000</th>
<th>2004/05 (Est.) £000</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>External Income</td>
<td>3,921</td>
<td>5,504</td>
<td>6,475</td>
<td>4,881</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In 2003/04 this growth in grants and external income meant that 37% of the work of the Youth & Community Service was funded from sources other than its core budget provided by the County Council, (and this will decline to about 30% based on current estimates for 2004/05).

This adds both complexity and uncertainty to the budget management issues for the service. In particular if it is to be managed effectively it requires the service to have
strong internal systems of personnel and financial monitoring. These should enable managers to respond to short term opportunities where presented but without entering into long term commitments. At present the configuration of financial and personnel information within the service does not facilitate the access to this information. This increases the risks, as evidenced in relation to the Youth Participation Workers, of decisions being taken without a secure financial basis being in place to ensure the sustainability of the provision.

As the table above illustrates one of the issues for the service in the 2004/05 budget is the significant reduction in external funding, particularly the fall out of some long standing European Funded activities, (eg New Routes and Equaliser). The service has introduced procedures for the approval of grant applications and to ensure that appropriate exit strategies are incorporated in place for future grant applications. The service’s arrangements are currently being reviewed by Internal Audit to ensure that all of the necessary controls are in place.

Levels of Management Delegation

The DFM schemes for the Education & Cultural Services Directorate are currently managed at the group level within the Directorate. This means that the budgets for the Youth & Community Service form part of the Lifelong Learning DFM with a net budget of £44m. This approach has benefits in enabling resources to be aligned within these broad DFMs to support County Council Priorities, and by reducing the risks of a silo mentality to the use of resources developing. However, by creating these large DFM blocks it can reduce the perception of the need for active budget management at lower levels in the organisation.

The Youth & Community Service’s management structure is based on a small central team, with the majority of service being managed and provided through teams managed locally in each of the 12 Districts in the County. The majority of service decisions are taken at a District Level. However, the budget accountabilities are not fully aligned with those for service delivery. This has the consequence that service decisions made locally can have a resultant impact on budgets managed at a County level rather than those held at a District level.

The experience of the steering group is that this lack of alignment between budget and service responsibilities is compounded by a lack of consistency of approach between Districts and communication processes with the Centre. For example, on behalf of the steering group, officers in both the Resources Directorate and the central team of the Youth & Community Service made a number of attempts during January and February to obtain an accurate picture of expected income levels during the remainder of the financial year, with little positive results. However, in late March and early April some £1.5m of income was coded to the service from various District based sources. This is being addressed through the alignment of service and financial accountabilities set out in the Action Plan.

Reliance on Key Individuals

It is clear that the knowledge of this highly complex budget was until March 2003 concentrated in three individual officers. Much of this was not documented in a way
that was readily accessible to those without the level of knowledge of the finances of
the service, nor was it easy to recreate this information from the records held on the
financial and other management information systems.

The three officers concerned coincidentally all suffered major health incidents at a
similar time and this knowledge base was lost to the service and the County Council.
All have now been granted retirement on ill-health grounds and it has not been
appropriate to pursue issues with them. Therefore time has had to be spent to
develop proper systems and procedures to ensure that this dependency on personal
knowledge is not exposed in the future. These databases are now being finalised
and will be kept up to date by the service.

Management Information

The requirement of clear accountability for financial performance necessitates
arrangements to ensure that financial and other management information is
accessible in a means that supports management responsibilities. At present there
is no such consistency in terms of the structure of information on the Corporate
Financial and other Management Information Systems. For example, the structure
established on the corporate systems is not used to facilitate the monitoring of
expenditure against agreed budgets within Districts or within the service overall.
Equally, the personnel records held on the corporate establishment register for the
service were incomplete when reconciled as part of this review to payroll records. In
addition, use is made of other systems for example to record income due to the
service. This leads to a lack of clarity in the financial position of the service during
the year in the absence of processes to ensure the regular reconciliation of the
information held on these various systems.

The Directorate operates a monthly budget monitoring process as part of the overall
corporate monitoring arrangements, resulting in the quarterly report to the Cabinet.
In most parts of the Directorate this provides sufficient information but in some
particular high risk areas, for example linked to “Demand” led budgets in the Pupil
Services DFM the engagement between finance and service managers has been
enhanced to provide a higher level of scrutiny of the position. However, the
engagement with Youth & Community Service has until recently operated at a
service level. With the weaknesses in the information systems within the service,
this means that knowledge of future plans and information held outside the corporate
systems is not readily incorporated into the financial monitoring information.

The Action Plan contains a number of recommendations to improve the
management and financial information available to the Service.

Actions Being Undertaken

The table at Appendix ‘A’ summarises the issues arising from the review. Against
each issue it sets out the actions already taken and the future plans to address these
issues and provide a secure basis for financial management in the future.
Implications: e.g. Financial, Legal, Personnel, Human Rights, Crime and Disorder or Other

This item has the following implications, as indicated:

N/A

Local Government (Access to Information) Act 1985
List of Background Papers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Paper</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Contact/Directorate/Ext</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cabinet report: Budget</td>
<td>6 January 2004</td>
<td>Mike Hart, Education &amp; Cultural Services, 01772 531648</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Position of the Youth &amp; Community Service</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Appendix A

### Directorate and Service Actions Arising From the Review of the Youth & Community Service Budget

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Purpose</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Directorate Wide Issues</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DFM Arrangements</td>
<td>Review DFM Scheme operational in the ECS Directorate</td>
<td>Strengthen Accountability for financial outcomes and improve linkage to service plans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finance Team</td>
<td>Implement Combined Finance Team in ECS Directorate</td>
<td>Improve the coherence of financial advice and standards in the service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finance Advice for Y&amp;C Service</td>
<td>Establish Finance Post on the model used for Adult Education Service for Youth &amp; Community Service</td>
<td>Improve the accessibility of professional financial advice to the service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Budget Monitoring Process</td>
<td>Enhance the linkage between financial and service outcomes within the Directorate</td>
<td>Improvements to Budget Monitoring process as part of DFM arrangements to emphasise service accountability Amendments to budget allocations to more closely match service management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Actions specific to the Youth &amp; Community Service</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incomplete staffing, property and income records</td>
<td>Establish accurate information systems for Staffing, Property and Income as basis for budget management in the service</td>
<td>Improve the management information systems within the service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scale of Premises Usage</td>
<td>Review premises used by service to reduce costs through more effective use of premises</td>
<td>Improve efficiency by rationalising premises</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Review processes for External Funding to include both approval and Exit Strategies</td>
<td>Establish improved authorisation and assessment processes in the service</td>
<td>To reduce risks of budget difficulties arising from fall out of external funding streams</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use of non-standard systems in the service</td>
<td>Undertake review of use of FMS6 and recommend how needs can be met through corporate systems</td>
<td>Improve financial control regime by simplifying system usage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of alignment between service and budget responsibilities</td>
<td>Ensure alignment of responsibilities for budget and service management</td>
<td>Ensure full accountability at all levels of the service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Issue</td>
<td>Action</td>
<td>Purpose</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improved processes for budgetary control and enhanced accountability</td>
<td>Improve control framework (see above) and provide guidance and training to all managers and senior managers to remind them of responsibilities and provide appropriate knowledge / skill training where required</td>
<td>To secure sustainable improvements in financial management of the service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Requirement for standardised reporting to Managers, Senior Managers and Directorate EMT</td>
<td>Establish timetable and prescribed reporting format</td>
<td>To ensure management are aware of financial issues in the service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Projected overspend in 2003/04</td>
<td>Control expenditure in the service in the 2003/04 financial year through the work of the Y&amp;C Steering Group</td>
<td>To reduce the projected overspend in the service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Projected overspend in 2004/05</td>
<td>Reduce ongoing commitments, and identify lower priority areas for service reductions</td>
<td>To reduce service costs whilst protecting frontline and high priority services</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the longer term the Steering Group is of the view that there will be significant opportunities to introduce new ways of working into the service as part of the Children's Services developments following the Every Child Matters Green Paper. These include the opportunities presented by the locality focus of the County Council's proposed response to that legislation, and the scope for closer linkages with the Connexions Service in Lancashire.
Cabinet - 2 July 2004
Report of the Director of Education and Cultural Services

Part I - Item No. 5 (a)

Electoral Division affected: All

The Annual Review of the Lancashire Education Development Plan for 2003/04 and School Improvement Programme for 2004/05
(Appendix ‘A’ refers) – Appendix ‘A’ is unavailable electronically please contact
Glenn Johnson on 533556

Contact for further information:
Dr A G Dunn, (01772) 531663, Education and Cultural Services

Executive Summary

This is deemed a Key Decision and is included in the Forward Plan.

The DfES requires all LEAs to evaluate the impact of the plan over the previous year, and produce a new School Improvement Programme for the coming year, and submit it by 16 July 2003. Lancashire’s Education Development Plan and its implementation have been found to be good in the recent Ofsted inspection of the LEA.

The document at Appendix ‘A’ is a draft of the information required by the DfES. It demonstrates that, overall, EDP2 is having a very positive impact on raising standards in Lancashire and in improving educational provision for all pupils. The plan has yet to be submitted to the Plain Language Commission for accreditation for the Clear English Standard. This is likely to result in some minor modifications to its written style.

Recommendation

The Cabinet is asked to:
(a) Endorse the report, and
(b) Recommend its approval by the Full Council on 15th July 2004.

Background

All national and local priorities remain the same for the third year of implementation of the current EDP and these are:
The DfES requires an evaluation of progress with the plan for 2003/04 including the following detail:

1. Comparison between the LEA targets for 2003 and the actual results achieved
2. Analysis of significant differences in the progress made by different groups of schools and strategies for improvement
3. Analysis of gaps between LEA targets and aggregate targets
4. Local Public Service Agreement 'stretched targets'
5. Evaluation of the effectiveness of the activities carried out in the EDP
6. Any changes made to emphasis within the School Improvement Programme priorities and Annex 2 for 2003-2004
7. Evaluation of success of activities in supporting the following:
   (a) pupils with SEN
   (b) attainment of pupils educated other than at school (EOTAS) including those children unable to attend school because of medical needs
   (c) under-performing Looked After Children
   (d) under-performing ethnic minority groups
   (e) early years provision
   (f) schools facing challenging circumstances including under-performing schools.
8. A summary of cost-effectiveness of LEA activities under the EDP2
9. Annexes
   - Annex 2 – List of activities within each priority for the coming year in accordance with EDP guidance for Annex 2
   - Annex 3 – Resource estimates for each priority for financial year 2003-2004

The required document has been written around these headings.
Consultations

Consultation has taken place with the Education Overview and Scrutiny Sub-Committee. The timetable for the production of the EDP update and for approval through the County Council’s decision making process meant that it was not possible for the Lancashire School Effectiveness Service to provide a completed advance copy of the updated Plan to the Education Overview and Scrutiny Sub-Committee. However, an Overview & Scrutiny Task Group will meet to review the Plan on the 21 June and any views will be verbally reported to the Cabinet Member for Education when he considers the report on the 22nd June.

For our school improvement programme to be fully supported and successfully implemented, we recognise the importance of involving a range of partners in both the preparation of the Education Development Plan and in the consultation process. Wherever possible, we use existing structures and procedures during preparation and consultation including:

- **The Partnership Development Group (PDG)**
  
  PDG is made up of community, diocesan, trade union and governor representatives, headteachers of nursery, primary, secondary and special schools, and advisers and officers from the Education and Cultural Services Directorate.

- **The role of the priority steward and critical friend**
  
  The role of the priority steward is to produce an evaluation report each term for the Service Strategic Management Team. The priority steward with their critical friend verbally reports on progress in their priority area at PDG meetings. In the main each priority steward has two critical friends. Critical friends are headteachers, governors and diocesan/faith group representatives.

- **The EDP Thematic Management Group**
  
  The Group is made up of the senior management team of the School Effectiveness Service, senior advisers and officer colleagues who have responsibility for the main areas of priority, themes and processes contributing to EDP 2002/07.

- **External evaluation where necessary**

- **Consultation with schools**
  
  To ensure that LEA planning remains relevant to schools, a school portal consultation was undertaken between mid February and early March. The feedback we received from schools was used to inform the final plans.

Some reworking of the plans has taken place to address new aspects of national policy or local developments:
In Priority 2 an additional area of focus area has been added to address the behaviour and attendance strand of the KS3 national strategy that became effective from September 2003. The new focus is entitled ‘Behaviour and attendance: removing barriers to attainment.’

In Priority 6 two areas of focus have been merged. This is in response to the recently issued White Paper and DfES guidance about raising standards and achievement in schools through the encouragement, identification and dissemination of good practice. The merged focus is entitled ‘Enable schools to identify, share and model good practice through networked learning and external validation.’

This report is being presented to the Cabinet Member for Education on 22 June 2004. Any resulting amendments will be notified to the Cabinet.

Advice

This update will be the last in its present format before the introduction of the Single Education Plan (SEP) from April 2005. At present the DfES requires LEAs to produce 13 plans, which has led to duplication and over-prescription for authorities. The SEP will replace the EDP and 12 other plans that LEAs are required to complete.

Alternative options to be considered

Nil

Implications: e.g. Financial, Legal, Personnel, Human Rights, Crime and Disorder or Other

This item has the following implications, as indicated:

Nil (The resource estimates are fully covered by existing budgets)

Local Government (Access to Information) Act 1985

List of Background Papers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Paper</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Contact/Directorate/Ext</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3. PDG papers – Priority Steward Evaluation Reports to SSMT and PDG</td>
<td>Spring 2004</td>
<td>Carol Beardsworth, Education and Cultural Services Ext 32428</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Local Transport Plan Annual Progress Report 2004
(Appendix ‘A’ refers)

Contact for further information: Stuart Wrigley 01772 534660
Directorate: Environment

Executive Summary

The County Council is required to submit an Annual Progress Report on its Local Transport Plan (LTP) at the end of July each year. The draft report is set out at Appendix ‘A’.

The report is largely a description of the progress made during the past year. It also includes a financial statement on the 2003/04 capital programme for transport and a report on progress towards the performance indicators included in the Local Transport Plan. The complete Government guidance on the content of 2004 LTPs was not received until the 7th June 2004. Given the tight timescale for its preparation, the attached document is still a draft. It will be developed further prior to submission to the Full Council.

This is deemed a Key Decision and is included in the Forward Plan.

Recommendation

The Cabinet is asked to recommend the Full Council to approve the draft Local Transport Plan Annual Progress Report as set out at Appendix ‘A’, and to authorise the Cabinet Member for Highways and Transportation to approve any necessary additions or changes to the report prior to consideration of the final version by the Full Council on the 15th July 2004. Members will receive the final version of the report under separate cover.

Background

Lancashire’s LTP allocation for 2003/04 was £25.388 million. Additional resources were added to set a programme of £28.660 million for the year. During the year additional resources were secured to increase the transport programme and total expenditure for the year was £30.246 million. Funding was from the following sources.

- County Council Capital Resources £25.412 million
- Supplementary Credit Approvals £ 2.424 million
Grants £ 0.747 million
Other Contributions £ 1.663 million

Performance indicators are included in the formats recommended by the Department for Transport and a high proportion are on track to meet the targets set.

Consultations

All Lancashire District Councils have been invited to contribute to the Annual Progress Report and a detailed consultation exercise of stakeholders has been undertaken.

Advice - As per the recommendation

Alternative options to be considered N/A

Implications: e.g. Financial, Legal, Personnel, Human Rights, Crime and Disorder or Other

The financial implications are included in the body of the Annual Progress Report. Future implications will be reported as work on developing priorities progresses.

