

Lancashire County Council

Cabinet

Thursday, 2nd February, 2023 at 2.00 pm in Committee Room 'B' - The Diamond Jubilee Room, County Hall, Preston

Supplementary Agenda

We are now able to enclose, for consideration at the next meeting of the Cabinet to be held on Thursday, 2nd February, 2023, the following information which was unavailable when the agenda was despatched

Part I (Open to Press and Public)

No. Item

4. Questions for Cabinet (Pages 1 - 24)

To answer any verbal questions and supplementary questions from a county councillor, about any matter which relates to any item under Part I on the agenda for this meeting under Standing Order C35(7).

There will be a maximum of 30 minutes for the questions to be asked and answered.

19. 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 Chair 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.

(a) Market Sustainability - Funding to Support the Adult Care Market (Pages 25 - 28)

Angie Ridgwell
Chief Executive

County Hall
Preston



Questions to Cabinet

Questions submitted under Standing Order C35

Number of questions to be asked by councillors at the meeting:	2
Number of written questions received from councillors:	0
Number of written questions received from members of the public:	28
Total Number of Questions received for this meeting:	30

No.	To be asked by:	Agenda Item:	Question:	For answer by (Cabinet Member):
1.	County Councillor Kim Snape	Item 17 - Update on the School Place Planning Delivery Programme 2023-25	In regard to the new Chorley & South Ribble planning area for school place provision the report advises there will be a 10 place increase from Parklands Academy and a 15 place increase for Albany Academy. My residents are concerned that because you have merged the two districts together for school place provision this now appears to give a skewed picture of the progress that has been made on secondary school place provision in Chorley Borough. The report fails to mention forthcoming plans from Southlands to reduced their admissions by 30 pupils and plans from Albany to allow up to 15 secondary school places to children from Chorley New Road Primary School in Horwich. Therefore potentially seeing a reduction in minus 45 secondary school places over the next couple of years in Chorley Borough.	County Councillor Jayne Rear



			Therefore can the cabinet member please tell me does this report provide a truly accurate update around secondary school place provision in Chorley Borough?	
2.	County Councillor Erica Lewis	Item 5 - South Lancaster to M6 Road Scheme: Link Road and Park and Ride Facility	In considering the realignment of the Galgate bypass, was further consideration given to a route running along the eastern side of the M6? An eastern alignment would take the road further from homes in the village & the Environment Agency has previously advised that alignment would optimize the flood risk reduction potential of the road.	County Councillor Alan Vincent and County Councillor Aidy Riggott

Questions asked by members of the public – To receive a written response

The following questions and comments have been received by the Cabinet in relation to Agenda Item 5 - South Lancaster to M6 Road Scheme: Link Road and Park and Ride Facility.

Some of the following questions and comments fall outside of the "Questions for Cabinet" rules, and normally therefore may not have appeared in this document. However, in order to ensure transparency on this issue, they have all been included below, and the written response will address the full range of issues raised.



No.	Asked by:	Agenda Item:	Question:	For answer by (Cabinet Member):
1.	Anthony Wood	Item 5 - South Lancaster to M6 Road Scheme: Link Road and Park and Ride Facility	<p>With regards to South Lancaster to M6 Road Scheme: Link Road and Park and Ride Facility. 3x questions below -- #1 being the most important.</p> <p>1) The justification of the South Lancaster to M6 Road appears to be to relieve congestion on the A6.</p> <p>My question is regards congestion: have detailed studies been performed on traffic on the A6 since COVID occurred? Myself and 9,000 of my North West colleagues now go to work a couple of times a month, instead of every day. This is the case for the UK workforce. The result of this is that roads are much quieter than they were pre-COVID. Have studies been performed in the last 12 months to ensure the A6 is still “congested”? I live in view of the A6 and I do not believe it to be the case.</p> <p>2) Can we challenge the mental gymnastics of simultaneously building a car park (Park and Ride) when we are trying to encourage public transport and cycling?</p> <p>3) If there is time, please read and discuss these issues. These concern the new road (South Lancaster to M6). Can you explain:</p>	County Councillor Alan Vincent and County Councillor Aidy Riggott



