

Minutes

At a meeting of the Full Council held at Council Chamber, County Hall, Preston,
on Wednesday, 2 September, 2015

Present:

County Councillor Margaret Brindle (Chairman)

County Councillors

T Aldridge	J Fillis	J Oakes
A Ali	J Gibson	M Otter
T Ashton	G Gooch	M Parkinson
A Atkinson	M Green	N Penney
M Barron	J Hanson	S Perkins
L Beavers	Dr M Hassan	C Pritchard
D Borrow	P Hayhurst	S Prynne
I Brown	C Henig	A Schofield
K Brown	N Hennessy	K Sedgewick
T Brown	S Holgate	S Serridge
P Buckley	D Howarth	J Shedwick
T Burns	K Iddon	R Shewan
Mrs S Charles	M Iqbal	D T Smith
A Cheetham	A James	K Snape
A Clempson	M Johnstone	D Stansfield
D Clifford	A Jones	V Taylor
Mrs F Craig-Wilson	A Kay	D Watts
C Crompton	J Lawrenson	D Westley
M Dad	T Martin	D Whipp
B Dawson	J Mein	P White
F De Molfetta	G Molineux	G Wilkins
C Dereli	Y Motala	B Winlow
M Devaney	B Murray	B Yates
G Dowding	D O'Toole	
K Ellard	Mrs L Oades	

1. Apologies and Announcements

Apologies

Apologies were presented on behalf of County Councillors Alyson Barnes, Peter Britcliffe, Geoff Driver, Dorothy Lord, Richard Newman-Thompson, Mark Perks, Paul Rigby, Jeff Sumner, Matthew Tomlinson and Christian Wakeford

Announcements

There were no announcements.

2. Disclosure of Pecuniary and Non-Pecuniary Interests

None disclosed.

3. Confirmation of Minutes from meeting held 23 July 2015

Resolved: That the Minutes of the meeting of the County Council held on the 23 July 2015 be confirmed and signed by the Chair.

4. Review of Electoral Boundaries in Lancashire

The report explained that the Local Government Boundary Commission for England (LGBCE) was undertaking an electoral review of Lancashire County Council's electoral arrangements because of electoral imbalances that had arisen since the last review in 2003/04.

The Boundary Commission was consulting on patterns for the County Council Electoral Divisions and the Full Council was now being asked to consider recommendations from the Political Governance Working Group (PGWG) on the County Council's proposal to the Boundary Commission on Electoral Division patterns.

The Chairman recommended that the proposals for each district be considered and voted on in turn, and that any amendments be dealt with as the relevant district was being discussed; all members would be able to speak once on each district proposal should they so wish. The meeting consented to this approach.

In moving the report County Councillor David Borrow, Chair of the PGWG, explained that, whilst the Boundary Commission's consultation on divisional patterns had ended on 31 August, the Boundary Commission had granted the County Council, and also Political Groups, a small extension of time to 3 September to submit proposals.

Appendix A to the report now presented summarised each of the recommendations of the PGWG for which there was a corresponding map setting out:

- existing and proposed divisional boundaries,
- the projected electorate and relative variance for each proposed division by 2021,
- the number of councillors recommended for each proposed division, and
- recommended divisional names.

The detailed proposals, including the maps referred to above are available to view [here](#).

In some cases the PGWG had recommended more than one proposal.

Burnley

The PGWG had recommended one proposal. Upon being put to the vote it was:

Resolved: that the proposed divisional pattern for Burnley, as set out in the report now presented, be approved for submission to the Boundary Commission.

Chorley

The PGWG had recommended two proposals as presented by Chorley Borough Council. Upon being put to the vote it was:

Resolved: that the two proposed divisional patterns for Chorley, as set out in the report now presented, be approved for submission to the Boundary Commission.