Local Government (Access to Information) Act 1985

List of Background Papers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Paper</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Contact/Directorate/Ext</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Local Transport Plan 2001/02 to 2005/06</td>
<td>July 2000</td>
<td>Ray Worthington 33718</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guidance on the 4th LTP Annual Progress Reports</td>
<td>March 2004</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How to Monitor Indicators in Local Transport Plans and Annual Progress Reports – 2002 Update</td>
<td>25 April 2002</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APR Good Practice Guide</td>
<td>June 2002</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APR Monitoring Update</td>
<td>27 March 2003</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Appendix A
Lancashire
Local Transport Plan

Annual Progress Report 2004
Foreword by CC Jean Yates

Last year’s Annual Report showed that we were making a great deal of progress in our aim to ensure that Lancashire residents were able to “Travel easily & safely”. The new Chorley bus/rail Interchange was opened and Beacon Status had been won, and many new innovative public transport schemes had been brought to fruition. Follow that? We have! 2004 sees Lancashire shortlisted for National Transport Authority of the Year, and shortlisted in four other categories.

The introduction of the Real Time Information Systems and the completion of the Urban Traffic Management System have been widely welcomed by passengers and has encouraged residents who have been doubtful of the efficiency of Public Transport to give it a try.

To further encourage passengers we have extended the Quality Bus Routes and encouraged operators in the use of low floor buses.

The marketing and promotion of the XI Service has been selected as an example of Good Practice. This together with our Wheels for Learning Scheme for Runshaw College Students, Mobility Services at Capitol Way and the Wyldefyre Service which links to healthcare are some of the examples of Good Practice Schemes which have been done to make sure that residents of all ages are able to benefit from new ways of providing services.

Having won “Beacon Status for support the Rural Economy” we have had a programme of events during the year to demonstrate our work in the rural transport. The Association of Community Railways held their Annual Conference in Carnforth and Kim Howells the Transport Minister who visited Carnforth was very impressed with the Carnforth Connect Service. Bowland Transit and Ribble Valley rail go from strength to strength. With RVR celebrating their 10th Anniversary this year.

The Lancashire Speed Awareness course for drivers is to be the model for the National Course. Those who were initially critical, both media representative and those taking the course have been extremely impressed and told us that the course has benefited them substantially.

What next? Can we do even better? We believe that we can. Our success with the new Bus/Rail Interchanges in Burnley and Chorley will be carried forward when we build new bus stations and Interchanges in Nelson, Rawtenstall, Ormskirk & Accrington. There is a new programme of Quality Bus Routes, and we intend to continue to develop walking & cycling across the County.

Preston City will be joining with the County Council to build a new bus station. We have won money from Europe to develop sustainable transport, and from the Government for the new Orbit Route. So there will be a great deal of exciting work done in the City during the next two years.

We intend to extend our Intelligent Transport Systems into Burnley & Lancaster, and look forward to further successes in the Urban & Rural Bus Challenge.

There is a great deal of work to be done if we are to maintain the high standards we have set, but we believe that Lancashire residents want and deserve the best in transport and support our aim of allowing everyone to “travel easily & safely”.

Executive Summary

2003/04, the third year of Lancashire’s Local Transport Plan, has been another successful year for the delivery of schemes that help to meet the LTP objectives.
Our year as a Beacon Council has been celebrated with further improvements in rural areas. The first Quiet Lanes and Greenways have been completed around Chipping and Slaidburn and the Red Rose Runner has provided easier access from remote villages to health care at Chorley Hospital.

In Preston, we have made further progress towards the vision of a Total Transport Network. We have completed a three-year scheme for Urban Traffic Management and Control. The final phase of the national pilot UTMC 29A has introduced Intelligent Transport Systems to control the traffic signal network and to provide links with internal and external systems. The Real Time Information System provides valuable information for bus passengers and operators.

As usual, the County Council has carried out annual programmes to improve safety and promote sustainable travel. We have introduced new schemes to improve access to essential services – employment, health care and education – in both urban and rural settings. Wherever possible, they have also provided links to the railway network.

The LTP allocation of £25.388 million was supplemented by almost £5 million of grants and contributions from the private sector and other authorities to deliver a transport programme of £30.246 million. The programme was increased within the year as new resources were identified to deliver an out-turn 6% above programme level.

This expanded programme has enabled increased provision of schemes to provide safe and attractive places to cycle and walk. There has also been increased investment in the maintenance of highways and bridges in an effort to halt deterioration of the network. The performance indicator for non-principal roads is showing improvement in condition. However, at current levels of allocation for highway maintenance and considering the urgent need to invest in the improvement of footways, we cannot forecast improvements in the structural condition of our roads for future years.

Performance against the DfT core indicators has been generally good with improvements in satisfaction with local bus services. Road safety indicators remain on target. Cycling numbers do not show the desired increase although in areas where good quality networks have been introduced there are signs of increased cycling. Investment has been increased for 2004/05 to try to address this.

Traffic growth on local roads measured on inter urban screenlines is on target for below 5% over the plan period. Motorways and Trunk Roads show traffic increasing at a faster rate. Traffic growth on the town centre cordons is well within the target levels with reduced flows in some major town and city centres.

On major schemes the County Council has continued to work towards a planning application for the Heysham to M6 Link and has commenced work to develop proposals for a bypass of Ormskirk.

The Government’s response to the major scheme bid to bring the Blackpool to Fleetwood tramway up to modern standards is still awaited. Development of a scheme to improve public transport access to Preston has commenced in parallel with proposals for a major redevelopment of part of the City.

For 2004/05 the County Council welcomes the increase in allocation from the Government to £29.209 million. The County Council has added additional resources
to give a programme of 29.857 million. Further contributions and grants will be sought to increase this programme further and to deliver more schemes that help the people of Lancashire to travel easily and safely.

Chapter 1 Policy Context

The Local Transport Plan is carried out within the context of National, Regional and County policies. Schemes will take into account the following:

Social Inclusion
Making the Connections, the Final Report on Transport and Social Exclusion by the Social Exclusion Unit, sets out a strategy to ensure that people can reach opportunities such as work, education and health treatment. The interim report made the links between transport, service location and social exclusion. It also showed the costs of poor access, including missed health appointments or limited job opportunities.

Elevate
Elevate is a major Government project to revitalise areas of East Lancashire. In a fifteen-year programme, Elevate will work with Local Authority partners to renew housing and to clear land for new uses. Elevate’s programme will be an important influence throughout the period of the next Local Transport Plan.

North West Regional Freight Strategy
This has been prepared for the Northwest Development Agency by the North West Freight Advisory Group. It sets out a Vision for the North West of an integrated, efficient and sustainable freight transport system.

M6 Route Management Strategy
The Highways Agency has completed its Route Management Strategy for the M6 from Warrington to the Scottish Border. The route is the main north-south corridor through North West England. The strategy sets out motorway and junction improvements to be carried out over the next ten years.

De-Trunking
The transfer of routine maintenance funds for former Trunk Roads will begin in 2004, leaving only two lengths of Trunk Road in Lancashire outside the Motorway network, the A56 between Bury and M65 Junction 8 and A585 from M55 Junction 3 to Fleetwood. Responsibility for most lengths will be transferred in June, with the transfer of the A570 between St Helens and Sefton and the A59 between Sefton and Preston in December. The transfer of the A65 between Cumbria and North Yorkshire will follow in 2005.

Fylde Coast Sub-Regional Transport Study
The transport problems of the Fylde Coast are recognised by the Highways Agency, the North West Regional Assembly and the four Local Authorities; Lancashire County Council, Blackpool Borough Unitary Authority and Fylde and Wyre District Councils. The study is welcomed by them all to offer solutions to the problems of increasing traffic volumes and meeting the future demands for capacity and access. On behalf of the partnership of the six bodies, the County Council has appointed the Faber Maunsell consultancy to carry out the study and report back to the partners by the end of 2004.

Rural Proofing
To ensure that schemes are successful in providing services where they are required, schemes are checked against the guidelines of the Countryside Agency.

Consultation
Consultation plays an important role in the development of the Local Transport Plan. A day-long seminar ‘Destination 2010’ launched the consultation for the second Local Transport Plan. Experts from different fields exchanged views with an audience of two hundred guests
representing a broad range of transport interests. A public consultation exercise is now under way. Consultation on the Annual Progress Report was repeated in 2003/04 with people representing a variety of transport users and operators.

Consultation takes place on a wide variety of programmes. The County Council works closely with District Councils through working groups and agency agreements. Through the Parish Partnerships scheme, Parish Councils can draw up business plans to address local highway and transport issues. The County Council consults with transport operators and user groups including businesses and schools.

Consultation also takes place on individual schemes before they are carried out. Local residents and businesses are consulted on all Local Safety Schemes and Quality Bus routes, while cycling representatives are consulted on all cycling schemes. Regular surveys ensure that Quality Bus services and bus stations are maintained to a high standard.

Chapter 2 Delivery of Schemes

2.1 Table showing a comparison of schemes predicted v schemes completed

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scheme Type</th>
<th>Predicted</th>
<th>Actual</th>
<th>+/- Divergence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bus priority schemes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New public transport interchanges</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improved public transport interchanges</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Park and ride schemes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New or improved bus stops</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other bus infrastructure schemes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New cycle tracks</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New cycle Paths</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other cycling schemes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedestrianisation schemes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other walking schemes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School travel plans</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other travel plans</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safe routes to school</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other local safety schemes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New or improved road crossings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home Zones</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quiet Lanes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 mph zones</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other traffic management schemes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New rural bypass</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New relief road or ring road</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Road dualling and widening schemes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Junction improvements</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strengthening bridges to carry 40 tonne vehicular loading</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>+205%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other bridge maintenance schemes</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>+25%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2.2 Major schemes

Heysham to M6 Link
This is the County Council’s first priority major scheme. Investigations have been carried out on the western and the northern routes. The Cultural and Built Heritage assessment has been completed. The field work for the environmental assessment has been completed and a report and non-technical summary are awaited from the outside consultant. The model of traffic movements in the Lancaster area has been substantially updated and will be used to predict the effects of opening a Link Road.

Ormskirk Bypass
This is the County Council’s second priority major scheme. Work has commenced on the environmental assessment and traffic data collection and modelling necessary for a Planning Application. It is anticipated that that a bid will be made for funds to deliver the scheme within the period of the next Local Transport Plan.

Blackpool-Fleetwood Tramway
The County Council is very disappointed that the Government still has not responded to the joint major scheme bid with Blackpool Borough Council for the full modernisation of the Tramway. During the winter of 2003/4 the tramway was again temporarily closed north of Cleveleys to allow for urgent repair work. The tramway re-opened at Easter 2004. The County Council contributed £0.8 million towards the cost of the repairs, which were undertaken to modern LRT standards.

Preston City Centre Access
The proposed major scheme bid for improving access to Preston City Centre, particularly by public transport, was due to is submitted in July 2004. Whilst considerable progress was made in 2003/4 in developing the project, there are still uncertainties surrounding the extensive re-development of the Tithe barn area by the private sector. Aspects of the project will not be developed in sufficient detail to allow a bid to be made this year and it is now intended to submit the bid in July 2005.

2.3 Scheme funded through development

Broughton Bypass
This scheme will be funded by private development. Planning permission has been granted for the scheme. When details of the proposed development have been clarified, the County Council will proceed with the Compulsory Purchase Order.

2.4 Other Schemes Delivered (Supplementary Information)
Road Scheme
Gillibrand Link Road
The link road was opened in September 2003 with funding from private development. It provides a link around the west side of Chorley, removing the need for traffic to enter the town centre. It gives better access to the M61 and demonstrates the integration of land use and planning.

Public Transport
Quality Bus
In 2003/04, work was completed on routes 22 and 23 from Preston to Royal Preston Hospital and ASDA supermarket. The design work on Chorley-Wigan and Accrington-Bacup routes has been completed and construction will begin in Summer 2004.

Design work continues on the Preston Bus Station to Gambol Lane route with construction programmed for 2005. There is a programme of design work for 2004/05 and 2005/06.

Bus Stations
The new bus stations in Burnley and Chorley Interchange have been successfully introduced into service and have achieved high levels of satisfaction from the users in their first year.

In the current LTP period, plans are being developed for a bus/rail interchange at Nelson and a bus station in Rawtenstall. The programme for the next LTP period will include bus/rail interchanges at Ormskirk and Accrington.

Rail Improvements
Improvements to Chorley railway station will complete the work for a full bus/rail interchange. Funded through a Rail Passenger Partnership, these will provide a refurbished booking hall and waiting areas with new signs, electronic displays and CCTV. Improvements will meet the requirements of the Disability Discrimination Act and will be completed in June 2004. The works will benefit passengers changing from bus to rail transport, particularly the large number of commuters who travel to Preston and Manchester.

Work is in progress at Church & Oswaldtwistle station to improve security and waiting facilities. Improvements include new signs, CCTV and the prototype ecoshelter, and will be a model for improvements to other unstaffed stations in East Lancashire. Greater community involvement will be encouraged to increase the use of the station and deter vandalism.

Through the West Lancashire Community Rail Partnership, work is now in progress at Parbold station on the Manchester-Wigan-Southport line to renovate the station building and provide a more attractive and safer environment for commuters and other passengers. The Partnership has also drawn up plans for a new rural interchange at Burscough Bridge station on the Preston-Ormskirk line.

Improvements are also planned for Ormskirk station. Under the MFAS programme, the Strategic Rail Authority will fund improvements at Aughton Park and Town Green stations on the Ormskirk-Liverpool line. In May 2004 the tenth anniversary of the restoration of passenger services to Clitheroe was marked by service improvements to weekday and Sunday services, together with additional Sunday services to Colne.

Marketing and Ticketing
Rural services are being improved and promoted under local brands to increase accessibility. In January 2003 the Fleetwood-Lancaster services via Knott End were branded the Wyre Villager. In 2003/04 the marketing has been refined and used as a model for other areas.
the Lune Valley were branded the Lune Villager and new buses were introduced in livery. The services will be integrated with the Carnforth Connect Line 2 and will be relaunched in September when the Carnforth Connect timetable is changed to match the winter railway timetable. In May 2004 the rural services between Preston and Blackpool were branded Fylde Villager. New Optare Solo vehicles in livery were introduced with publicity and new timetables and operating an additional route.

In January 2004, we launched a ten-week Integrating Transport campaign in Lancaster and Morecambe, an area subject to congestion on working days and weekends too. The aim of the campaign was to increase awareness of sustainable transport choices in the area and to get the TravelWise message into as many homes and businesses as possible. Each week of the campaign had a key theme and highlighted a different aspect of sustainable travel, with an appropriate item on the front page of the local paper. Businesses were invited to take part in the Corporate Challenge.

**Box DfT article on X1 promotion plus latest passenger figures**

**NoWCard Smartcard**

This five-year project in partnership with Cumbria County Council, the unitary authorities of Blackburn with Darwen and Blackpool and 20 District Councils started in 2002/03. The project is on target and in 2003/04 issued 87,000 smart cards to concessionary pass holders. It equipped 6 operators with electronic ticket machines and smart card readers and gave grants to eight major operators. It is developing the back office services, including a secure communication link with the main contractor that will be a model for other authorities.

**Demand Responsive Services**

Special services have been developed to meet the needs of people living in rural areas of Lancashire. With the help of the Rural Transport Partnerships, the Countryside Agency and the East Lancashire Partnership, the County Council operates two rural bus/rail interchanges at Clitheroe and Carnforth Connect. Plans have been prepared for a third at Burscough Bridge. Four demand responsive services provide access to essential services and connections with train services; Ribble Valley Rider, Garstang Super 8, Carnforth Connect and the latest, Bowland Transit.

The growing network supports the economy of the rural areas and their market towns and increasing passenger numbers show that they are meeting a community need. Bowland Transit began operation in April 2003 with four buses, running a regular service through the Bowland Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty from Clitheroe Interchange to Settle station. The project maintains close contact with the local community and issues a newsletter every two months. In October 2003 an additional bus was introduced on the Garstang Super 8 to improve access to and from work and education. It connects with inter-urban buses in Garstang and with trains in Poulton. The Rural Bus Challenge in 2003 awarded funding for a further service, the Pendle Wayfarer.