			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The justification for destroying woodland, wildlife habitats, and the impact on the river's biodiversity. • Why was there no renewed consultation with the residents of Chapel Lane & the local community, whose views will be ruined by new roads/traffic/car parks? • How can the costs be justified and what are the benefits? I thought we were in a cost-of-living crisis. • The flood risks and light pollution of building a road at the back of residents' gardens? • Impact on public footpaths? Instead of minutes from nature and footpaths, the residents now are looking at more roads, car parks & destruction of nature. Why? • And once this work is underway, we have the noise and disruption to our community whilst the natural world is concreted over? 	
2.	Mrs Liz Thomas	Item 5 - South Lancaster to M6 Road Scheme: Link Road and Park and Ride Facility	<p>Where is the evidence that a 500 park and ride facility built on a flood plain is necessary in South Lancaster? The growing confusion surrounding the chaotic and increasingly bizarre and unnecessary development of this area is a shambolic and incompetent mess. When will someone in the council admit that this whole plan needs to be scrapped.</p> <p>Not only is it unnecessary but surely the cost can no longer be justified. There needs to be a full review and full transparency of how much this is going to cost the Lancaster taxpayer.</p>	County Councillor Alan Vincent and County Councillor Aidy Riggott



3.	Paul Tynan	Item 5 - South Lancaster to M6 Road Scheme: Link Road and Park and Ride Facility	<p>As the lay out of the new motorway junction has changed please can you advise about any change to costs? Is there a proposal as to where the costs will fall if there is overrun?</p> <p>2. Please can you supply all the impact assessments that are needed to assess this new layout? I am thinking water run off, air quality, oil into the river Conder. What happens to the footpaths.</p> <p>3. What is the likely use for the park and ride. Is it for people coming into lancaster or for people to car share on their way to work south of lancaster?</p> <p>4 How does this junction connect to any Bailrigg garden village</p>	County Councillor Alan Vincent and County Councillor Aidy Riggott
4.	Darren	Item 5 - South Lancaster to M6 Road Scheme: Link Road and Park and Ride Facility	<p>The increased traffic on Blea Tarn road as even more motorist use to try and bypass the A6 and pointer roundabout back log will be inevitable.will we get a pavement to prevent pedestrian and cycle deaths and injuries?</p> <p>Blea Tarn road will be death trap. Will we get pavement and cycle path?</p>	County Councillor Alan Vincent and County Councillor Aidy Riggott
5.	Robert Jukes	Item 5 - South Lancaster to M6 Road Scheme:	What research has been undertaken to determine the perceived benefits will actually be realised and used?	County Councillor Alan Vincent and



		Link Road and Park and Ride Facility	<p>Has anyone surveyed local residents/ university students to establish if this will likely be used? Have we reviewed the usage of the current park and ride scheme we have?</p> <p>This is increasingly seeming a rushed project with an awful lot of disruption, cost and effort for a new road and park and ride system that will not offer much more than what we already have and which potentially may not be effective.</p> <p>The current park and ride system seems to be under utilised when I drive to work every day. Is it not better to invest the money in further improving our existing infrastructure to further encourage and incentivise using greener methods of transport such as a potential train/ tram link copying the west coast main line into Lancaster and then potentially to Morecambe not be more effective and offer far better benefits? Or even routing the road to Ashton road and invest in a circular road around Lancaster that will alleviate a lot of the one way/ city center traffic and encouraging greater movement of traffic? This would also alleviate a lot of the motorway traffic that occurs every-time the M6 is blocked!</p>	County Councillor Aidy Riggott
6.	Sarah Blackler	Item 5 - South Lancaster to M6 Road Scheme: Link Road and	The details in this Agenda Item have been released only a few days ago, which gives interested members of the public insufficient time to read, understand, and digest the changes implied. They give the appearance of having been rushed out in	County Councillor Alan Vincent and County Councillor Aidy Riggott



		<p>Park and Ride Facility</p>	<p>response to the news that the previous plan involved destroying an ancient wood.</p> <p>In particular why were plans, dated 9 November 2022, released to one Chapel Lane resident in December 2022. to be followed by totally different plans released on January 25 2023 for a County Council meeting on February 2nd?</p> <p>As an interested member of the public I am denied the opportunity to respond carefully to these plans, as I have other matters to attend to, and cannot continually make myself available to consider yet another hastily-put-together plan for this very important area just outside my home city of Lancaster.</p> <p>Accordingly I am indebted to the leaders of CLOUD for the following summary of concerns, which I share wholeheartedly.</p> <p>1) What is the estimated cost of the new additional bridge over the West Coast Main Line? Have Network rail been consulted about this?</p> <p>2) Where precisely will the 500 car Park and Ride be situated and how will the surface water run off be handled? How will pollution of the Conder from oil etc be avoided? How has the flood risk to Galgate been assessed?</p> <p>3) What evidence is there (eg traffic survey?) that a Park and Ride on Hazelrigg Lane will be used and by whom?</p>	
--	--	-------------------------------	--	--