Fylde

The PGWG had recommended two proposals; a preferred proposal 1 to retain the status quo and a proposal 2 as an alternative for the Boundary Commission to consider if it was not minded to agree proposal 1. Upon being put to the vote it was:

Resolved: that the two proposed divisional patterns for Fylde, as set out in the report now presented, be approved for submission to the Boundary Commission and that, of these, proposal 1 be submitted as the preferred option.

Hyndburn

The PGWG had recommended one proposal. Upon being put to the vote it was:

Resolved: that the proposed divisional pattern for Hyndburn, as set out in the report now presented, be approved for submission to the Boundary Commission.

Lancaster

The PGWG had recommended one proposal.

CC Gina Dowding moved an **Amendment** which was seconded by CC Liz Oades. The amendment was submitted in the form of a map which had been circulated in advance to all members, a copy of which is attached to these minutes.

On being put to the vote the amendment was lost. The original motion was then put to the vote and was carried and it was:

Resolved: that the proposed divisional pattern for Lancaster, as set out in the report now presented, be approved for submission to the Boundary Commission.

Pendle

The PGWG had recommended one proposal. Upon being put to the vote it was:

Resolved: that the proposed divisional pattern for Pendle, as set out in the report now presented, be approved for submission to the Boundary Commission.

Preston

The PGWG had put forward two proposals; both options recommended a reduction from 10 to 9 divisions, but each achieved this in a different way. The PGWG recommended proposal 1 with a second preference for proposal 2.

Resolved: that the two proposed divisional patterns for Preston, as set out in the report now presented, be approved for submission to the Boundary Commission and that, of these, proposal 1 be submitted as the preferred option.

Ribble Valley

The PGWG had put forward two proposals; proposal 1 recommended four divisions and proposal 2 recommended two single-member divisions and one two-member division. The PGWG recommended proposal 1 with a second preference for proposal 2.

It was moved by CC Albert Atkinson and seconded by CC Alan Schofield that the recommendation be **amended** and that only proposal 2 be submitted to the Boundary Commission. On being put to the vote the amendment was lost.

It was then moved by CC David Whipp and seconded by CC Bill Winlow that the recommendation be **amended** and that only proposal 1 be submitted to the Boundary Commission. On being put to the vote the amendment was lost.

The original motion was then put to the vote and was carried and it was:

Resolved: that the two proposed divisional patterns for Ribble Valley, as set out in the report now presented, be approved for submission to the Boundary Commission and that, of these, proposal 1 be submitted as the preferred option.

Rossendale

The PGWG had put forward three proposals each with a different approach to correcting the electoral imbalances in Rossendale.

It was moved by CC David Stansfield and seconded by CC Clare Pritchard that the recommendation be **amended** and that only proposal 1 be submitted to the Boundary Commission. On being put to the vote the amendment was carried and therefore became the substantive motion, which on being put to the vote was carried and it was:

Resolved: that the proposed divisional pattern for Rossendale, as set out in proposal 1 in the report now presented, be approved for submission to the Boundary Commission.

South Ribble

The PGWG had put forward two proposals; proposal 1 recommended eight single-member divisions, proposal 2 recommended five single-member divisions and one three-member division. The PGWG had recommended proposal 1 with a second preference for proposal 2.

It was moved by CC David Watts and seconded by CC David Howarth that the recommendation be **amended** and that only proposal 1 be submitted to the Boundary Commission. On being put to the vote the amendment was carried and therefore became the substantive motion, which on being put to the vote was carried and it was:

Resolved: that the proposed divisional pattern for South Ribble, as set out in proposal 1 in the report now presented, be approved for submission to the Boundary Commission.

West Lancashire

The PGWG had recommended one proposal. Upon being put to the vote it was:

Resolved: that the proposed divisional pattern for West Lancashire, as set out in the report now presented, be approved for submission to the Boundary Commission.

Wyre

The PGWG had recommended one proposal. Upon being put to the vote it was:

Resolved: that the proposed divisional pattern for Wyre, as set out in the report now presented, be approved for submission to the Boundary Commission.