**Dial-a-Ride Services**

Lancashire supports eight dial-a-ride services, run by community transport operators, which cover most populated parts of the county. Two pilot schemes were introduced to extend evening and Saturday services in central Lancashire and the Fylde coast, particularly for the benefit of younger age groups. The schemes have been successful, carrying 3,435 passengers, and will be continued for a further year. Dial-a-ride schemes carried a total of 186,564 passengers, an increase of 6.5% over the previous year.

With funding awarded through the Urban Bus Challenge, we applied our experience of dial-a-ride services to produce Skelmersdale Roundabout, an urban service linking residential areas
with out-lying employment areas, both poorly served by public transport. Launched in August 2003, it has proved an immediate success. Urban Bus Challenge 2003 has awarded funding for two more services, Preston Orbit and BEST Burnley Employment Shuttle Transport.

Dial-a-ride services are supplemented by car journeys offered by volunteer drivers through 15 County Car schemes. The new Communicars scheme was launched in September 2003 and has proved a great success, carrying 3,468 passengers in the financial year. It also acts as a central office for Burnley, Pendle, Bacup and Stacksteads. Last year, community car schemes carried a total of 27,600 passengers, an increase of 5% over the previous year.

Transport to Healthcare
Three dial-a-ride services have been established in partnership with the Countryside Agency to improve access from rural areas to health care. They are intended for people without access to a car and who cannot use conventional bus services. Transport to Health continues to operate in West Lancashire. Wyldefyre serves health centres in Great Eccleston and Over Wyre. In 2003 Lancashire County Council funded a second vehicle, with Wyre Primary Care Trust and the Countryside Agency providing revenue funding, for an extended service to destinations for shopping and social visits, including Preesall Day Centre. With a third vehicle, a new service to Blackpool Victoria Hospital began in April 2004 under a service level agreement with Lancashire Ambulance Service NHS Trust. The third service, Red Rose Runner to Chorley Hospital, was launched in September 2003.

Lancashire is a member of Optimum 2, a pan-European project with partners from Holland, UK and Belgium, using sustainable transport to tackle the accessibility and mobility problems caused by congestion in major areas. Over the next four years, the County Council in co-operation with Lancashire Teaching Hospitals NHS Trust will review the travel method of patients to Preston and Chorley hospitals and offer the patients a choice other than the motorcar.

Box: DfT article on Wyldefyre plus photo

The County Council has made further efforts to improve access to health care. Rural Bus Grant is also used to fund conventional bus services to hospitals, including the 44/45 from Longridge to Royal Preston Hospital and the 107/108 from Walmer Bridge to Chorley Hospital, now extended to Chorley Interchange and railway station. To improve access to Chorley Hospital and Southport and Ormskirk Hospitals, travel information has been published in two new brochures. Frequent access to Preston Royal Hospital is provided by Quality Bus services on two corridors. Service 22/23 stops outside the hospital entrance while Service 19 runs through the grounds.

Transport to Education
The Wheels to Learning scheme has been introduced to Runshaw College, Leyland by the South Lancashire Rural Transport Partnership. It provides practical ways of travelling to the college so that transport problems are not a barrier to learning. Solutions include moped and cycle hire, dial-a-ride bus service, variation of college bus routes and a shared taxi service.

There has been steady growth in the numbers using the scheme. The most innovative element of the scheme, the moped hire has caught the imagination of students and has been a great success. Students are charged £5 per week for the use of the moped and are provided with the safety clothing and helmets. Additional funding is being sought to increase the fleet of mopeds.
Other schemes also contribute to improved access to education. Lancashire has a large school bus operation. The Safer Travel Unit monitors behaviour on school buses and other services. Quality Bus routes serve the university campuses in Preston and Lancaster. They also serve the colleges in Lancaster, Preston and Colne. Carnforth Connect and Garstang Super 8 Plus offer pupils safe transport home from after-school activities. School Travel Plans and Safer Routes to School promote sustainable transport and also give pupils the opportunity to take exercise on their way to school.

Box: DfT article plus photo

Safer Travel Unit
The Safer Travel Unit was established in 2002 to address problems of antisocial behaviour, including bullying and vandalism, on public transport. It now plays a leading role in dealing with problems on public transport services and infrastructure. In partnerships with schools, the unit delivers an educational programme to Key Stage 3 pupils across the county. The unit is working with students at Accrington & Rossendale and Preston Colleges to produce an educational video to show to schools.

The unit has set up a hotline, with a text service aimed at pupils, to report bad behaviour. The unit has also established a protocol for reporting incidents on home to school transport. This has encouraged operators to report incidents and the number of incidents reported has grown, reaching a maximum in January 2004. Since then there has been a steady monthly decline, which is attributed to the educational programme and interventions made at schools. The Passenger Transport Executive Group (PTEG) Security Group has recommended that the protocol should be adopted nationally.

A three-year experiment started in 2002/03 to determine whether CCTV reduces incidents of anti-social behaviour on school bus services. Eight portable digital CCTV systems were fitted on vehicles, with an immediate reduction in reported incidents. Ten more systems were purchased in 2003/04. The unit monitors the systems and downloads images to be used as evidence when investigating incidents or as part of the educational programme.

The unit has pioneered Acceptable Behaviour Contracts for school transport, now adopted by other authorities. It is working with partners and operators to develop a Driver Training Programme to address problems of conflict resolution on home to school journeys.

Working relationships have been built with other groups. The unit is the first representative of a shire county to be invited to sit on the PTEG Security Group. It is helping to build the North West Travelsafe Partnership where local authorities will be able to discuss travel problems. With Greater Manchester PTE, it is compiling a regional database of incidents to help develop strategies to address antisocial behaviour.

The Safer Travel Unit is widely recognised as an example of best practice. It has been invited to address road safety and antisocial behaviour seminars hosted by the pressure group BUSK. Authorities including Gloucestershire and Monmouthshire County Councils have turned to it for advice on dealing with antisocial behaviour.

Taking Services to the Client

Mobile libraries
Lancashire maintains a network of 80 libraries across the county. Twelve mobile libraries plus three trailer libraries visit remoter areas. In April 2003 a second Library Link vehicle was introduced to call at 36 nursing homes and sheltered accommodation units in North Lancashire. A third Library Link was introduced in November to serve another 85 addresses. Residents with limited mobility are able to use the bus's hydraulic lift to access books, CDs and videos.
Lancashire’s Xrefer-plus system makes up-to-date reference material available over the
Internet to homes and offices countywide. It is also available in local libraries that are too
small to stock a full range of reference books.

Online information
MARIO - Maps & Related Information Online - is an interactive map, which gives internet
access to information held by the Council at any location in Lancashire. The map layers are
split into six categories; countryside, education, road safety and highways plus historic maps
and aerial photos.

Shared contact centre
Under its strategy for E-government, the County Council has developed plans for improving
customer/public access to the council through a network of contact centres to be shared with
District Councils. They will give customers increased convenience and easier access to a
wider range of council information through streamlined telephone numbers.

The Highways Partnership has established a single telephone number for its enquiries with a
large percentage being successfully resolved at this first point of contact as a result of the use
of new technology and processes. Other services such as Concessionary Travel have also
streamlined customer access via a single telephone number for all customer enquiries.

Sustainable Transport Systems

Total Transport Network
Lancashire is working towards its vision of a Total Transport Network for the Preston area.
The County Council has carried out a three year project UTMC 29A to install high technology
for Urban Transport Management and Control in Preston.
2001/02
Car park management system and signs to direct cars and reduce congestion
Area access control system to maintain access to the railway station
2002/03
Variable message signs on main routes to display traffic information and alternative routes in
emergencies
Journey time measurement to measure congestion
2003/04
UTMC SCOOT to control traffic signals more efficiently
Common Data Base to provide internal and external links

The County Council has supported the Quality Bus routes and Park & Ride operations in
Preston through the introduction of the Real Time Information System. The Preston Bus fleet
of 124 vehicles has been fitted with a Global Positioning System and real time information is
displayed at 75 bus stops. The information is also available to Preston Bus over the Busnet
and to the general public on the MARIO website.

Voice communication to the whole fleet has also been provided including a CAD computer
system to identify callers visually. Any emergency situation is immediately brought to the bus
inspectors’ attention. Work is continuing at 25 traffic-signal controlled junctions to install bus
priority facilities and is scheduled to be completed in early July 2004.

In combination, the measures have reduced the number of car journeys into the City Centre.
UTMC SCOOT has proved responsive to changing traffic flows. In the areas where it has
been validated, traffic-signal cycle times have been shortened by as much as half,
considerably reducing the waiting time for pedestrians at signal-controlled crossings. Initial
measurements of journey times on a principal corridor show savings of 10% in the evening
peak, 4% in the morning peak and 2% interpeak, which benefit public transport in particular.
Project UTMC 29A has also been a national pilot scheme to integrate different systems through a Common Data Base. This too has been successfully achieved and the experience gained will be valuable in implementing schemes in Burnley and Lancaster as well as other towns across the country.

Parking Enforcement
The County Council has coordinated the Decriminalisation of Parking Enforcement across the county. The new parking management and control system is called ParkWise and the twelve District Councils were due to take over the enforcement and management of all parking regulations in July. However, to complete its own legislation related to the new traffic management bill, the Department for Transport has now set a new date in September 2004.

Walking
Improvements for pedestrians completed this year included three new zebra and puffin crossings. New pedestrian facilities were provided at three signal controlled junctions. Crossing facilities were upgraded for blind people leaving very few sites yet to be equipped in Lancashire.

Six footway improvements have been completed, including the third and final phase of the scheme at Brierfield. The quarry operator contributed to the construction of a new off-road footway on a road used by heavy quarry traffic at Nether Kellett. A joint foot/cycleway was constructed adjacent to the A59 to link Sawley with Chatburn. In Ormskirk, a footway build out and pedestrian refuge were funded jointly with funds for Safer Routes to School.

A two page spread on Cycling

Cycling
Lancashire’s innovative guidelines for designing routes for cyclists will be published in 2004. Details from this have already been included in the draft Notes on Good Practice issued by the National Cycling Strategy Board. The Vulnerable Road User Audit will ensure that the needs of cyclists, amongst others, are considered in new schemes and that conflict with other traffic is avoided. Training seminars have introduced design staff to both new documents.

Lancashire takes part in the regional benchmarking exercise and visits to other authorities have been made through the CTC benchmarking project. Best practice is shared with Districts through twice yearly meetings to discuss cycling issues. In 2003, the County Council jointly hosted the Local Authority Cycle Planning Group meeting in Lancaster and gave a guided tour of the local network that radiates from the Millennium Bridge.

Consultation is an essential element of Lancashire’s strategies and schemes. In 2002 a report prepared jointly with the Countryside Association indicated that there was a demand for off-road routes. Off-road routes in the Forest of Bowland are now proving popular. Following public consultation in Skelmersdale, a study in 2003 recommended a network of radial routes. Work on the northern routes began in Spring 2004. In 2004, Sustrans will carry out a survey of cyclists’ needs and attitudes for the County Council.

Lancashire has a County Cycle Liaison Group that meets three times a year and Cycle Forums have been established in four Districts. Local cycling groups are also consulted on all new highway proposals. In 2003/04, public consultations were carried out on two proposals, cycling on the seawall at Knott End and extending the Lune Valley Cycleway to Hornby.

Cycling is promoted in a variety of ways, including Bike to Work Week. Cycle flows into Preston over the Old Tramway Bridge were 25% greater than usual on the first day of Bike to Work Week in 2003. Pendle Bike Festival attracted 2,000 visitors in an area of low cycle use, while the Lancaster Bike Fest had a more specialised appeal. Lancashire Cycling News is published annually, together with a programme of summer rides. New routes are opened with a ceremony and a press release, supported by pamphlets and route maps. Six new brochures
were published in 2003. Supplements were also carried in local newspapers and Sustrans Network News carried a four page article on Lancashire schemes.

The County Council has a Travel Plan Officer and assistant. Cycling to work is encouraged in the Staff Travel Plan with publicity during Bike to Work Week. The Council also has a Bicycle Users Group. The proportion of journeys to work by cycle has risen from 3% in 1998/99 to 5% in 2003/04. The Council is working with Preston and Chorley Hospitals to promote cycling amongst their staff. At the hospital, secure cycle storage has been provided at convenient locations and changing facilities have been upgraded. A leaflet shows cycle routes to the hospital sites. The work will be taken forward within the European project Optimum 2. Bike to Work was promoted with Lancashire Wildlife Trust. Through BikeAid, financial assistance is offered to popular destinations – employment, schools, railway stations and health and leisure centres - to install cycle shelters and secure storage.

In 2003/04, the County Council spent £844,000 on its programme of cycling schemes, with additional funds from sources including the European Community, National Lottery and SRB. More than £1 million has now been secured from external sources. Twenty-five kilometres of new route were opened in 2003/04, including the Pennine Cycleway NCN Route 68 in Lancashire. This is both a leisure and a utility route, with a link to Lomeshaye Industrial Estate in Nelson. The route from Preston to St Annes completes another link in the National Cycle Network. In Ormskirk, the new railway station cycle path also serves the Primary School. Several lengths of canal towpath have been resurfaced. A Toucan Crossing has been constructed on the route to Broughton Business and Enterprise College, a High School to the north of Preston. It will also provide commuters to Preston City Centre with a safe alternative route to the M6 motorway junction. The Lancashire Cycleway, a challenging 260 mile tour of the county, was relaunched in Summer 2003 with new signs, a new guidebook and a website. The programme for 2004/05 will be worth £820,000. Work will continue on the National Cycle Network. In 2005 Sustrans will celebrate the completion of 10,000 miles of National Cycle Network with a ceremony in Preston, the central node of the network. New cycle lanes have been installed through Local Safety Schemes and maintenance work.

Cycle parking in town centres has increased from 540 to 611 stands. Lockers have been installed at the new transport interchanges and park and ride sites, and are being installed on railway stations. Buses on the demand-responsive rural services can carry cycles. Under the Supplementary Planning Guidance, cycling infrastructure is required for all new developments. Cyclepath networks have been included in the new developments at Buckshaw Village and Gillibrand in Chorley. Developments have funded cycle facilities at junctions and improvements to cyclepaths and towpaths and discussions are taking place with developers on a cycle route to Preston Station.

Cycling facilities continue to expand in Lancaster. In 2003 improvements were completed to the canal towpath between Lancaster and Carnforth. A new path across Ryelands Park links the canal to the Millennium Bridge, with new links over the river to the Marsh area and the railway station. This route offers a future link to Lancaster Royal Infirmary as well as an alternative to the one-way system in the city centre. An Employment Access Coordinator has been appointed in the Economic Development Zone, where cycle paths will link communities in need with places of employment. Funding has been received to extend the River Lune Millennium Park cycle tracks on both banks. The numbers of cyclists in Lancaster continue to grow. Surveys indicate that cycling has grown by 10% in 2003. If this is sustained, the use of cycles will treble by 2016. The successful Budgie Bikes cycle hire was funded by the DfT National Cycling Projects and the County Council. It serves both residents
and visitors with 230 cycles available from 17 pick-up points. Cyclepoint is based at Lancaster station and offers cycle hire, secure storage and a repair service.

School Travel Plans and Safer Routes to School are progressed by a new team of five travel advisers. All primary schools in Lancashire are offered the modular training course Passport to Cycling and research has been commissioned into a training module for secondary schools. Training is also available to inexperienced adult cyclists, including a morning on the cycletrack at the University Sports Centre in Preston followed by a gentle afternoon ride.

The 2001 Census suggested that cycling levels were falling on the coast where flows have traditionally been high. Where money has been invested in high quality cycling facilities, flows are stable and are actually rising in the hillier east of the county.

Box: The Best Canalside Bike Ride
Shun hectic 36-hour city breaks and enjoy the peacefulness of Lancashire instead – the new canalside track from Burnley to Barnoldswick is a joy for soft cyclists.