			<p>4) The proposed Bailrigg Garden Village Spine Road appears to have vanished from the latest plans? What does this mean?</p> <p>5) Why the sudden change in plans with almost zero notice to concerned residents?</p> <p>My concerns about this project include, but are not limited to the following:</p> <p>1) The appropriateness and relevance of this and every other plan the County Council has issued on this topic</p> <p>2) The financial implications for the citizens of Lancashire, particularly with costs of raw materials and energy rising exponentially</p> <p>3) The environmental implications of this massive building project, including gas and particulate emissions, as well as destruction of the countryside</p> <p>4) The environmental implications, including gas and particulate emissions, of vehicles using this long piece of motorway extension, in perpetuity.</p> <p>5) The enormous number of houses involved in the sister project of Bailrigg "Garden" Village, which sounds so cosy and green, but which will convert vast acres of land into housing. Each house</p>	
--	--	--	--	--



			will have multiple occupants with yet more pressure on the environment	
7.	Malcolm Martin	Item 5 - South Lancaster to M6 Road Scheme: Link Road and Park and Ride Facility	What evidence is there that the proposed "Park and Ride would alleviate the traffic that is experienced in Lancaster City Centre"? So far as I can see the current Park and Ride (from Junction 34) carries rather less than 9 passengers on average. I submit that this makes the environmental impact greater than if the same number of passengers used private cars. That is without considering the environmental impact of the large swathe of tarmac that these car parks require in the rural location where they are created.	County Councillor Alan Vincent and County Councillor Aidy Riggott
8.	Jane Binnion	Item 5 - South Lancaster to M6 Road Scheme: Link Road and Park and Ride Facility	<p>"This is not a question, it is an objection for this "debate".</p> <p>What you refer to as "south Lancaster" is actually a village called Galgate. A mill village that has been around a long time. We are Not simply an extension of Lancaster, or as this proposal suggests, a university car park for 500 vehicles!</p> <p>We have had threat of this ridiculously over priced scheme to move the junction hanging over us for far too long.</p> <p>We do not need a new junction, it is the university that will benefit, not residents.</p>	County Councillor Alan Vincent and County Councillor Aidy Riggott



			<p>We had the Bay Gateway built with the promise of reduced traffic through Galgate, but that is such a dangerous road people don't like using it.</p> <p>In addition, local residents can not figure out what the heck this map is showing, except that the new motorway is going to cross the railway in 2 places. Why on earth would anyone design something so complicated .</p> <p>If we, as a County are serious about environmental concerns and global warning, creating space for more cars is not the answer (never has been and never will be). And neither is digging up green space for thousands of 4 and 5 bedroom houses (who the heck needs those now-days).</p> <p>The answer is improved public transport. Reinstating a railway station in this area (and yes it can be done). Insisting on a reliable bus service, one that turns up and doesn't become a skeleton service at 5 .45 pm.</p> <p>We are told that putting a railway station in would be too expensive, remind me again please how much this plan will cost.</p> <p>If we care about people and planet we need to stop being so car focussed. We need to think differently and find new solutions.</p>	
9.	Barbara Walker	Item 5 - South Lancaster to M6	What assessment has been made of the flood risk to the village of Galgate from the revised plans for the link roads to Bailrigg	County Councillor Alan Vincent and



		Road Scheme: Link Road and Park and Ride Facility	Garden Village and does this assessment (if it has been done) also take into account the flood risk and dangers from pollution of the Conder be avoided if this plan goes ahead, to current and proposed housing developments alongside the A6 and adjacent to the river Conder?	County Councillor Aidy Riggott
10.	Tony Breakell	Item 5 - South Lancaster to M6 Road Scheme: Link Road and Park and Ride Facility	<p>Why were plans, dated 9 November 2022, showing a revised route for the M6 Link Road released to just one Chapel Lane resident in December 2022, but plans showing a substantially different alignment enclosed with the agenda for Lancashire County Council Cabinet meeting to be held on 2nd February 2023?</p> <p>Note : The November 2022 plans show a different link road alignment to that announced in Transforming Lancaster Travel Issue 2 in March 2021 - but the 2022 plans were only provided to one local resident and not to any of the other residents directly affected by this change.</p>	County Councillor Alan Vincent and County Councillor Aidy Riggott
11.	Mary Breakell	Item 5 - South Lancaster to M6 Road Scheme: Link Road and Park and Ride Facility	<p>Question in relation to the following statement :The Catalyst will create capacity for ... 3,000 new jobs expected on the University campus by 2027</p> <p>Currently there are 3,022 academic and support staff on Lancaster University campus according to the University website.</p>	County Councillor Alan Vincent and County Councillor Aidy Riggott