5. Full Council Meetings 2015/16.

A number of changes to the timetable of Full Council meetings for 2015/16 had been proposed, as set out on the agenda.

In moving the recommendation the Leader proposed that the request to change the date of the meeting scheduled for 25 February to 24 February be withdrawn. It was therefore moved and seconded that the:

- Meeting scheduled for 1 October 2015 now be held at 1.30pm on 22 October 2015; and
- Budget meeting scheduled for 11 February 2016 now be treated as the ordinary meeting and the meeting scheduled for 25 February 2016 now be treated as the Budget meeting.

County Councillor David Whipp moved the following Amendment which was seconded by County Councillor David Howarth:

To delete the recommendation that the:

- Budget meeting scheduled for 11 February 2016 to now be treated as the ordinary meeting and that the meeting scheduled for 25 February 2016 be treated as the Budget meeting.

On being put to the vote the Amendment was carried and became the substantive motion, which on being put to the vote was carried and it was therefore,

Resolved: That it be agreed the Full Council meeting scheduled for 1 October 2015 now be held at 1.30pm on 22 October 2015.

6. Notice of Motion

Notice of Motion submitted under Procedural Standing Order 14.2.1(a).

It was moved by County Councillor Bill Winlow and seconded by County Councillor Paul Hayhurst that:

"Over the last few weeks we have witnessed United Utilities struggle to contain an outbreak of *Cryptosporidium*. Apart from the obvious public health risk, this has led to business damage and great inconvenience for over 300,000 residents in Lancashire. The prolonged period for which this situation has continued appears to have been due to a failure of inspection and regulatory procedures and an apparently inadequate contingency plan for dealing with such an outbreak.

Lancashire County Council therefore instructs the Chief Executive to write to the Prime Minister, the Secretary of State for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs, the Minister for Health and to the Minister for Energy and Climate Change drawing their attention to the inadequacy of regulation in major industries, particularly in the light of the 14th round of onshore oil and gas licence awards covering much of England. We also request that Central Government should put in place rigorous, independent regulatory and inspection regimes for industries which affect Public Health, above all improved purification of domestic water supplies, and the treatment and disposal of contaminated waste water."

County Councillor Azhar Ali moved the following **amendment** which was seconded by County Councillor Marcus Johnstone:

Add the following words between the first and second paragraphs:

"Lancashire County Council recognises the work of the multi-agency strategic coordination group that is chaired by Lancashire County Council's Director of Public Health and includes a number of district councils and government departments. This Council further recognises the work of LCC's Emergency Planning and Public Health Teams in preventing any major sickness outbreaks."

County Councillor Winlow accepted the amendment to his motion which combined became the substantive Motion, which on being put to the vote was carried and it was:

Resolved: That,

"Over the last few weeks we have witnessed United Utilities struggle to contain an outbreak of *Cryptosporidium*. Apart from the obvious public health risk, this has led to business damage and great inconvenience for over 300,000 residents in Lancashire. The prolonged period for which this situation has continued appears to have been due to a failure of inspection and regulatory procedures and an apparently inadequate contingency plan for dealing with such an outbreak.

Lancashire County Council recognises the work of the multi-agency strategic coordination group that is chaired by Lancashire County Council's Director of Public Health and includes a number of district councils and government departments. This Council further recognises the work of LCC's Emergency Planning and Public Health Teams in preventing any major sickness outbreaks.

Lancashire County Council therefore instructs the Chief Executive to write to the Prime Minister, the Secretary of State for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs, the Minister for Health and to the Minister for Energy and Climate Change drawing their attention to the inadequacy of regulation in major industries, particularly in the light of the 14th round of onshore oil and gas licence awards covering much of England. We also request that Central Government should put in place rigorous, independent regulatory and inspection regimes for industries

which affect Public Health, above all improved purification of domestic water supplies, and the treatment and disposal of contaminated waste water."

Jo Turton
Chief Executive

County Hall
Preston