*From The Times Travel Magazine October/November 2003*

**Travel Plans**

The County Council continues to work with major employers, including hospitals, education centres and Local Government authorities, and employment areas.

The County Council is working with the Lancashire Teaching Hospitals to promote sustainable transport to hospitals in Preston and Chorley. Cycling has been encouraged by installing secure parking at convenient locations, pamphlets of cycling routes to the main sites and upgraded changing facilities. The work will be progressed through the European project Optimum 2.

With the Groundwork Trust, it is developing the Green Business Park initiative at three estates in Burnley, Hyndburn and South Ribble. Through BikeAid it provides funding for the installation of measures for cyclists at destinations such as workplaces, schools, railway stations and leisure and health centres. Measures include cycle shelters, secure storage and showers and changing facilities.

A Local Employers Forum has been established in Lancaster to discuss travel planning and transport problems, including staff travel, parking and deliveries. Local topics include patient travel to Lancaster Royal Infirmary and student travel to Lancaster University, St Martin’s College and the adult college at White Moss.

**School Travel Plans**

Lancashire’s School Travel Strategy aims to:

- Reduce the incidence and severity of injuries to school age children as pedestrians, cyclists and passengers
- Help parents and school staff choose walking, cycling and public transport with confidence
- Reduce traffic congestion and pollution around schools
- Improve the health, fitness, safety and well being of children, parents and staff through encouraging walking and cycling
- Make the environment around schools safer and more enjoyable for everyone
- Ensure sustainable transport issues are addressed in new or major school developments.

Schools are encouraged to prepare a School Travel Plan and Lancashire’s Guidelines for School Travel Plans have been distributed to over 300 schools. The School Travel Plan
Development Grant Scheme was introduced in the latter half of 2002 and offers Primary Schools up to £500 and High Schools up to £1,000 to help them produce their first Travel Plan. A theatre in education tour has been commissioned that stimulates thought and discussion on school travel related topics - "Car Story" was performed in front of 19 Lancashire schools during a two week tour in September and October 2003.

Schemes identified in conjunction with schools include:
- Footway alterations including a build-out, junction improvements and a marked route to Overton St Helens Primary School
- Area-wide scheme encompassing 4 local primary schools in Pendle including traffic calming measures, 20 mph zones, footway crossovers, buildouts and marked routes to school
- Toucan crossing on foot and cycle path to Broughton Business and Enterprise College
- Widen footway and infill redundant bus lay-by outside Stubbins Primary School to provide a safe area for the school crossing patrol
- Widen footways on approaches to Garstang High School
- Shelters and secure cycle parking facilities at five schools
- Various single site-specific initiatives included in School Travel Plans
- Financial assistance to help schools introduce specific initiatives in their Travel Plans including publicity materials and jackets for walking buses.

In September 2003 the Government launched a major new initiative to encourage more children to travel safely on foot, by bike or by bus. Through the Department for Education and Skills Capital Programme, capital grant is available to all maintained schools with an authorised School Travel Plan in place by 31st March 2004 to help them to support sustainable travel to school. All Travel Plans previously submitted to the Authority have been reviewed against the DfES minimum criteria. Following additional guidance issued to all schools a total of 41 schools in Lancashire now have an approved School Travel Plan. A number of these schools have already started to consider how they can best use the new funding that should be available by July 2004.

With the County Council’s assistance, the School Council at Wellfield High School has established four working groups to examine the issues of cycling, walking, public transport and pupils living in outlying areas. The County Council has engaged five new School Travel Advisers to support schools introducing initiatives that help to reduce car dependency and improve safety on the school journey.

Support for Over 16 Students
(to be added)

Quiet Lanes and Greenways
The first phase of the Quiet Lanes project has now been completed in two areas around Chipping and Slaidburn involving twenty Quiet Lanes. A pilot scheme in Downham has demonstrated the methods and techniques involved. Three Greenways in the Forest of Bowland have also been completed.

Public Rights of Way
The County Council, working in partnership with the Countryside Agency to deliver the Integrated Access Demonstration Project in the North West, produced an access audit and a demand study for Lancashire. These have provided the platform for making progress on producing a rights of way improvement plan for Lancashire. Framework, draft themes and action plans now exist. Consultants have been commissioned to complete the Improvement Plan by December 2004, including further refinement with the Lancashire Local Access Forum and full public consultation.
The Lancashire Local Access Forum was established in 2001 and has been fully involved in advising on the development of the improvement plan and the preparation for implementation of access to open countryside and registered common land. The Forum is a partnership between the three highway authorities of Lancashire, Blackpool and Blackburn with Darwen. The Rights of Way Improvement Plan will cover all three areas.

The Integrated Access Demonstration Project also supported innovative work through the Bowland Open Access Pilot Study and the development of Draft Guidance for Countryside Managers “Increasing access to the countryside for disabled people”.

Box; Bowland, the fells that time forgot.

From Country Walking July 2004

Road Safety Services
Lancashire provides a wide range of road safety services through road user education, training and publicity programmes. 33 road safety projects continue to be delivered, all of which contribute to the corporate objective of Travel Easily and Safely and to national and local casualty reduction targets.

Road User Education
To deliver road user education and training programmes in educational establishments across the County, a dedicated team of four advisers have continued to develop strong links with schools. During the year 235 business meetings took place with teaching staff to encourage schools to implement road safety programmes. Teaching staff have been supported by over 6,800 resource packages.

Lancashire’s own Right Start child pedestrian training programme has gone from strength to strength, training over 6,000 children in the year in 116 of our primary schools. This programme is being expanded as a result of additional funding for schools within areas of disadvantage. Senior Area Co-ordinators have been recruited to work closely with 75 target schools.

Theatre in education performances have been provided to 50 educational establishments across the County. The Road Safety Services guide has been developed for Community Beat Managers to maintain a consistent approach to road safety education. The group have also completed the risk assessment of all 360 school crossing patrol sites.

Road User Training
Lancashire provides a wide range of driving programmes. Powered two wheeler courses range from Back to Biking to Advanced Level. 706 drivers have benefited from Driver Improvement Courses and MIDAS courses are provided for minibus drivers. During the year over 14,000 drivers have taken the Lancashire Speed Awareness Course, which offers them an opportunity to improve their driving as an option to prosecution. Lancashire has been involved in establishing the Speed Awareness Course as a national model.

Managing Occupational Road Risk is still a challenging area of work and we are addressing this area with the continued promotion of our Drive It Forward initiative. The group are now Fleet Accredited, one of only 16 organisations nationally and have delivered fleet training to County Council drivers.

Mentoring of Learner Drivers is a new and innovative project, which will give learner drivers and their parents/guardians an increase in awareness, responsibility and driving skills affecting both parties.
Publicity
The second edition of ROADLIFE magazine celebrates the achievement and raises public awareness of the quality and quantity of road safety work carried out across Lancashire. Together We Can Make The Difference continues to be our very successful publicity and marketing strategy. In coordination with the DfT THINK! campaign, sponsorship deals with Burnley and Preston North End Football Clubs have promoted key road safety messages.

Lancashire Partnership for Road Safety
The partnership has completed its programme to install 320 safety camera sites. It continues with its campaigns to reduce drink driving and promote wearing of seat belts.

Freight
The joint study by Lancashire County Council and the Port of Heysham into the feasibility of reintroducing rail-freight services to the port has now been completed. A number of potential shippers have been identified through a thorough market research exercise and negotiations have taken place with Freight Train Operating Companies. Details are being completed for a trial train-load operation into the port.

Chapter 3 Progress towards Targets and Objectives

3.1 Table of Core Indicators (see attached)

3.2 Tables reporting progress 2003/04 (see attached)

3.3 Commentary on progress towards targets
(to be completed)

Good Progress has been made over the year in strengthening 30 substandard bridges and 531 m of substandard retaining walls. This included the three further joint schemes with Network Rail in order to improve access to rural communities in the Fylde and to assist in the regeneration of an urban area in Burnley. Progress on assessment of bridges has continued and preparatory work has been carried out for the assessment of retaining walls. However resources have been diverted from assessments in order to carry out urgent strengthening work on bridges because this provides greater benefit to the travelling public. Now that this work has been done it is planned to complete the assessment of bridges and to make a significant start with the assessment of retaining walls in 2004/05. Also it is intended as part of this work to commit significant resources to improve the information held in our Bridge Management System so that an asset Management Plan can be developed based on the framework developed by CSS/TAG. A further 2 bridges have been identified on the detrunked network which will need assessment because of the different definition of a bridge used by the HA and DfT. Very little work has been done on reducing the backlog of non-strengthening structural maintenance because of the lack of resources and the allocation for 2004/05 is such that
this will not change. Providing allocations are increased significantly in future years to make up the shortfall in recent years, then it should be possible for the Council to achieve its targets for Bridge Maintenance, Assessment and Strengthening. Bids for future years (i.e. 2006/07 onwards) have been based on this. The new inspection system developed by CSS is now being used and by 2005/06 it will be possible to calculate the average Bridge Condition Indicator for the whole stock. In the interim we shall continue to use the Lancashire Condition Indicator to monitor the condition of the stock and will convert this information to the new indicator by carrying out inspections using both systems in the next two years. This will enable us to have condition information from 1992. This currently shows that the continual decline in condition, which has continued since 1992 has finally been halted due to recent higher allocations.

The Best Value Inspection of Highways Maintenance, Street Lighting and Energy, Highways Structures and Reservoirs, resulted in a Service Improvement Plan the most significant element being that the County Council enter into a Partnership, Lancashire Highways Partnership (LHP), with all the District Councils of Lancashire. The aim of the LHP is to provide an improved service to the people of Lancashire by ensuring a more consistent, cost effective service with the benefits of improved coordination of the ‘street scene’ responsibilities. The LHP started on 1st July 2003. An integral part of the LHP is that all Highway Authority works below the value of £100,000 are now delivered through two Term Maintenance contracts, the first being a partnership of District Direct Services Organisations and Lancashire Engineering Services, the second with Cumbrian Industrials Limited. Two contracts have been let to ensure competition through the development of contractual Performance Management in line with national recommendations, as members of ‘The Highway Works Best Value Benchmarking Club’, allowing individual Partner and national comparison. In addition to the above a Performance regime is being developed for the Client management of the LHP in conjunction with the Members of both County and Districts who are represented on the Area Members Boards.

Third Party claims against the County Council for defects on the highway have been rising at a significant rate for the past five years and as a result the County developed a Highways Inspection System under the management of a Risk Manager. The inspection system, in conjunction with the above contracts, is enabling the county to develop a consistent approach to identification, recording and repair of safety defects allowing a robust S 58 defence to be mounted when required. The development of Daily Response teams to react to and repair both the substantial number of safety defects identified and those defects identified by customer contacts has led to a small decline in the number of claims, but it is too early yet to confirm this as the trend. The increase in the ability to defend claims will release resources and it has been indicated that these will be redirected to high priority areas of maintenance, further improving the safety of the network and reducing the likelihood of further claims generation.

The condition of the Moss Roads continues to cause great concern. The dry summers of the last two years have had the effect of accelerating the deterioration and whilst resources have been targeted from within both the revenue and the capital allocation to alleviate some of the problems there still exists an outstanding requirement for a further significant investment. These roads serve a highly productive agricultural area and failure to maintain these roads adequately will have a deleterious effect on economic activity. It is for this reason that the county has continued to allocate a disproportionate amount of resources to this area. The estimated outstanding workload to tackle the moss roads liability is £33M.
The Pavement Management System is being used to provide the objective assessment necessary to prioritise need and to aid development of programmes within the resources available. However, in order to ensure network safety, skid resistance has been prioritised prior to structural condition on the principal road network. This has had a positive effect, in terms of safety, with the percentage of the network above the intervention level rising from an initial 94.33% in 2001, 95.95% in 2002 to 97.16% in 2003, but at the cost of a deterioration of the residual life of the network as reflected in BV 96. BV 97a shows a trend of improvement in the network whilst BV97b shows a deterioration. The trends projections for these BVPI’s is indicated as a deterioration as with a similar resource allocation and possible changing priorities from carriageways towards footways there will be insufficient resources available to achieve an improvement in the network condition overall.

The figure for BV 187 included in the annex represents a complete survey of the relevant footway network. The results show that nearly half of this network should be considered for structural treatment and are such that a further investigation is being undertaken in order to rationalise, estimate and prioritise the network to enable a reasonable programme, at relative priorities to the carriageways, to be developed. There is therefore a need for further additional resources to be available for the repair of footways otherwise the good work of the Highways Safety System above will be negated.

The responsibility for a number of lengths of non-core Trunk roads transferred to the County Council on the 1st April 2004. The Highways Agency have indicated in their letter of the 15th March 2004 those schemes that had been identified for inclusion in their 2005/06 programme, based upon Value Management type information. It is the intention of the County, should the additional resources be available, to undertake those schemes in line with the Highways Agency programme as indicated in Annex____

The County Council are aware of the proposals for the development of Asset Management Plans for the Highway Authority function requiring the coordination and integration of Transport policies, taking into account their whole life costs and benefits. This will be a major initiative bringing together and using the various sets of data available to ensure that more informed decisions are made with respect to future policies and programmes. The costs of the development of Asset Management Plans will be significant and are yet to be identified.
Chapter 4 LTP Spending Programme

4.1 2003/04 Spending Programme

Lancashire’s LTP allocation for 2003/04 was £25.388 million. Additional resources were added to set a programme of £28.660 million for the year. During the year additional

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scheme Type</th>
<th>APR 2003 Budget £,000</th>
<th>Actual Spend £,000</th>
<th>% Actual/budget</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Quality Bus</td>
<td>1459</td>
<td>1435</td>
<td>98%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information Ticketing and Smartcards</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>605</td>
<td>101%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interchanges</td>
<td>1000</td>
<td>953</td>
<td>95%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rail</td>
<td>625</td>
<td>1197</td>
<td>192%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cycling</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>844</td>
<td>141%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedestrians</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>465</td>
<td>116%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>518</td>
<td>497</td>
<td>96%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking</td>
<td>1000</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schools</td>
<td>350</td>
<td>321</td>
<td>92%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Travel Plans</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freight Partnerships</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highways and Traffic Management</td>
<td>3016</td>
<td>4093</td>
<td>136%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Street Lighting</td>
<td>350</td>
<td>313</td>
<td>89%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Safety</td>
<td>1300</td>
<td>1044</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lancashire Road Safety Project</td>
<td>581</td>
<td>497</td>
<td>86%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 mph Zones and Home Zones</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>263</td>
<td>132%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Transport Network</td>
<td>1974</td>
<td>879</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintenance of Highways including land and blight</td>
<td>10463</td>
<td>12054</td>
<td>115%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bridge Maintenance</td>
<td>2874</td>
<td>3407</td>
<td>119%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Park and Ride Capitol Centre</td>
<td>1200</td>
<td>1108</td>
<td>92%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>28660</strong></td>
<td><strong>30246</strong></td>
<td><strong>106%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
resources were secured to increase the transport programme and total expenditure for the year was £30.246 million.

Funding was from the following sources.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>County Council Capital Resources</td>
<td>£25.412 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supplementary Credit Approvals</td>
<td>£2.424 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grants</td>
<td>£0.747 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Contributions</td>
<td>£1.663 million</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The table below indicates expenditure compared with budget. Where programme slippage has occurred other areas of work have been increased to maintain programme delivery at the planned level.

Spending closely in line with the programme for Quality Bus, Information, Ticketing and Smartcards, Interchanges, Rural Schemes, Business Travel Plans and Park and Ride.

Delivery of Local Safety Schemes was slower than expected due to the high levels of local consultation in delivering schemes and spending on this block was 80% of the programmed level.

Programme slippage also affected the spending on the Lancashire Road Safety Project. Capital investment in the set up of the scheme will now be completed in the current financial year. Spending was 86% of the programmed level.