			<p>What evidence has Lancaster University provided that the numbers employed on campus will double by 2027 as the report to County Cabinet suggests?</p> <p>Note: It is worth bearing in mind that the jobs associated with the new Health Innovation Campus come largely as a result of assistance to small businesses across the North West, rather than being located on campus.</p> <p>This was revealed in a Freedom of Information request to the University in 2019 when they stated :</p> <p>The University confirms that only Phase 1 has funding and is being currently built along with infrastructure works. Phase 1 is to house the Faculty of Health and Medicine. The jobs directly in the Lancaster economy derived from the business case for Phase 1 are as follows : ‘The expenditure of the additional students will support 113 FTEs posts in the local economy and 36.5 FTE posts will be created for additional teaching and administration staff to resource the expanded Faculty and the Innovation Hub. 2.</p> <p>University website (https://www.lancaster.ac.uk/media/lancaster-university/content-assets/documents/facilities/campus-developments/LancasterUniversityEstateStrategy2022-2027.pdf)</p>	
12.	Alison Marriner	Item 5 - South Lancaster to M6 Road Scheme:	When will the final decision be made in relation to South Lancaster Bailrigg Garden Village, specifically how many properties will be built and which precise route will the link road	County Councillor Alan Vincent and



		Link Road and Park and Ride Facility	take. Additionally why has someone had a compulsory purchase order for their land on Chapel Lane, which is a significant distance from any proposed indicated routes? Which routes will construction traffic take to initiate and then complete the proposed plans? As a very concerned residence on Chapelside Drive, It is still unclear to me if full consultation has taken place and/ or will continue to be paramount in all future decision making	County Councillor Aidy Riggott
13.	Chris Adams	Item 5 - South Lancaster to M6 Road Scheme: Link Road and Park and Ride Facility	The revised plan is an expensive route requiring a bridge over the main line railway and 3 more bridges over a river and roads to create a Park and Ride for 500 cars in an area which will exacerbate the existing flood problems for Galgate. What evidence is there that a Park and Ride on Hazelrigg Lane will be used and has the alternative of siting a Park and Ride adjacent to Junction 33 been considered ? This would be a massively cheaper/easier option reducing the traffic through Galgate and the M6 as it could also be used for car sharing on the motorway.	County Councillor Alan Vincent and County Councillor Aidy Riggott
14.	Charles Ainger	Item 5 - South Lancaster to M6 Road Scheme: Link Road and Park and Ride Facility	For the South Lancaster to M6 Road Scheme: Link Road and Park and Ride Facility: What is the estimated total cost, total carbon emissions, and timescale, for constructing the new design of this scheme, that councillors are being asked to approve today; including both crossings of the WCML, and all construction cost	County Councillor Alan Vincent and County Councillor Aidy Riggott



			inflation expected by the time it is built? [Surely councillors need to know this, before giving approval?]"	
15.	Alison Cahn	Item 5 - South Lancaster to M6 Road Scheme: Link Road and Park and Ride Facility	Does this change in the design of the link road alter or impact the agreement between the County and City Councils to fund the shortfall in HIF funding from a development roof tax on 9185 new homes and, if so, what impact will it have?	County Councillor Alan Vincent and County Councillor Aidy Riggott
16.	Frank Blackler	Item 5 - South Lancaster to M6 Road Scheme: Link Road and Park and Ride Facility	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Given that council and government finances are all under considerable strain at present, how confident are the proposers of this new plan in the feasibility of what they are now suggesting? 2. The spine road of the proposed ""Bailrigg Garden Village"" does not appear on these new plans. What has happened to that idea? 3. How well researched is the new ""Park and Ride"" idea? 4. There has been considerable, and long-lasting, local opposition to the developments of which these new proposals are a part. Why have elected officials turned their back on the distress such proposals continue to create? 	County Councillor Alan Vincent and County Councillor Aidy Riggott
17.	Mr Roy Clark	Item 5 - South Lancaster to M6 Road Scheme:	Why do plans put to public consultation (JTP 22 October 2020) bear no resemblance to the iterations discovered by members of	County Councillor Alan Vincent and



		<p>Link Road and Park and Ride Facility</p>	<p>the public and why were the public not consulted on these fundamental changes?</p> <p>Why was a recent plan, dated November 2022, released to only one resident of Chapel Lane in December 2022? Why is this plan radically different to the one now on the agenda for Lancashire County Council Cabinet?</p> <p>The proposed Bailrigg Garden Village Spine Road has vanished from the latest plans, why? Is the Cabinet aware that the HIF fund is specifically for housing infrastructure, not to aid expansion of the University?</p> <p>Where will a Park and Ride (not on the consultation 2020) now be situated. It appears to keep moving, why? Will the Park and ride be available for the University if it is unused in the first 6 months?</p> <p>Are the Cabinet aware of the significant surface water run-off from this 500 vehicle park and ride and the link road? Since LCC engineering options report of 16/09/2020 and EIA by Jacobs February 2022 suggests the run off will use existing water courses, how will the significant environmental pollution, antifreeze, salt, oil, petrol and detritus of the Conder and other water course be avoided?</p> <p>How has the flood risk to Galgate and further downstream been assessed? (the EA has admitted they cannot prevent current flooding, let alone more surface run-off)</p>	<p>County Councillor Aidy Riggott</p>
--	--	---	---	---



			<p>In this latest plan to Cabinet, there is now a new bridge over West Coast Mainline (WCM). Since this line carries more freight than passengers, including nuclear waste, what is the cost to close the mainline during construction of a new bridge over the WCM? Have Network rail been consulted about this? Have plans to build a pumping station under WCM at A6-Hazelrigg (below ground and river Ou Beck level) been abandoned due to cost?</p> <p>With reference to the October 2020 consultation and to a recent plan circulated to one member of the public, showing a new motorway junction 33, with a new roundabout squeezed east of West Coast Mainline and west M6. It was obvious to the layperson by simply checking https://www.standardsforhighways.co.uk/dmrb/ that a roundabout could not fit in the space on LCC plans. Why are LCC planning officers incapable of rudimentary studies of motorways entry, exit lane lengths and roundabout diameters? What have these failed plans and the now pointless site drilling cost the public?</p> <p>With reference to the consultation of October 2022. Since the route was already pre-determined in 2016 (LCC own emails and letters) and a preferred option prior to public consultation (LCC Engineering Options Report, 16/09/2020) Why did Cabinet allow this misleading and deceptive consultation?</p>	
--	--	--	---	--



			Why did Cabinet fail to include 32 dwellings on Chapelside in the consultation?	
18.	Rachel Bindless	Item 5 - South Lancaster to M6 Road Scheme: Link Road and Park and Ride Facility	<p>I would like to raise some serious concerns over the plans for the South Lancaster Road Scheme. I am extremely worried about the planning procedures and the way these have been made available to the public. There seems to be a lack of clear and concise information available and the map showing the route the new road will take is quite frankly awful. We are expected to send in questions and comments on indecipherable information! This does little to support public engagement and is actually quite insulting to residents of Galgate. This is our village and there appears to be little effort to include us in the plans or even to help us understand what the plans are.</p> <p>I have just learned that the road is now to take a new route, due to ancient woodland which apparently was not recorded. This new route seems to cross the West Coast Mainline twice, and seems to take up more space than the last suggestion. Whilst the reports state that this route would be less costly, there does not immediately appear to be evidence to support this claim and no further evidence is given in the report. I feel that the public are not being fully informed as regards the costs, real route and the associated structures and layout. There seem to be more costs than the County list providers for. Who will pay for the rest of the bill? Us Lancastrians and Galatians? The whole County? These are not questions to be ignored. This money is tax payers money</p>	County Councillor Alan Vincent and County Councillor Aidy Riggott