Spending on the Total Transport Network for Preston and South Ribble was dominated by the provision of the Real Time Bus Information System. This system was installed and was operational within the financial year, however final testing was still outstanding and as a result we were not in a position to release some significant payments. This work is now completed, the system is fully operational payments are being made, however the spending for last year of 45% does not reflect the good progress this has achieved on a very tight timescale.

There was no capital spend on freight schemes in 2003/04 but progress was made on several schemes as described in paragraph *.*

The Street Lighting for Crime Reduction programme made good progress in identifying and delivering schemes to reduce the fear of crime and spending was 89% of the programme level.

In order to mitigate these areas of slippage other elements were expanded to maintain the delivery of the programme. The 20 mph zone and home-zone block delivered above programme and the amount of cycling schemes undertaken was increased to take advantage of the grants and match funding available from other bodies such as Sustrans and British Waterways. Pedestrian priority schemes were also delivered above programme level.

Rail schemes were substantially increased with the need to carry out more essential refurbishment works to the Blackpool to Fleetwood Tramway. These works were necessary to prevent closure pending a decision on the major scheme bid for upgrading the tramway, which has now been with the Government for three years.

The increase in Highway Schemes and Traffic Management is largely due to the completion of the Gillibrand Link scheme, which was due in the previous financial year, being delayed into 2003/04. This scheme was mainly funded by private sector contributions.

The most significant increases in the programme were planned increases in highways and bridges maintenance, which were increased by 15% and 19% respectively. These increases
ensured a total programme was delivered at 6% above the budgeted level. The total expenditure on Bridge Maintenance, Assessment and Strengthening in 2003/04 was £3.407m, which is £587,000 greater than anticipated in last year’s progress report. This was done to compensate for slippage in other programmes in the LTP Spending Programme.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key Transport Revenue Expenditure Items</th>
<th>2003/04 Actual £000</th>
<th>2004/05 budget £000</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Highway Maintenance</td>
<td>22479</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Road Lighting</td>
<td>8785</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Crossing Patrols</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Transport Payments to Operators</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Transport SEN Payments to Operators</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EMA Transport Pilot</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service Level Agreements (Colleges and 6th forms)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contracted Services Payments to Operators</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blackpool to Fleetwood Tramway Support</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Transport</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural Bus Grant</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transport Block Capital Programme</td>
<td>2004-05</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Safety Schemes</td>
<td>£1200</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 mph zones</td>
<td>£300</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lancashire Road Safety Project</td>
<td>£70</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality Bus Schemes</td>
<td>£2488</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information, Ticketing and Smartcards</td>
<td>£750</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Transport Network</td>
<td>£880</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interchanges</td>
<td>£1030</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rail Schemes</td>
<td>£425</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cycling Schemes</td>
<td>£820</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedestrian Priority Schemes</td>
<td>£400</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freight Partnerships</td>
<td>£20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural Schemes</td>
<td>£350</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking Management</td>
<td>£900</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Travel Plans</td>
<td>£350</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Travel Plans</td>
<td>£100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highway Schemes and Traffic Management</td>
<td>£3198</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Street Lighting Crime Reduction/Energy Saving</td>
<td>£300</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintenance of Highways</td>
<td>£11743</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintenance, assessment and strengthening of bridges</td>
<td>£4533</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>£29857</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Lancashire’s LTP allocation for 2004/05 is £29.909 million. This includes £16.176 million for maintenance. The integrated transport block funding is 13.033 million of which £2.033 is additional allocation to reflect Lancashire’s performance in delivering the Local Transport Plan.

This additional allocation has enabled expansion of the Quality Bus provision within the programme and additional cycling schemes. It also allows for further work on the real time bus information system as part of the total transport network and continuation of the Nowcard project for the introduction of smartcards on buses.

The remainder of the spending programme continues with the spending profile in line with previous years. Capital Investment in the setting up of the Lancashire Road Safety Project is now largely complete and this element is substantially reduced. This project will now continue on a self-financing basis.

### Key Private Sector Contributions 2003/04

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>£,000</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Carnforth Connect</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ribble Valley Cycle Route</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wyldefyre Rural Transport</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gillibrand Link Road</td>
<td>1224</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Key Grants Applied in 2003/04

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>£,000</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Carnforth Connect</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bowland Transit</td>
<td>214</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UTMC demonstration Project</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homezones</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 4.2 2004/05 Spending Programme

LTP Spending Programme

Lancashire’s LTP allocation for 2004/05 is £29.909 million. This includes £16.176 million for maintenance. The integrated transport block funding is 13.033 million of which £2.033 is additional allocation to reflect Lancashire’s performance in delivering the Local Transport Plan.

This additional allocation has enabled expansion of the Quality Bus provision within the programme and additional cycling schemes. It also allows for further work on the real time bus information system as part of the total transport network and continuation of the Nowcard project for the introduction of smartcards on buses.

The remainder of the spending programme continues with the spending profile in line with previous years. Capital Investment in the setting up of the Lancashire Road Safety Project is now largely complete and this element is substantially reduced. This project will now continue on a self-financing basis.

### Chapter 5 Evidence of Improvement

#### 5.1 Response to December 2003 Letter

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Summary of the comments contained in the December 2003 LTP settlement decision letter that indicated a need for improvement or clarification</th>
<th>Summary of actions taken in response to comments contained in the decision letter (where appropriate, please cross refer to any information contained in the APR)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Progress towards targets and objectives</td>
<td>Indicators and targets have been updated where appropriate, see section <em>.</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Further development of indictors and targets to ensure they remain challenging and appropriate to local circumstances</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>| Delivery of schemes on the ground                                                                                               | Schemes are being developed in line with Regional Freight Strategy see section <em>.</em>                                                                 |
| Freight strategy to develop in line with Regional Freight Strategy Plan                                                         |                                                                                                                                                  |
| Review or position statement on: -                                                                                             | Position statements included at <em>.</em>                                                                                                              |
| Decriminalised                                                                                                                 | <em>.</em>                                                                                                                                              |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Spending programme</th>
<th>Explanations of adjustments to programme blocks within the 2003/04 programme are given in section <em>.</em>.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fuller explanation of 33% increase in rural funding</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultation arrangements</td>
<td>An update on the LTP consultation process is included in section <em>.</em>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Update on various strands of consultation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Best Practice sharing and learning</td>
<td>Innovative practices have been shared with other authorities, see section <em>.</em>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Make innovative practices known to other LTP authorities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chapter 6 Best Practice</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beacon Status</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lancashire was proud to be awarded Beacon Status in 2003 for Supporting the Rural Economy. During the year, it has staged a programme of Beacon events to publicise its achievements. These include improved travel arrangements in the countryside, increasing access to employment and services and promoting social inclusion. Many visitors – Ministers, senior civil servants and Local Government members and officers – have come to see the demand-responsive bus services and rural interchanges in operation at Carnforth Connect and Clitheroe Interchange.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Awards</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The high standard of the work carried out by Lancashire has been recognised by the following awards;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bus Industry Awards</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winners – Burnley bus station, X1/X2 WHAM promotion</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Runner-up – Rural real time RIBS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highly Commended – SoccerBus</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infrastructure Awards</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winner – Burnley bus station</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prince Michael International Road Safety Award</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lancashire Partnership for Road Safety</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sustrans School Travel Initiative Award</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St Helen's County Primary School, Overton</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Civic Trust Awards
Commendation – River Lune Millennium Bridge

National Transport Awards
Lancashire has been shortlisted for the Local Transport Authority of the Year. In addition, four schemes have been shortlisted in different categories;
- X1/X2 WHAM bus service promotion
- Lancashire Road Safety Programme
- Preston Urban Traffic Management scheme
- Carnforth Connect rural transport service

Sharing Best Practice
Lancashire is keen to exchange views and develop schemes with European partners. As part of the CIVITAS project, Lancashire is developing sustainable transport in Preston City Centre. It is also working on projects for Optimum 2 and Europarc. Lancashire is an active member of the European groups Access, UITP and AGILE. In April 2004 Lancashire signed the European Road Safety Charter at the SAFE Campaign ceremony.

Lancashire schemes selected as examples of best practice include;
- Lancashire’s Speed Awareness Course has been chosen by the DfT as the model for the national course
- Three schemes - the X1/X2 Promotion, Wheels to Learning and Wyldefyre have been included on the DfT Accessibility website as examples of good practice
- The Capitol Centre Park & Ride site has been selected by the DfT as an example of good design for people with mobility handicaps.

Glasgow City Council officers came to inspect the delivery of road safety in Lancashire as a model of good practice. Lancashire, in partnership with the CSS, is preparing Good Practice Guides on Mini roundabouts and Puffin signal controlled crossings.

Lancashire staff have presented papers on topics including;
- Urban Traffic Management and Control to the ITS European Congress in Budapest
- The Lancashire Speed Awareness Course to the Scottish Road Safety Conference
- Marketing Public Transport at an ATCO seminar.

Accreditation
The Highway Consultancy has achieved BS EN ISO 9001:2001 registered status and all planning, design, supervision, maintenance management and geotechnical commissions are subject to the control of the Quality Management System. The Highways Laboratory is also approved by UKAS for testing materials. LCES, who operate the Fleet Management Services, has gained accreditation to both OHSAS 18001 and BS EN ISO 9001:2000.

Chapter 7 Accessibility Planning
Accessibility planning stems from the premise that a person’s quality of life is fundamentally affected by their ability to get to places of work, healthcare facilities, education, food shops and other destinations that are important to them. Accessibility planning will also provide the framework for the 2005 Local Transport Plan.

The Social Exclusion Unit report ‘Making the Connections’ sets the framework for accessibility planning.

The first stage, which Lancashire is a significant way towards completing, consists of an accessibility audit to identify barriers to accessibility. Lancashire County Council’s ‘Accessibility technical report 2004’ provides a broad analysis of accessibility issues within the County and acts as a baseline for future work. The report was written to assist in monitoring targets set in the Deposit Joint Lancashire Structure Plan, which considers five services to be essential. These are:-

- Post Offices
- Bus stops
- Doctors’ Practices
- Primary Schools
- Food Shops

A number of other services are also considered to be important for daily living:

- Secondary schools, Further and Higher Education establishments
- Independent Schools, Specialist schools and Pupil Referral units
- Libraries
- Hospitals
- Dentists
- Banks, building societies and cash machines
- Public Houses

Further facilities of significant value to people are also identified:

- Pharmacies
- Industrial Estates
- Large Employers
- Employment and Benefit Offices
- Community Halls
- Leisure facilities

For all the services and facilities listed above, accurate location data has been collected to allow comparison to socio-economic data from the 2001 Census. Further work is being undertaken to provide more detail of what each facility offers, e.g. opening/clinic times, range of products etc. This is being facilitated by links with local service providers such as the Primary Care Trusts, Jobcentre Plus, Local Education Authorities and other local bodies.

Once all data relating to journey destinations has been collated, the DfT accession software will be used to determine what barriers to accessibility are presented by Lancashire’s current transport network, in accordance with expected DfT guidance. A resources audit will then be carried out to identify financial and other resources available for tackling these barriers. The audit will also consider whether better use could be made of existing services and facilities through co-location of services or changes in opening times. This resources audit will lead to the production of an action plan of agreed initiatives.
The existence of baseline data will be invaluable in monitoring the Lancashire’s improvements to accessibility within the county and steps will be taken to ensure that the destination is kept up to date.

Appendix A Maintenance Information

The tables for reporting maintenance data given in Annex D of the Guidance Notes on LTP Annual Progress Reports are given below:

### Latest Bridge Data:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No. of bridges requiring strengthening</th>
<th>No. of bridges requiring major maintenance (&gt;£50,000)</th>
<th>Total No. of bridges (&gt;1.5m span)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>247</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>1449</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Latest Primary Route Bridge and Retaining Wall Strengthening and Major Maintenance Data:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Structure Name</th>
<th>Primary Route (i.e. road number)</th>
<th>Indicate Strengthening or Major Maintenance (&gt;£50,000)</th>
<th>Cost £</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Primet</td>
<td>A56</td>
<td>Strengthening</td>
<td>90,000</td>
<td>2006/07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kelbrook New</td>
<td>A56</td>
<td>Strengthening</td>
<td>70,000</td>
<td>2006/07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tarnbrick Railway</td>
<td>A583</td>
<td>Strengthening</td>
<td>90,000</td>
<td>2006/07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rosegrove Lane Railway</td>
<td>A646</td>
<td>Strengthening</td>
<td>250,000</td>
<td>2007/08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reedyford North</td>
<td>A682</td>
<td>Strengthening</td>
<td>150,000</td>
<td>2005/06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Claughton</td>
<td>A683</td>
<td>Strengthening</td>
<td>90,000</td>
<td>2005/06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oxheys Railway</td>
<td>A5085</td>
<td>Major Maintenance</td>
<td>132,000</td>
<td>2005/06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lea Hall</td>
<td>A583</td>
<td>Major Maintenance</td>
<td>95,000</td>
<td>2006/07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Billington</td>
<td>A59</td>
<td>Major Maintenance</td>
<td>90,000</td>
<td>2006/07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rose Cottage</td>
<td>A59</td>
<td>Major Maintenance</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>2006/07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whiteacre Lane</td>
<td>A59</td>
<td>Major Maintenance</td>
<td>162,000</td>
<td>2005/06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Downham Road</td>
<td>A59</td>
<td>Major Maintenance</td>
<td>110,000</td>
<td>2006/07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brockholes</td>
<td>A59</td>
<td>Major Maintenance</td>
<td>400,000</td>
<td>2006/07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denny Beck</td>
<td>A683</td>
<td>Major Maintenance</td>
<td>60,000</td>
<td>2005/06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greyhound Viaduct</td>
<td>A683</td>
<td>Major Maintenance</td>
<td>800,000</td>
<td>2005/06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hornby</td>
<td>A683</td>
<td>Major Maintenance</td>
<td>150,000</td>
<td>2006/07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rush Hey Bank North Ret/Wall</td>
<td>A671</td>
<td>Strengthening</td>
<td>68,000</td>
<td>2005/06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rush Hey Bank South Ret/Wall</td>
<td>A671</td>
<td>Strengthening</td>
<td>53,000</td>
<td>2005/06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clay Pit Ret/Wall</td>
<td>A671</td>
<td>Strengthening</td>
<td>40,000</td>
<td>2005/06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rawnook Farm Ret/Wall</td>
<td>A671</td>
<td>Strengthening</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>2005/06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Towneley Arms Ret/Wall</td>
<td>A671</td>
<td>Strengthening</td>
<td>45,000</td>
<td>2005/06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ridings Ret/Wall</td>
<td>A671</td>
<td>Strengthening</td>
<td>58,000</td>
<td>2005/06</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Refuse Tip Ret/Wall | A671 | Strengthening | 250,000 | 2005/06
Moneyclose Ret/Wall | A683 | Major Maintenance | 50,000 | 2005/06

There is no equivalent table for “Latest retaining wall data” and even before the formal programme of assessing retaining walls has started, there is a significant backlog of strengthening work. This is given in the table below.

**Latest Retaining Wall Data:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Length of Retaining Walls Assessed (m)</th>
<th>Length of Retaining Walls Requiring Strengthening (m)</th>
<th>Total Length of Retaining Walls (m)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>25,480</td>
<td>8,730</td>
<td>392,900</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Maintenance of de-trunked roads**

The following bid is made for funds to carry out capital maintenance (i.e. structural maintenance) of bridges and retaining walls on roads detrunked on 1st April 2004. It is based on the value management exercise carried out prior to detrunking by Lancashire County Council’s Highway Consultancy as agents for Area 17. The schemes listed here have been included in the information given above.