			<p>and we would like to be fully informed of the financial risks to us from this road. The report and information provided is not transparent, has no real meat to it and does not inform residents of vital aspects of the scheme.</p> <p>Hence my questions are as follows:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Where will the new BGV spine be located? It is not shown in the new map, well if it is it is so well disguised as to render the map of little use. 2. What are the actual estimated costs of the new route? 3. Have these costs been tested- will the perceived benefits of the new road justify the millions of pounds of tax payers money needed? 4. Has there ever been any survey/reports done to support the claim that this road will reduce traffic on the A6 at Galgate? 5. Have there ever been any surveys done to determine any other negative effects of the new bypass/road on Galgate and immediate area, such as traffic build up around the new road exit site; pollution impacts to residents living near the new road, etc. 6. Can the public have access to these reports/surveys? 	
--	--	--	---	--



			<p>7. What are the estimated financial costs to local residents from the HIF and the new road scheme?</p> <p>8. What are the estimated environmental costs in terms of runoff, air pollution and noise pollution to local residents from the new road scheme?</p> <p>9. How will the Council explain and justify the incompatibility between Lancaster growth, especially the HIF fund agreement and the potential 9,000 plus new homes AND the South Lancaster Road Scheme and the declared climate emergency? Please can we have access to this justification and be provided with the full reports on how this decision has been reached?</p> <p>10. Due to the dismal maps and other information circulated, will we be reissued with clearer informative data we can actually learn from, or will the County dismiss the right of residents to be fully involved and included in the public consultation process?</p> <p>11. What are the flood risks to Galgate homes from the new road due to run off etc?</p>	
19.	Patricia Jackson	Item 5 - South Lancaster to M6 Road Scheme: Link Road and	Why are residents only now hearing about the proposals& re-configurations regarding the re-routing of link road from junction 33?	County Councillor Alan Vincent and County Councillor Aidy Riggott



		Park and Ride Facility	<p>The latest information is confusing, not to mention tedious for residents to understand & respond to. The plans are very difficult to work out for the lay-person & this is felt to be somewhat deliberate .</p> <p>What exactly is the route for the link road & how does this affect Galgate's status as a village ? - yet again we are to be surrounded by roads , & not one but TWO bridges over the west coast main line , a park& ride for up to 500 cars, & BGV with up to 9000 houses ??</p> <p>Regarding the 500 car park& ride scheme, how sure are developers that people will use this facility as the one at caton rd junction 34 is often empty . - does this really warrant all the extra pollution/ run off flooding & associated traffic problems?</p> <p>Have Network Rail agreed to what will no doubt be massive disruption with not just one , but now two bridge crossings to accommodate the whole ridiculous proposal ?</p> <p>How can the already compromised & ever diminishing countryside, wildlife , flora& fauna ever recover from all this disruption& destruction caused by this all unnecessary expansion & urban sprawl ?</p>	
20.	Anthony John Blendall	Item 5 - South Lancaster to M6	What is the estimated cost of the new additional bridge over the West Coast Main Line at the southern end of the link road route?	County Councillor Alan Vincent and



		Road Scheme: Link Road and Park and Ride Facility	Have Network rail been consulted about this and the need for line closures while the bridge is being constructed?	County Councillor Aidy Riggott
21.	Sara Bundy	Item 5 - South Lancaster to M6 Road Scheme: Link Road and Park and Ride Facility	<p>I see no new road along Highland Brow from the latest proposed new link road. Is it therefore only a link to a park and ride facility, position of which is unclear, as currently Highland Brow is totally unsuitable for all the additional traffic that it will serve assuming Bailrigg Garden Village goes ahead?</p> <p>Why has there been no public consultation about this latest proposal?</p> <p>What is the proposed costing for this scheme and how is it to be paid for?</p>	County Councillor Alan Vincent and County Councillor Aidy Riggott
22.	Robin Jackson	Item 5 - South Lancaster to M6 Road Scheme: Link Road and Park and Ride Facility	On what evidence has the County Council assessed the likely usage of the Park and Ride scheme proposed for Hazelrigg Lane, and does the Council expect usage to be higher than at the existing Park and Ride at Junction 34?	County Councillor Alan Vincent and County Councillor Aidy Riggott



23.	Helen Wilkinson	Item 5 - South Lancaster to M6 Road Scheme: Link Road and Park and Ride Facility	What is the estimated cost of the new additional bridge over the West Coast Main Line? Have Network rail been consulted about this? How will Lancaster City Council ensure that it mitigates against the financial risks of undertaking this build when the roof tax to fund it is set on the development of over 9,000 new houses in the South Lancaster area?	County Councillor Alan Vincent and County Councillor Aidy Riggott
24.	Tom Wilkinson	Item 5 - South Lancaster to M6 Road Scheme: Link Road and Park and Ride Facility	I received confirmation in my FoI request on the 15th of January 2023 that the Council will be liable to clawback clauses for any shortfall in revenue generated through the 'roof tax' payable by developers. Can the council therefore explain why they repeatedly insist that the number of houses earmarked for the scheme is c3,000 yet the number required to generate sufficient 'roof tax' revenue to fund the capital spend to develop this scheme is 9,000+, with any less than that number leaving every council tax payer in the area responsible for finding the rest of the funds for many years?	County Councillor Alan Vincent and County Councillor Aidy Riggott
25.	Mark J Salisbury	Item 5 - South Lancaster to M6 Road Scheme: Link Road and Park and Ride Facility	I am a very concerned South Lancaster resident. In relation to the latest South Lancaster M6 Road Scheme and link road proposals. I would like to raise the following question to Lancashire County Council Cabinet and look forward to receiving a full response -	County Councillor Alan Vincent and County Councillor Aidy Riggott

			In respect of surface water run-off from the new Link Road, what provision and where will it be made for attenuation ponds to cope with storm events and how will pollution of the River Conder and just as importantly from the Whitley Beck which enters the Conder from the inevitable oil deposits and other contaminants from the road, be avoided?	
26.	Heather Ward	Item 5 - South Lancaster to M6 Road Scheme: Link Road and Park and Ride Facility	The new map showing planned road infrastructure appears to leave out the proposed spine road running north-south through Bailrigg Garden Village, and associated spur roads connecting the spine to the A588 and Ashford Road. The road shown appears to stop at Shearset Beck Bridge just to the west of the proposed West Coast Main Line underpass. Is this an oversight or has the spine road been abandoned as part of the HIF-funded infrastructure?	County Councillor Alan Vincent and County Councillor Aidy Riggott
27.	Emily Heath	Item 5 - South Lancaster to M6 Road Scheme: Link Road and Park and Ride Facility	Does the changed design of the road alter the HIF - County grant agreement for £140M, or not?	County Councillor Alan Vincent and County Councillor Aidy Riggott
28.	Jo Carruthers	Item 5 - South Lancaster to M6	I was very concerned to see the new proposals (which have been subject to insufficient consultation of residents), which include the	County Councillor Alan Vincent and



		<p>Road Scheme: Link Road and Park and Ride Facility</p>	<p>building of a 500-space Park and Ride car park. In view of the recent flooding in the Galgate area, I'm concerned about the run off from such a large footprint build and so can the Council please outline their plans for surface water run off and assessment of flood risk to Galgate and the Bailrigg area. If there are no plans, why is this and how can the council justify progression on the scheme without them? The park and ride also runs the risk of pollution to the river Condor - please can the council also outline assessments done for potential pollution and its mitigation. This is a huge concern to me in view of my children's, as well as other residents', health.</p>	<p>County Councillor Aidy Riggott</p>
--	--	--	---	---



Report to the Cabinet

Meeting to be held on Thursday, 2 February 2023

Report of the Executive Director of Adult Services and Health & Wellbeing

Part I

Electoral Division affected:
(All Divisions);

Corporate Priorities:
Caring for the vulnerable;

Market Sustainability - Funding to Support the Adult Care Market

Contact for further information:

Mike Alsop, Tel: 01772 539256, Senior Commissioning Manager

mike.alsop@lancashire.gov.uk

Brief Summary

This report sets out a proposal to provide financial support to providers of adult social care who contract with Lancashire County Council. This proposal utilises specific government funding, which has been provided to ensure both adult social care market sustainability and to support the NHS to safely discharge people home from hospital or to avoid admissions.

This is deemed to be a Key Decision and the requirements of Standing Order C21 have been complied with. Compliance with Standing Orders C19 and C20 was not possible due to the decision on the overall use of Discharge funding only being made recently through external NHS governance, and the urgency of the support required by the care market in order for providers to utilise the monies to maintain support levels and meet demand for care and support.

Recommendation

Cabinet is asked to approve:

(i) The utilisation of the following funding:

- £1.2m Fair cost of care funding available for 2022-23.
- £0.6m Discharge funding to support the provider market.

(ii) The recommended mechanism detailed within the report, for the allocation of

funding to providers.