**A59**

Billington - parapet replacement - £90,000
Rose Cottage - parapet replacement - £50,000
Whiteacre Lane – concrete repairs & parapet replacement - £162,000
Downham Road - parapet replacement - £110,000

**HIGHWAYS AGENCY CAPITAL SCHEMES PROGRAMMES**

**AS INDICATED IN THE LETTER detrunk01-lancs of the 15th March 2004**

**Highways and Lighting Schemes**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2006</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A 59</td>
<td>Renewal Clitheroe by pass</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A 59</td>
<td>Renewal Osbaldeston to Showley Field</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A 59</td>
<td>Renewal Myerscough Smithy Road/Longsight road (lighting)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A 565</td>
<td>Renewal Tarleton West of A 59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A 646</td>
<td>Resurfacing of Plane Tree Burnley</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix B Comments from District Councils

BURNLEY BOROUGH COUNCIL

In 2003/2004 there has been further progress on various transport related issues throughout the Borough as a result of partnership or co-ordinated working between the District and the County Council.

- Local Safety Schemes have progressed despite extended consultation on two major schemes. Overall there are four schemes ready to go out to tender in the next few months.

- Progress has continued on 20 mph zone schemes and the Borough is confident that the programme of schemes continues to result in reduced accident rates across the District.

- On the cycling front, following the adoption of the 'Burnley Cycling Strategy' in April 2003, much work has been undertaken and is ongoing in developing the identified network of cycle routes.

LTP funding of £95,000 has been spent with a further commitment of £100,000 for 2004/05. The major schemes being undertaken are: NCN 68 The Pennine Cycleway, Leeds and Liverpool Canal Towpath, and the 'Padiham to Ightenhill Greenway'

- Work on the Intelligent Transport System (ITS) has progressed throughout the year and the results should be seen throughout the District in 2004/05.

- A large programme of alleygating schemes is in progress throughout the town and both District and County Councils have been involved in their implementation.

Hyndburn Borough Council

- Public transport
Hyndburn Borough Council has continued to work in partnership with LCC and with Lancashire United on the Hyndburn Circular Quality Bus Scheme. This Scheme, which is now nearing completion includes a fleet of easily accessible low-floor low-emission buses, raised bus-stop boarders, modern illuminated shelters with seating, Bus Stop Clearway markings, and a bus lane.
Following from the success of the Hyndburn Circular scheme, a Quality Bus partnership on the Accrington to Bacup route, with Rossendale Transport, Rossendale Borough Council and LCC is also underway.
A new bus station and improved railway station for Accrington are planned, and preliminary discussions with LCC, GONW, Accrington Town Centre Regeneration Board, Accrington Bus Forum, East Lancashire Partnership, and other stakeholders are underway.

- Access for all
A network of dropped crossings throughout Accrington Town Centre has been installed, and consultations with Area Councils were held to establish similar networks in the other townships of Hyndburn, these networks are now nearing completion.
Vulnerable Road User audits will be carried out on all relevant projects, in accordance with LCC guidelines, to ensure that the needs of the mobility impaired are addressed.

- Congestion
HBC encourages sustainable developments in line with PPG13, promotes public transport use through Quality Bus, and Bus Station improvements, and
is reviewing parking policy to address the ratio of long stay-short stay provision.

- **Cycling**
  HBC has worked with LCC, BwB, BwDBC, RBC, and various developers to promote cycle schemes. During the current year it is anticipated that the Rishton-Blackburn Canal Towpath route and Accrington-Baxenden disused railway route schemes will be completed; also the developer funded Lower Antley link route, and Lynwood Road – Station Road, Huncoat link route. Additionally, Hyndburn BC has played a significant part on the production of the Lancashire Cycle Route Design Guidance document.

- **Road Safety**
  In partnership with LCC and the Police work has continued to address various aspects of road safety.
  Two 20mph zones were completed in 2003/4, three are programmed for 2004/5. Two local safety schemes were completed in 2003/4, six are programmed for 2004/4.
  Two speed limit reduction schemes were completed in 2003/4, one is programmed for 2004/5.

**LANCASTER CITY COUNCIL**

The City Council’s Community Strategy, adopted in 2003/04, identifies that transport was the top priority for local citizens. Stakeholder consultations identified the following transport objectives as important:

- Heysham/M6 link.
- Reduced traffic congestion, particularly in Lancaster city centre where air quality needs to be improved.
- Improved road safety.
- Better roads and pavements.
- Better and integrated public transport, especially
  - City centre bus shuttle.
  - Rural bus services.
  - Local and inter-city trains services.
- Lower fares, particularly for young people.
- Promotion of cycling and walking as alternatives to driving.
- Park and Ride system.

The City and County Councils have a good record of working together to meet these objectives. In 2003/04, partnership and coordinated working included:

- Approval of a programme of cycling/walking improvements as part of Lancaster’s Economic Development Zone (EDZ) – implementation in 2004/2008.
- Promotion of Business Travel Plans, particularly by a collective approach on industrial estates and transport corridors.
- Highways Partnership agreement implemented.
The Heysham/M6 link is high in the City Council’s priorities and the City Council urges the County Council to publish the Environmental and Economic Impact Assessments in 2004/05. However, the City Council feels that it is essential to continue to make progress on the identification and implementation of further traffic management measures, infrastructure improvements and additional public transport options to prevent further deterioration before the link road is built. A stakeholder forum, possibly similar to the team that submitted the unsuccessful ‘Sustainable Travel Town’ bid, should be formed to identify measures, priorities and a programme for implementation.

PENDLE BOROUGH COUNCIL

1. Public Transport

   Partnership with the County Council has enabled a site for a new bus/rail interchange to be identified in Nelson; partnership with the County Council will enable the improvement bus waiting facilities at Barnoldswick and Earby termini.
   
   The Borough’s Asset Renewal programme has allocated £20,000 in both 2003 and 2004 to enable the replacement of some of the older bus shelters.
   
   In partnership with the County Council, a successful funding bid has enabled the Pendle Wayfarer rural transport scheme to be developed (September 2004 start).

2. Traffic Management

   20mph zones were introduced, three in Nelson, one in Brierfield and one in Colne; five Safe Routes to Schools projects were completed in Nelson and Brierfield and a further project is being progressed in Barnoldswick.
   
   The Borough has been working in partnership with the County Council to enable the implementation of a decriminalised parking scheme, due to commence in September 2004.
   
   An additional highways store for recyclable materials has been created in Nelson.
   
   Consultants have been appointed by the Borough Council to produce Area Development Frameworks in parts of Nelson, Colne and Brierfield, with a view to home zones being introduced.
   
   In partnership with the County Council and the police, five additional fixed speed camera sites have been established.

3. Town Centres

   Further improvements for pedestrians have been introduced in Brierfield town centre.
   
   Significant improvements to town centre footways are proposed in Colne, using both County Council and Borough Council funding.

4. Cycling

   The Borough Council is providing £25,000 of funding towards improving links to the Pennine Cycleway.
   
   A new cycleway has been created to enable access to the Lomeshaye Industrial Estate.
   
   A cycling festival for East Lancashire will be held in the Borough (July 2004) and will include an on-road bike race for the first time.

5. Travel Plans

   A draft travel plan for Council staff has been agreed and the means of progressing its recommendations are being considered.

Preston City Council
The City Council has been very pleased over the last twelve months to support its County partner in the delivery of a number of key initiatives to meet the aims and objectives of the Local Transport Plan.

A sustainable approach has brought about achievements that have included Quality Bus Routes to Royal Preston Hospital, which, along with other routes throughout the City, have further benefited from the introduction of real time passenger information.

The County Council has been active in the provision of a riverside cycle path at Fishwick Bottoms, a controlled cycle crossing of Lightfoot Lane and in providing funding for the City Council to install a new cycle path across Ashton Park. The City Council adopted its Cycling Strategy in January 2004 and is certain that further cycle network improvements will follow.

The Council continues to be successful in its application for, and delivery of, Local Safety Schemes, which together with a continuing programme of jointly funded 20 mph zones, to build upon the success of those already created, will assist in meeting casualty reduction targets.

A great deal of partnership working, involving all districts, has taken place over the last year, with the common aim of introducing decriminalised parking enforcement across Lancashire. Whilst the benefits of DPE will not be seen until the Autumn of 2004, much of the groundwork has been achieved during this reporting period.

The City Council commends the County Council on its achievements to date and looks forward to contributing to the preparation of the next five-year plan.

Ribble Valley Borough Council

In 2003/4, there has been steady progress on many transport initiatives through Ribble Valley Borough Council (RVBC) and also partnership with the County Council. These include:

- Ribble Valley Community Transport has worked closely with North Lancs. Rural Partnership to become a successful form of rural Community Transport.
- The re-introduction of the ‘Public Transport Open Forum’ every 6months, which has been well attended by transport operators, representatives from LCC, members of the public and also Council members.
- The Ribble Valley Strategic Partnership has established an Environment and Transport Working Group.
- RVBC have installed motorcycle anchor points in two of the car parks.
- RVBC have taken responsibility for the maintenance of 21 new bus shelters that were installed as part of the ‘Quality Bus Route Initiative’.
- RVBC has agreed to appoint an officer part of whose duties will be to prepare a Cycling Strategy for Ribble Valley and to administer public rights of way on behalf of the County Council.
- From the 6th September the Borough Council will act as agents for the County Council for Decriminalised Parking Enforcement.
- A ‘Parking Strategy’ for RVBC is in the course of being proposed.
- RVBC are working with support of the Lancashire Highways Partnership.
- This year RVBC are to conduct an audit of the Councils ‘street furniture’, with a view of making better use of our assets and improving the street scene.
Wyre Borough Council welcomes the opportunity to express its commitment to working with the County Council in meeting the aims and objectives of the Local Transport Plan.

In association with the County, Wyre are investigating the possibility of securing a ten-year contract for the operation of the Fleetwood to Knott End-on-Sea ferry service. The LTP will provide a funding source for the provision of a new vessel for this vital transport link across the river Wyre estuary for the rural communities of Over Wyre and the urban peninsula. The proposals also include the upgrading of the Fleetwood ferry dock to provide disabled access in accordance with the Disability Discrimination Act.

Wyre Borough Council also supports the proposals to upgrade and extend the tramway that runs from Fleetwood to the south of Blackpool.

Problems with congestion on the A585(T) which links the port of Fleetwood with the M55 motorway are cause for concern. The Highways Agency are currently finalising their Route Management Strategy for the A585(T), which the Council formally commented on at public consultation stage. In addition, the Council, in partnership with the County, Fylde Borough Council, Blackpool Borough Council and the Highways Agency have commissioned a multi-modal study for the area.

Two County funded and three District funded local safety schemes are currently being progressed. In addition, there are two 20mph zones and six 20mph school safety zones being implemented in the District.
Executive Summary

The purpose of this report is to set out a proposed programme of community based renewable energy initiatives. It builds comprehensively on a report presented to the Cabinet on 6 March 2003. Attached at Appendix "A" are examples of best practice.

The programme has been developed by a number of organisations and is divided into a set of six discrete projects covering a wide range of renewable energy related initiatives at the community level. These range in nature from the provision of training and demonstration activities to fully developed technologies producing income for rural communities. Funding has been secured for large parts of the programme. However, additional resources are also being sought.

Until now the development of renewable energy at the community level has been fragmented and uncoordinated and has focused predominantly on large-scale commercial operations. Benefits in terms of business competitiveness, resource procurement, social enterprise and environmental protection have not been maximised. This Programme will seek to redress this balance by developing a comprehensive package of initiatives to maximise the potential benefits through linking investment at the regional level to interventions at the local level. The programme contributes directly to a number of the Council’s key corporate objectives, including:

- Lead healthy lives
- Learn and develop
- Work and prosper
- Enjoy a high quality environment
Recommendation

The Cabinet is asked to:-

i) approve the overall development of the Programme as set out in the report for implementation by the Cabinet Member for Urban and Rural Regeneration; and

ii) note that the Cabinet Member for Urban and Rural Regeneration will consider and approve applications for funding to support the implementation of the programme, including those through the Rural Recovery Programme, INTEREGG IIIC, SAVE III and others as and when appropriate.

Background

In March 2003 the Cabinet considered a report on ‘An assessment of Solar Water Heating and other Energy Conservation Schemes for the Domestic Sector and options for setting up a Scheme in Lancashire’. It was resolved that the Environment Director would investigate further the feasibility of setting up a community wind power scheme in Lancashire as a more effective alternative to the promotion of domestic solar water heating systems.

The conclusions of this investigation are that many of the sites under County Council ownership which have average wind speeds that would prove viable for community wind generation have constraints placed upon them, including, those on disused quarries located less than 500m from domestic properties. As a consequence, the search was broadened to include sites owned by other organisations, including those of United Utilities. Following this a number of sites are now under further investigation with detailed site assessments being made and liaison with local community groups well established. These include sites at Cliviger, the Strategic Location for Development in Fleetwood (former ICI Hillhouse plant) and Middleton Wood in Heysham.

At the same time it was deemed sensible to broaden the approach by investigating the potential for developing a more holistic programme covering a wide range of social and economic initiatives linked to renewable energy. This report identifies such a programme, which could be implemented in addition to the Community Wind Power Scheme.

Lancashire Energy Group

An informal group was established to look at how a range of renewable energy issues could be drawn together by the key agencies. The key organisations: Lancashire County Council, Lancashire County Developments Ltd., Lancaster University, CLAREN (Cumbria and Lancashire Community Renewables) and United Utilities have drawn up a detailed programme. This programme consists of six discrete projects, which are summarised below. The aims of the programme are as follows:

- Establish small-scale renewable energy with part ownership by community groups, providing these groups with a regular source of income to support their own local economic development projects e.g. new village hall roof, community transport, hanging baskets etc.
• Develop domestic installations e.g. solar water and wood chip, particularly within isolated communities over reliant on inefficient oil powered heating systems amongst those households at risk from fuel poverty.

• Raise awareness of the whole renewable energy sector both within local communities as well as amongst schools and other teaching establishments.

It is envisaged that funding applications will be developed by the Energy Group to support the development of the projects listed below. Funding will be sought from a variety of external sources at the European, national and regional level. It is a requirement of some of these funding programmes that the lead organisation is a local authority, in which, case it is proposed that the County Council take the lead on these through the Cabinet Member for Rural and Urban Regeneration when appropriate.

**Summary of Projects**

i) Socio-Economic Study

Funding for this Study to a total of £20,500 has been secured through LCDL and Lancaster University has begun work on this. It is anticipated that work will be completed in July 2004 and the results will be disseminated at a Conference in September. The overall purpose of this piece of work is to assess the opportunity for the development of the renewable energy sector across Lancashire on both the supply chain side and installation. It will be complemented by a further piece of research work to identify targets for each technology, in line with government guidance. This latter piece of work is being progressed through the Joint Structure Planning process, but is complementary to the programme outlined in this report.

ii) Community Ownership of Renewable Energy Projects

This element will look to establish a network of community owned renewable energy projects, covering a diversity of technologies. Communities will be able to develop partnerships with private sector renewable energy developers to establish micro-scale community renewable energy projects. The community will then be able to sell the energy generated and receive an income, which, can be used for their own purpose e.g. new roof for village hall, construction of disabled access to community facilities. Bespoke ownership of the renewable energy projects will be developed covering a broad range of options including; share options, private sector grant.

iii) Lancashire Solar Club

The Lancashire Solar Club will be run for domestic householders who wish to install their own solar panels. Similar clubs have been run successfully elsewhere, including London and the South West. Householders, who are interested in carrying out the work, will undergo a weekend of training, covering the basic plumbing and installation needs for installing their own solar panels. The training will be provided free of charge. As well as training, a network will be developed to enable club members to share best practice between them.

iv) Wood Fuel Heating in isolated Rural Areas
This will look at the potential for developing a small-scale wood chip fuel project. Initially the study will identify the number of properties currently obtaining their energy supply from oil or other non-renewable sources. It will then work out the amount of wood chip required to provide heating for these properties, if they were to convert to wood chip boilers on an individual basis as well as identifying the costs and infrastructure required. It will refer to best practice work carried out elsewhere, including, that funded through Objective 2 in Finland as well as local work including that of Lancashire Wildlife Trust. Depending on the results of the feasibility study an initial marketing and promotion exercise will be carried out amongst relevant property owners to gauge interest in taking the scheme to the next stage.

v) Renewable Energy in Schools

This will look at two issues:

- Supporting the teaching of climate change and renewable energy technologies within the national curriculum; and

- Installing demonstration renewable energy technologies within schools.