This decision should be implemented immediately for the purposes of Standing Order C28(3) as any delay could adversely affect the execution of the county council's responsibilities. The reason for this is to support adult social care provider sustainability during the winter period, in order to support safe discharge from hospital, and to prevent unnecessary admissions to hospital. It is therefore vital that providers can receive any agreed funding as soon as possible.

Detail

Lancashire County Council recognises the additional costs that its care providers are facing over this winter period, stemming from continued inflationary pressures in addition to the national pressure on the Health and Care system relating to recruitment and retention of staff.

Lancashire County Council has received some national funding to support Hospital Discharge from the recently announced '£500m Discharge Fund', to be utilised in the period 1 December 2022 to 31 March 2023, in agreement with the county council's NHS partners in the Lancashire and South Cumbria Integrated Care Board. As part of the approved submission, the county council requested that some of the funding be used to sustain the provider market during this winter period.

Lancashire County Council has also received national funding for 'Market Sustainability and Fair Cost of Care', of which some funding has already been used to support fee uplifts to providers in 2022-23. The remainder of this funding can therefore be utilised to support the provider market during this winter period, which is in line with the prescribed grant conditions requiring Local Authorities to pass on at least 75% of the funding to providers, to improve market sustainability.

Proposal

To support the provider market, the proposal is to utilise the available funding which is:

- £1.2m Fair cost of care funding available for 2022-23.
- £0.6m Discharge to Access funding to support the provider market.

Utilising this total funding of £1.8m, it is proposed that a one-off grant be awarded to contracted providers, based on the numbers of Lancashire County Council service users supported within the Lancashire boundary as at 30 September 2022.

The county council will issue grant conditions to providers, with the expectation that 75% of any one-off funding will be allocated to employee pay (i.e. salary and employers on costs), with the remaining 25% supporting business running costs. This will be monitored through the county council's usual contract monitoring processes.



The total amount of £1.8m supports a payment of £122.95 per service user supported. All funding will be paid within the current financial year, (i.e. prior to the 31 March 2023. and no further adjustments will be made to the amounts per provider or to the amount payable.

Consultation with providers

The county council's regular provider fora for residential and homecare met in December 2022 and were attended by senior commissioning staff. Discussion took place with regards to cost pressures being faced by providers who requested additional financial support now and considered that, to wait until April for the annual fee uplifts would severely affect their sustainability in the short term, particularly over the winter period which is more challenging to meet demand for care.

These discussions echoed previous consultation with providers of both homecare and residential and nursing care, during the recent 'Fair Cost of Care' exercise with pressures around staff recruitment, general inflation, and energy costs particularly for residential and nursing providers cited.

Providers reported that their ability to continue to attract and retain staff, remain sustainable, and therefore be in a position to maintain or increase current levels of care was likely to be impacted without some additional financial support. This is borne out by the county council's ability to secure appropriate packages of care in a timely manner in some areas of Lancashire.

Implications:

This item has the following implications, as indicated:

Financial

The proposal in this report will cost approximately £1.8m, with the funding being entirely provided through additional grant funding for 2022/23. This proposal will not impact on the currently reported forecast outturn position for 2022/23.

The proposed use of this funding is in line with the prescribed grant conditions, and is time specific in that it has to be utilised before 31 March 2023. Failure to utilise the funding within this timeframe may result in a requirement to pay it back to the Department of Health and Social Care.

Legal

The county council is advised to ensure that any relevant obligation placed on it by the central funding body(ies) is mutually applied to service providers.

Section 5 of the Care Act sets out a duty to ensure quality in the provision of service. In performing this duty, the county council must ensure the sustainability of the market as is the aim of this proposal.



Risk management

There would be a risk to the viability of some individual providers in Lancashire, if the proposed one-off funding is not agreed. The county council has undertaken regular and specific consultation with providers such as the Fair Cost of Care exercise to inform this assessment. Any loss of provision would severely impact on the council's ability to meet people's care needs, prevention of hospital admission and the ability to return people home from hospital.

It is likely that there will be continuing pressure on the care market in the short to medium term. Unprecedented increases in energy costs bring significant financial risk to residential and nursing home providers, and it is not possible to predict future energy costs at this time. There is a continuing risk of provider failure and/or of providers handing back contracts, should they consider that it is not viable for them to continue to provide services. Commissioning staff will continue to monitor the market and engage with providers and the NHS to mitigate any risk where possible.

List of Background Papers

Paper	Date	Contact/Tel
-------	------	-------------

None

Reason for inclusion in Part II, if appropriate

N/A