The project will build on the work carried out through the Eco-Schools initiative and seek to complement the work done on waste minimisation through the Education for Greener Future. It will link with work carried out by the education advisory service. Dedicated support will be given to teachers through an established network of co-ordinators within schools, ensuring that relevant information is provided to them in helping deliver the national curriculum at both primary and secondary levels. In addition support will be provided to mainstream schools as well as those with learning and behavioural difficulties in installing demonstration projects, which will help with studies, as well as providing resources to the school.

vi) Renewable Energy in the Tourist Sector

This will have two primary objectives:

- Increase the uptake of renewable electricity amongst Small/Medium Size Enterprises (SMEs) in the tourist industry.
- Decrease the energy consumption amongst SMEs in the tourist industry.

The scheme aims to address the current barriers to these aims specifically: cost/finance, awareness and poor installation.

The scheme would offer:

- A competitive green electricity supply aiming to match or beat the current tariff.
- A cheaper energy supply.
- An energy audit with report detailing costed recommendations and paybacks.
- Bulk discount on energy saving measures & on installation from a register of trained installers.
- A grant of £300 per business for the implementation of energy efficiency measures identified by the audits.
- Advice on national grant schemes.

Consultations

In developing the Programme consultation has been carried out with the group members, namely, United Utilities, University of Lancaster, LCDL and CLAREN. In addition, comment has been received from a host of regional bodies, including the NWDA (Head of Energy), Renewables Northwest and the Regional Sustainable Energy Group. Meetings have also been held with Lancashire Rural Futures and Cliviger Parish Council.

Advice

See recommendations.

Alternative options to be considered     N/A

Implications: e.g. Financial, Legal, Personnel, Human Rights, Crime and Disorder or Other
Nil.

Local Government (Access to Information) Act 1985
List of Background Papers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Paper</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Contact/Directorate/Ext</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
Appendix A

Lancashire Community Renewable Energy Programme

Examples of Best Practice


Arts Factory is working to develop eight turbines creating an income stream to fund work in the community and create new jobs for local people, delivering more free services to local people. "Power Factory" is a joint venture company set up by Arts Factory & United Utilities Green Energy to develop the wind farm. It is the largest scale partnership between a community owned organisation and the private sector ever seen in Wales.

Arts Factory aims to build a stronger community for people of all walks of life with an aim to generate money through enterprise & use it to fund the facilities and services for community need. Current enterprises include a graphic design and website creation service, an environmental design & creation service, a community consultation service, and managed workspace to rent.

The revenue gained from the sail of energy will be used to support a wide ranging programme including:

- playgroups & parent & toddler groups
- slimming groups
- quit smoking groups
- karate, tai chi and yoga classes
- screen films
- gallery exhibitions
- sexual health advice surgeries
- CAB surgeries
- job search service;
- and a wide range of daytime & evening classes.

“POWER FACTORY isn't just about generating green electricity but about creating jobs for local people. Arts Factory will use the income we generate from the wind farm to employ more local people to deliver more free services to local people. We will be able to work in new places that we couldn't afford to before, and to reach more people.”

2. Solar Clubs, Bristol and Leicester Solar Clubs

In 1997 the Centre for Sustainable Energy (CSE), in partnership with Environ, was awarded a grant from the Environmental Action Fund to pilot two Solar Clubs over a two-year period. One of the clubs was located in Bristol, the other in Leicester. In the second year of the initiative, the Mark Leonard Trust and the Esmée Fairbairn Foundation provided additional funding. During the pilot period, a total of over 100 members installed solar water-heating systems in the Bristol and Leicester areas.
A key development occurred in 1998, when the BOC Foundation contributed extra funding to expand the project and to support the launch of ten new Solar Clubs around the UK. To this end, seminars were held in Bristol and Leicester in February 1999 to disseminate the findings of the pilot project, and to invite applications to set up clubs as part of the network. Applications were received from a variety of organisations, and all the new clubs were launched in the spring.

As part of the support provided by CSE and Environ to these new Solar Clubs, training was offered to the organiser and trainer in each one. Clubs also received a starter pack that consisted of manuals and profile-raising publicity material, such as leaflets, posters and T-shirts. A key point is that the network has a national identity which gives members added confidence that this is a tried, tested, supported and carefully monitored scheme. For example, CSE and Environ operate a helpline for club trainers and organisers that they can use if they need assistance with or advice on a local issue. There are now 13 solar club networks in the UK ranging geographically from Cornwall to Ayr, and from Wales to Essex, all operate on a "not for profit" basis. Each club also offers a choice of at least three types of solar panel from manufacturers, all of whom are members of the UK's Solar Trade Association.

3. Renewable Energy in Tourism and Leisure, Southwark ESCO

The Albion Public House in Southwark is one of fifty pubs to have benefited from an ESCO scheme designed to reduce energy consumption and increase the uptake of green tariffs in the SME sector. Public houses were picked as the target group for the scheme as they are surprisingly large energy users for their size. The 350 pubs in Southwark use around 10% of the total commercial sector consumption, yet constitute only 5% of the 7000 businesses in the borough. Average bills for the pubs are between £6,000 and £8,000. SEA hope to be able to reduce pub energy bills by 50% by cutting out energy wastage. Because their electricity use will be generated renewably the carbon dioxide emissions thought to be responsible for the floods that caused havoc in many pub beer cellars over the last year, are reduced by around 75%.

Customers at the Albion will now be able to sit down and enjoy their pint in knowledge that no pollution was produced in the process of cooling their drink to just the right temperature. The scheme is being run by Southwark Energy Agency (SEA) with funding from the Energy Saving Trust and Southwark Council. Initially fifty pubs in Southwark are being supported under the scheme, but SEA are hoping to roll this out in the rest of London and possibly nation-wide.

The Albion's landlord, John Campbell said “Small businesses like mine generally don't have the time, capital or expertise to reduce energy bills and this scheme has provided independent assistance to really cut my energy overheads in a cost-effective manner.”

As part of the scheme pubs receive a free energy audit on condition that they sign a contract committing them to a renewable electricity supply and to reinvest at least 50% of the savings from avoiding the climate change levy in the most cost-effective
recommendations identified by the audit. Costs of installation and energy supply are reduced by bulk purchase arrangements facilitated by SEA.
Cabinet – 2nd July 2004

Report of the External Overview and Scrutiny Committee

Part I - Item No. 8

Electoral Division affected: None

External Overview and Scrutiny Committee
Report of the GM Crops and Food Task Group

Contact for further information:
Sulafa Halstead, (01772) 532203, Office of the Chief Executive

Executive Summary

On 6th August 2003 the External Overview and Scrutiny Committee received the first report of the GM Crops and Food Task Group on the consultation they had undertaken with groups in the county as part of the Government’s Public Debate on genetic modification (GM) issues. At that meeting it was suggested that further investigation should take place into what is enforceable in relation to GM crops and food; what the County Council could do and where the County Council has responsibility.

The Committee resolved that the GM Task Group be reconvened to look in depth into the implications of some of the suggested actions including legal and practical issues. The four recommendations resulting from these further investigations have been agreed by the External Overview and Scrutiny Committee and are detailed below. The Committee commends these recommendations to the Cabinet.

Recommendation

a). The Cabinet is asked to agree the following recommendations made by the External Overview and Scrutiny Committee:

In relation to GM foods:

1. To endorse the support already given by the County Council to the policies and arrangements in place at Lancashire Purchasing Agency, County Commercial Services, Social Services and Educational establishments to prevent foods containing genetically modified ingredients entering the food chain.

2. To welcome the introduction of New EC Regulation No. 1830/2003 on the Traceability and Labelling of Genetically Modified Organisms (GMOs), but to support the view of Trading Standards and ask the Secretary of State to introduce clear and concise front of packet labelling for these products.

In relation to GM Crops:

3. To consider requests made to the EC for commercial/marketing consents for GMOs in relation to the likelihood of them being used in the County of Lancashire and if appropriate on proper grounds, to make representations to
the Secretary of State for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs (as the “competent authority”), DEFRA and to the European Commission expressing the Council’s opposition to the commercialisation of particular GM crops

4. To protect the interests of organic growers within the county, primarily in support of establishing voluntary GM-free zones, and request to the Secretary of State that should the Government agree to the commercial cultivation of any GM Crop in the UK, that prior to approvals being granted:
   i. legally enforceable crop management protocols be put in place to deal with coexistence.
   ii. the compensation scheme be established
   iii. guidance to farmers interested in establishing voluntary GM-free zones be provided

b) In addition to the recommendations from the O & S Committee, the Cabinet are asked to consider the following recommendations in relation to applications to release GMO’s for research and development, and to labelling products of GM-fed animals.

5. To make representations to the Secretary of State to express the Council’s opposition to any applications for consent for the release of GMO’s for research and development within the County of Lancashire

6. To ask the Secretary of State to introduce labelling requirements to the products of GM fed animals.

c) To delegate action in respect of the above recommendations to the Cabinet Member for Urban and Rural Regeneration

Background

The existing Full Council Resolution in relation to GM passed on 27 February 2003 (following a Notice of Motion) is as follows:

"Lancashire County Council recognises that:

- There is uncertainty about the safety of genetically modified crops
- A number of Lancashire farmers rely on GM-free or organic status to sell their products.
- The growing of GM crops could present legal, economic or social problems.

In the light of the above, the County Council welcomes the fact that the Lancashire Purchasing Agency, County Commercial Services, Social Services and Educational establishments have in place policies and arrangements to prevent foods containing genetically modified ingredients entering the food chain.

The County Council also recognises that:

- There is a statutory framework in place, which regulates the production and release of GM products. The County Council is a
statutory consultee in the event that an application was made for consent in respect of land in Lancashire.

- The County Council cannot apply, as of right, for exemption from future GM Consents but could make representations to take Lancashire out of the geographic area of any consent.

- There is no evidence that any County-owned land is being used to produce GM products, although tenancy agreements were entered into before this became an issue.

The Council, therefore, asks that the Head of Property conduct a review of the tenancy agreements with a view to considering how the issue might be addressed. The Council also authorises the Cabinet to agree a response on its behalf should an application for a future GM consent be made that includes land in Lancashire."

In May 2003, the County Council was invited to take part in ‘GM Nation?’ the UK Government’s first national attempt to explore the issues around the possible introduction of commercial GM crops and foods into Britain. The External Overview and Scrutiny Committee established a Task Group which gathered perspectives from interested groups within the county, facilitated members of the public putting forward their views and produced a report of the information gathered and discussions held. The External Overview and Scrutiny Committee received the report and resolved that the Task Group be reconvened to look in depth into the legal and practical implications of some of the suggested actions. This was particularly in relation to applications made to the EU for commercial/marketing consents for GMOs.

As a result of the consideration of views put before them and advice received Members of the task group have agreed on the four recommendations as detailed at the beginning of this report. These have been endorsed by the External Overview and Scrutiny Committee.

**Background to Recommendation 2 and 6:**

New EC Regulations came into force on the Traceability and Labelling of GMOs on 14th April ’04 (Regulation (EC) No. 1830/2003). These strengthen labelling requirements, so that the following will have to be labelled:

- Approved GM ingredients present above a threshold of 0.9% (reduction of 0.1%)
- Non-approved GM ingredients\(^1\) above a threshold of .05% for a period of 3 years
- Animal feed (at the above thresholds, though products of GM-fed animals do not have to be labelled)

If GM foods are allowed in the UK, then Lancashire Trading Standards Officers felt there should be “front of packet” labelling. An example of how this can be effective was when the EU wanted the UK to allow the supply of irradiated food. The government agreed to allow the supply but stipulated that front of package labelling should be required. This deterred retailers from stocking products, as they did not believe there was a demand from consumers.

\(^1\) GMO’s not approved by the EU but allowed by other countries
Background to Recommendation 3 and 5:

As the February ‘03 Resolution acknowledges, there is a legal framework governing the production and release of GM products. However, contrary to what is said in the resolution, it has now become apparent that the County Council is not a statutory consultee on applications for Consents for the release of GMOs.

The European Directive sets out two regulatory regimes;

Part B Consents for controlling releases for research and development, and

Part C Consents for crops to be grown, processed or imported for commercial purposes in the EU.

The key difference between Part B and Part C Consents is that for research and development releases, decisions are made by individual Member States, whereas for placing GMO products on the market, decisions are made by all Member States or the European Commission.

To obtain Consent from a Member State under part B of the Directive applicants must submit a detailed dossier of information to the Joint Regulatory Authority. The application has to include information on the nature of the GMO, how it has been modified, the precise nature of the research programme proposed, where it will be released and how the release will be monitored. There are statutory requirements for Part B applicants to place advertisements in national newspapers circulating in the areas where proposed releases are to take place and for mandatory public consultation lasting for a minimum of 48 days. Decisions on whether or not to issue Part B Consents and any conditions placed on them are taken at the Member State level. This allows the Secretary of State to have a high level of control over Part B releases, which are small-scale and intensively managed – such as for the farm scale field trials. Once a GMO has received a part B Consent it may still only be released at specified sites and under certain conditions.

An application for a Part C Consent for placing a GMO on the EU market as, or in, a product must be submitted to the competent authority of the Member State within whose territory the release is to take place, or where the GMO is to be placed on the market for the first time. The competent authority in that State then reviews the notification and forms an opinion, which must be within 90 days of receipt. If that opinion is favourable, the competent authority will forward the dossier to the European Commission. The Commission circulates the dossier to the other Member States for further evaluation and comments by their competent authorities who are given 60 days to evaluate the application in detail, taking into account the particular health and environmental safety issues unique to their territories. If no objections are made, the competent authority in the originating Member State issues the marketing consent, which applies throughout the European Community.

If, however, another Member State objects to the GMO being placed on the market, the competent authorities and the Commission may discuss any outstanding issues with the aim of arriving at an agreement. Then the Directive provides for the European Commission to prepare a draft decision that reflects the concerns raised by Member States, on which it falls to the Council of Environment Ministers to make a decision. If the Council fails to decide within three months, the Commission can adopt its draft decision.
During the process there are two separate 30-day periods of public consultation, one in the Member State receiving the application and a second one across the whole of the EU.

As mentioned above, if the application is approved, a Part C consent is valid for the whole of the European Union subject to any conditions or restrictions agreed by Member States, and to the completion of any other regulatory procedures that may be relevant to the product concerned.

If an application is rejected a new application could be made for the same product in a different Member State.

Lancashire has a clear interest in GMO consents. The Lancashire Rural Recovery Action Plan includes a commitment to “Create a more ecologically diverse natural environment”. The County Council has a variety of commitments to the environment through both the Lancashire Environment Strategy and Environmental Management Strategy within the policy theme relating to Landscape, Heritage and Wildlife. In addition, the Council is a partner in helping to deliver Lancashire’s Biodiversity Action Plan, which, seeks to enrich both the habitat and species diversity in the County.

The UK has international obligations to safeguard its native biodiversity, in particular through the EU Habitats Directive, the EU Birds Directive, and the Convention for Biological Diversity. In the UK, much of our biodiversity is closely associated with agricultural systems and activity, and with managed forests and aquatic habitats.

The advice received by the Task Group is that County Council cannot apply, as of right, for exemption for Lancashire from future GM Consents but could make representations to the Secretary of State and the European Commission to express its opposition to the commercialisation of particular GM crops.

Systems are in place whereby County Officers are alerted to any applications for Part B or Part C Consents and can advise the Cabinet Member for Urban and Rural Regeneration.

Background to Recommendation 4:

In a Statement to the House of Commons on March 9TH, 2004, the Secretary of State for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs, Margaret Beckett MP, indicated that the government recognises the concerns of organic growers in terms of compensation payments caused by growers losing their organic licence as a result of contamination issues. She acknowledged that "Apart from the scientific decisions which flow from the trials there is the related issue of GM and non-GM crops being grown in the same area - so-called coexistence and the Agriculture and Environment Biotechnology Commission (AEBC) has recently produced advice on this issue". At this stage the Government is seeking to look at an appropriate threshold for compensation with key stakeholders. However they are clear such compensation would have to come from the GM crop sector. In addition, Margaret Beckett stated that “The Government will also provide guidance to farmers interested in establishing voluntary GM-free zones in their areas, consistent with EU legislation”.

The Agriculture and Environment Biotechnology Commission (AEBC) provides the Government with independent strategic advice on developments in biotechnology.
and their implications for agriculture and the environment. On 25\textsuperscript{th} November 2003 the Commission published its report \textit{GM Crops? Coexistence and Liability}.

The report looks at the key issues of coexistence and liability were GM crops are to be grown commercially in the UK and makes nine recommendations. These include “If GM crops were to be grown commercially, farmers growing them should be required to follow legally enforceable crop management protocols”, that there should be “intensive monitoring and auditing of coexistence arrangements” and that there “should be special arrangements for compensation of farmers suffering financial loss...through no fault of their own”.

Following Margaret Beckett’s statement to the House of Commons in March Professor Grant, Chairman of AEBC and of the independent Steering Board which organised last year’s national GM debate - \textit{GM Nation?}, said the Government agrees in principle that there needs to be rigorous arrangements for coexistence and liability but that he is concerned that “there is no guarantee that the cultivation of GM crops will be delayed until a proper coexistence regime has been finalised, and a compensation system is in place for conventional and organic farmers whose crops are contaminated”.

The County Council is a lead partner within the Lancashire Rural Partnership. The key document of the partnership is the Lancashire Rural Recovery Action Plan (LRRAP), 2000. Within this strategic document the programme seeks to promote the use of organic food growing under a number of strategic objectives, principally;

- Strategic Objective 3 of the programme \textit{“Assisting the restructure of Agriculture”}.
- Strategic Objective 4: \textit{“Enhancing the Competitiveness and capability of Primary Agriculture”}.

Bearing in mind both the national position and the County Council’s position on organic farming through the LRRAP, the Task Group wanted to incorporate a comment on organic farming within the recommendation to ensure it reflected the County Council’s commitments through the LRRAP.

\textbf{County-owned land}

As requested in the final paragraph of the County Council’s February 2003 Resolution, the Head of Property has provided information relating to the tenancy agreements as follows. The County Council’s Agricultural Estate currently extends to only approximately 125 hectares (310 acres). Existing tenancy agreements can only be amended by agreement to include prohibition on the growing of GM crops. In any event the majority of land is used for livestock grazing.

Of the County Council’s other land holdings ranging from the Country Parks through to land held for operational reasons these are areas again used almost exclusively for livestock.

All new lettings will include a clause prohibiting the growing of GM crops.

\textbf{Consultations}

As above

\textbf{Advice}
In addition to the advice provided to the first meeting further advice has been sought from the LCC Environmental Policy Team, Property Group and Legal Services Teams

**Alternative options to be considered**

N/a

**Implications**: e.g. Financial, Legal, Personnel, Human Rights, Crime and Disorder or Other

This item has the following implications:

N/a

---

**Local Government (Access to Information) Act 1985**

**List of Background Papers**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Paper</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Contact/Directorate/Ext</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GM Crops, Effects on farmland wildlife (Results of the 3 yr Field Trials)</td>
<td>16th October 2003</td>
<td>Sulafa Halstead, Office of the Chief Executive, 32203</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weighing up costs &amp; benefits of GM Crops</td>
<td>21 July 2003</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GM Nation – public debate Advisory Committee on Releases to the Environment report</td>
<td>24th September 2004</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13th January 2004</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Report of Action Taken by the Cabinet Member for Resources

Contact for further information: 
Jacky Lawson, (01772) 534594, Resources Directorate

Executive Summary

Action taken by the Cabinet Member for Resources, under Standing Order No.72 (Waiving of Contract Standing Orders). Such actions are required to be reported to the Cabinet for information.

Recommendation

The Cabinet is asked to note this report.

Background

In accordance with the provisions of Standing Order No.72, the Cabinet Member for Resources reports that he has agreed the following:

The waiving of the provisions of Standing Order No. 74 to allow a single tender to be invited from a named contractor for the following:

i) To relocate a demountable unit from the County Hall courtyard to Arthur Street, Preston (Preston South West)

ii) Hardware, software and support services to provide curriculum materials to all primary and special schools, Pupil Referral Units and nurseries within Cumbria and Lancashire (All)

iii) A Service Level Agreement for a day service in Chorley for people with mental health problems (Divisions in Chorley)

iv) A Service Level Agreement for a day service in Skelmersdale for people with mental health problems (Divisions in West Lancashire)

v) Extension of existing arrangements in respect of Pooled Funds with Morecambe Bay and Hyndburn and Ribble Valley PCTs (Divisions in Lancaster, Hyndburn and Ribble Valley)
vi) Analytical work services for the provision of information to schools on issues such as pupil performance and progress related to contextual factors (All)

vii) Issue of contracts to existing Home Improvement Agency providers for Supporting People services (All)

The waiving of the provisions of Standing Order No. 74 to allow tenders to be invited from select lists of contractors for the following:

i) A window replacement scheme at Guild House, Preston (Preston South West)

ii) A replacement audio system for the Council Chamber, County Hall (Preston South West)

iii) Development of playing fields at Clayton le Moors Mount Pleasant Community Primary School (Rishton, Clayton-le-Moors and Altham)

iv) Procurement of ion chromatography equipment for the County Analyst and Scientific Adviser (All)

Consultations - N/A

Advice - N/A

Alternative options to be considered - N/A

Implications: e.g. Financial, Legal, Personnel, Human Rights, Crime and Disorder or Other

This item has financial implications

Any representations made to the Cabinet Member prior to the issue being considered in accordance with the Public Notice of Forward Plans

None
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Report on Decisions on Additions and Amendments to the Approved Capital Programme 2004/05

Contact for further information:
Jacky Lawson, (01772) 534594, Resources Directorate
Stuart Benson, (01772) 534022, Environment Directorate

Executive Summary
The decisions of the Deputy Leader and the Cabinet Member for Resources to add and amend schemes in the Capital Programme 2004/05.

Recommendation
That the decisions be noted.

Background
It is a requirement of Standing Order 53(4) that any additions or amendments to the approved Capital Programme made by Cabinet Members must be reported to the next meeting of the Cabinet for information.

The Deputy Leader has approved the following:

(a) County Analyst Service - Acquisition of equipment as part of the Capital Programme
i. the purchase of a mobile monitoring instrument to be financed by a revenue contribution to capital,
ii. the purchase of an auto sampler to be financed by a revenue contribution to capital, and
(b) Lancashire Certificate Service

Fitting out, shelving for efficient records management and general furnishings at accommodation for the Lancashire Registration Certificate Service.

The Cabinet Member for Resources has approved the following: -

(a) Preston County Hall Council Chamber – Replacement Audio System

The existing audio system within the Council Chamber is outdated and inefficient and following consultation with Officers and Councillors, it was recommended that a modern replacement system with enhanced features be installed.

Following evaluation and consultations with users, a wireless system was recommended and it was agreed to add this scheme to the Capital Programme to be funded from the Modernisation Reserve

(b) Clayton le Moors Mount Pleasant Community Primary School

In consultation with Hyndburn Borough Council, a scheme to upgrade the playing fields at Clayton le Moors Mount Pleasant Community Primary School has been prepared by the Head of Property. It has been agreed to add this scheme to the Capital Programme, subject to further negotiations between the Head of Property and the Cabinet Member for Resources on final cost outcomes

(c) Ormskirk School

The Cabinet Member approved the latest estimated scheme cost of £16.569m for the development of the new Ormskirk School and agreed that the capital programme be amended to reflect this figure.

Consultations - N/A

Advice - N/A

Alternative options to be considered - N/A

Implications: e.g. Financial, Legal, Personnel, Human Rights, Crime and Disorder or Other

Financial: These additions comply with the revised arrangements agreed in order to streamline the process for in-year additions to the Capital Programme.
Any representations made to the Cabinet Member prior to the issue being considered in accordance with the Public Notice of Forward Plans

Name: Organisation: Comments:

None
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Executive Summary

Key Decisions taken by the Deputy Leader.

Recommendation

The Cabinet is asked to note the Key Decision detailed below.

1. **Annual Review of Children and Young Persons (Protection from Tobacco) Act 1991**

The Children and Young Persons (Protection from Tobacco) Act 1991, prohibits the sale of cigarettes and tobacco to children under 16 years of age. It also requires the display of appropriate warning notices and prohibits the sale of loose cigarettes. The Act (Section 5) places a statutory duty on the County Council to annually consider the extent to which it is appropriate to carry out a programme of enforcement action. The Deputy Leader has approved, under the existing policy, active enforcement, education and awareness for 2004/05.
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Reason for inclusion in Part II, if appropriate

N/A.
Cabinet – 2nd July 2004

Part I - Item No. 11 (b)

Electoral Division affected: None

Key Decision taken by the Cabinet Member for Adult Services

Contact for further information:
Dave Gorman, (01772) 534261, Social Services Directorate

Executive Summary

Key Decision taken by the Cabinet Member for Adult Services.

Recommendation

The Cabinet is asked to note the Key Decision detailed below.

Proposals for the Utilisation of Former Care Home Buildings and/or Sites for Alternative Services for Older People

The Cabinet Member for Adult Services:

(i) noted that an overall strategy for the development of extra care housing schemes in Lancashire will be prepared by the Director of Social Services by 1 November 2004 for approval by the Cabinet;

(ii) agreed to the transfer of Fell View, Longridge and Crossacres, St Annes from the group of sites to be sold to a partnership site;

(iii) subject to the plan being in accordance with the overall strategy mentioned above, agreed to the taking forward of plans for Moor Platt, Caton; Wheatley Court, Fence; Fell View, Longridge; Coniston House, Chorley; Ebor House, Burnley; Brookville, Whitworth and Hill Top, Accrington for the provision of purpose built extra care housing with ancillary facilities, the timescale to be dependent on the date the property will be vacated and noted that more work is still required in the form of detailed business plans inclusive of costings to identify the viability of these proposals. These plans to be formulated and preferred providers selected by 1 November 2004 and be the subject of further individual reports on schemes as they are developed;

(iv) noted that discussions will continue with Lancashire Care NHS Trust, primary care trusts and other partners to:
- develop Ravengarth, Haslingden and Brookside, Ormskirk as resource centres for older people with mental health problems;
- develop day care services at Beaumont View, Lancaster;
- develop a nursing home at Slyne House, Lancaster;
- develop Falcon House, Preston as a resource centre for the wider community in the Deepdale area of Preston;

and that these discussions should be concluded by 1 October 2004 with a view to the resultant plans being finalised by 1 January 2005;

(v) agreed the sale of Worsley House, Fleetwood; Ainsdale House, Preston; Charnley Fold, Bamber Bridge; Peterfield House, Penwortham; New Manor, Longton and Walverdene, Nelson with the capital receipts being available to fund programmes to develop extra care housing and other services for older people currently being developed at a local level.
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Key Decisions taken by the Cabinet Member for Highways and Transportation

Contact for further information:
Sharon Montgomerie, 01772 530544, Environment Directorate

Executive Summary

Key Decisions taken by the Cabinet Member for Highways and Transportation.

Recommendation

The Cabinet is asked to note the Key Decisions detailed below.

1. Highways Act – Section 116
   Proposed Stopping-Up of Public Highway (Alleygating)
   Various Streets, Preston
   (Preston South East, Preston Central East, Preston South West)

   Authorisation was given to the County Council’s Head of Legal Services to apply to the Local Magistrates for the stopping-up of highways at the rear of various streets in Preston, presented on the grounds that each is no longer necessary for public use. This authorisation had been sought, following the experimental gating of these streets during the last 16 months by Preston City’s Community Safety Partnership as a means of reducing crime and nuisance.

2. School Safety Zones – Lancashire Pilot Project
   (Accrington South, Colne, Heysham, Hillhouse, Morecambe West, Poulton-le-Fylde, Preston Rural West, West Lancashire East, West Lancashire South)

   Following the publication of a joint DfT and DfES report, “Travelling to School: A Good Practice Guide”, local transport authorities were strongly encouraged to consider the case for 20 mph zones around schools, on the grounds that research had shown that the risk of a child being involved in an accident was reduced by two-thirds where these 20 mph zones were installed.

   Approval was given to trial 12 locations across Lancashire as part of the School Safety Zone Pilot Project.
3. **Proposed Prohibition of Waiting Order**  
Hollowhead Lane and The Grange, Wilpshire, Ribble Valley  
Consideration of Objections  
(Ribble Valley South West)

Proposals to prohibit vehicles waiting on Hollowhead Lane and The Grange, Wilpshire were advertised following requests from local residents and a number of personal injury collisions between 1997 and 2002. Despite a number of outstanding objections, approval was given to the making of a Prohibition of Waiting Order on the following two lengths of road:

- On both sides of Hollowhead Lane from a point 41 metres east of its junction with the centre line of A666 Whalley New Road for a distance of 32 metres in an easterly direction;
- On both sides of The Grange from its junction with the centre line of Hollowhead Lane for a distance of 15 metres in a southerly direction.

4. **Extension of Footway/Cycleway, Gillibrand Link Road, Chorley**  
(Chorley West)

Approval was given to commence the scheme to extend the existing footway and cycleway provision alongside the new Gillibrand Link Road to its southern end at Coppull New Road. The cost of the scheme will be met by contributions from Pedestrian Priority Schemes, the Cycling Schemes and School Travel Plans allocations in the 2004/05 Capital Programme.

5. **Local Safety Scheme Ref No 1.199**  
Halton Village, Lancaster District  
Proposed Safety Measures  
(Lancaster Rural Central)

Following public consultation, approval was given to the Local Safety Scheme Ref No 1.199. As a result of concerns raised, two footway build-outs have been excluded from the Scheme at this stage, although further consideration would be given at a future stage, if it were felt that a problem existed.

6. **A683 Hornby Road, Caton, Lancaster District**  
Proposed Provision of Zebra Crossing  
Scheme Approval  
(Lancaster Rural South)

Approval was given to the establishment of a new zebra crossing on the A683 Hornby Road, Caton.
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Executive Summary

Key Decisions taken by the Environment Director.

Recommendation

The Cabinet is asked to note the Key Decisions detailed below.

1. **Approval to the Making of a 20 mph Speed Limit Zonal Order, Including Provision of Road Humps**
   
   Hall Lane Area Zone, Leyland, South Ribble Borough (South Ribble South West)

   Approval was given to the making of a 20 mph Speed Limit Zonal Order, including the installation of road humps. This had been included as part of a traffic-calming scheme by the developer, under Section 278 of the Highways Act 1980, and public advertisement of the proposed Order was carried out in accordance with legal requirements, with no objections being received.

2. **Approval to the Making of a 20 mph Speed Limit Zonal Order, Including the Provision of Road Humps**
   
   Erskine Road Area Zone, Chorley, Chorley Borough (Chorley East)

   Approval was given to the making of a 20 mph Speed Limit Zonal Order, including the installation of road humps, for the Erskine Road Area, Chorley, Chorley Borough.

3. **Approval to the Making of a 20 mph Speed Limit Order, Including the Provision of Road Humps**
   
   Beaconsfield Terrace Area, Chorley, Chorley Borough (Chorley East)

   Approval was given to the making of a 20 mph Speed Limit Zonal Order, including the Installation of road humps for the Beaconsfield Terrace Area, Chorley, Chorley Borough.
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