

COUNCIL

**REMOTE MEETING HELD
ON 4 MARCH 2021**

PRESENT: Councillor Burns (in the Chair)
Councillor Robinson (Vice-Chair)

Councillors Atkinson, Bennett, Blackburne, Bradshaw, Brennan, Brodie - Browne, Brough, Byrom, Carr, Carragher, Cluskey, Cummins, Dawson, Dodd, Dowd, Doyle, Dutton, Evans, Fairclough, Friel, Gannon, Grace, Halsall, Hands, Hardy, Howard, Irving, Keith, John Kelly, John Joseph Kelly, Killen, Lappin, Lewis, McCann, McGinnity, McKinley, Moncur, Morris, Murphy, Myers, O'Brien, O'Hanlon, Pitt, Pugh, Pullin, Roche, Roscoe, Sathiy, John Sayers, Yvonne Sayers, Shaw, Spencer, Anne Thompson, Lynne Thompson, Tweed, Veidman, Waterfield, Sir Ron Watson and Webster

58. MAYOR'S WELCOME

The Mayor took the opportunity to welcome Members to the remote meeting of Sefton Council and extended a special welcome to members of the public who were viewing the meeting online. This meeting was being held using Microsoft Teams Live Events software. A protocol for Members attending remote meetings had been circulated prior to the meeting and Members were respectfully requested to adhere to the protocol.

The Mayor advised all Members who were nominated Spokespersons or Movers and Seconders of Motions to turn their cameras off and mute their microphones when not addressing the meeting. The Mayor also advised that any of the nominated Spokespersons, Movers and Seconders of Motions who would like to address the meeting at any time should indicate by using the chat facility in Microsoft Teams and emphasised that the chat facility should only be used to indicate the wish to speak.

The Mayor further advised that all Members who were not nominated Spokespersons should turn their camera off and mute their microphone, and that they should only un-mute their microphone to confirm their attendance and to state how they wished to vote.

The Mayor highlighted that during the meeting Members should indicate their agreement to an item in the usual way and in the case of an item not being agreed, a vote would be taken on the item. The vote would be taken by an officer asking each member in alphabetical order to indicate their vote. Members should turn on their microphones when it was their turn to vote but that there was no need to turn on their camera.

59. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Maher and Thomas.

60. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

No declarations of any disclosable pecuniary interests or personal interests were received.

61. MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING

RESOLVED:

That the Minutes of the Council Meeting held on 21 January 2021 be approved as a correct record.

62. MAYOR'S COMMUNICATIONS

Liverpool City Region Culture & Creativity Awards

The Mayor reported on the Liverpool City Region Culture and Creativity Awards that was held virtually on 19 February 2021 and congratulated Claire Morgans of YKids who received the award for the Borough of Culture Star of the Year. The Mayor also congratulated the Atkinson Centre for their success in winning two awards; The People's Choice for Outstanding Contribution to Culture and The Impact Award – Covid 19 Creative Response. The Mayor reported that it was a pleasure to watch the awards and to see the Borough recognised for all its hard work.

The Mayor also thanked the Cabinet Member for Communities and Housing's speech at the Awards when handing over the Borough of Culture to Halton Borough Council and on behalf of the Council she wished them all the best for their year.

Former Councillor Lord Fearn

The Mayor reported that former Councillor Lord Fearn had recently celebrated his 90th Birthday and on behalf of the Council she extended its Best Wishes to him.

63. MATTERS RAISED BY THE PUBLIC

The Mayor reported that no matters had been raised by members of the public.

64. QUESTIONS RAISED BY MEMBERS OF THE COUNCIL

The Mayor reported that the schedule setting out the questions submitted by Members of the Council together with the response by the appropriate Cabinet Member had been e-mailed to all Members of the Council.

The Mayor further reported on the following procedure for the asking of supplementary questions at the remote meeting of Council.

Members would be given the opportunity to ask one supplementary question of the Leader/Cabinet Member and those questions should be e-mailed to the Chief Legal and Democratic Officer by 4 p.m. the following day after the Council Meeting, Friday 5 March 2021. It was further reported that the answers to the supplementary questions would be e-mailed directly to the Councillor by 4 p.m. on the Monday following the Council meeting, date being 8 March 2021.

The Mayor indicated that the Democratic Services Manager or her colleague would e-mail all Members of the Council with the complete supplementary question and answer schedule the following week after Council.

The Mayor reminded Members when submitting a supplementary question that the question should be a question and not a statement and furthermore must arise directly out of the original question or the reply.

65. PRUDENTIAL INDICATORS 2021/22

Further to Minute No. 99 of the meeting of the Cabinet held on 11 February 2021 the Council considered the report of the Executive Director of Corporate Resources and Customer Services advising that the CIPFA Prudential Code for Capital Finance in Local Authorities was introduced following the Local Government Act 2003; that it detailed a number of measures / limits / parameters (Prudential Indicators) that were required to be set each financial year; and that the approval of these limits would provide a benchmark to measure actual performance against, to help ensure that the Council complied with relevant legislation, was acting prudently and that its capital expenditure proposals were affordable.

The report indicated that the Council was required to approve Prudential Indicators for the following items:

- (i) Capital Expenditure (Section 2);
- (ii) Financing Costs/Net Revenue Stream (Section 3);
- (iii) Capital Financing Requirement (Section 4);
- (iv) External Debt (Section 5-7); and
- (v) Treasury Management Indicators (Section 8).

It was moved by Councillor Fairclough, seconded by Councillor Atkinson and

RESOLVED: That:

- (1) the Prudential Indicators, as detailed in the report, be approved as the basis for compliance with The Prudential Code for Capital Finance in Local Authorities;
- (2) it be noted that the relevant Prudential Indicators will be revised as required and that any changes will be brought to Cabinet and then to Council for approval;
- (3) it be noted that the estimates of capital expenditure may change as grant allocations are received; and
- (4) delegated authority be granted to the Executive Director for Corporate Resources and Customer Services in conjunction with the Cabinet Member for Regulatory, Compliance and Corporate Services to manage the Authorised Limit and Operational Boundary for external debt as detailed in Section 5 of the report.

66. TREASURY MANAGEMENT POLICY AND STRATEGY 2021/22

Further to Minute No. 100 of the meeting of the Cabinet held on 11 February 2021 the Council considered the report of the Executive Director of Corporate Resources and Customer Services that set out the following proposed policy and strategy documents, namely, the Treasury Management Policy, as set out in Annex A to the report; the Treasury Management Strategy, as set out Annex B to the report and the Minimum Revenue Provision Policy Statement, as set out in Annex C to the report.

The report indicated that the Council had adopted CIPFA's revised 2017 Code of Practice on Treasury Management in the Public Services which recommended the production of annual Treasury Management Policy and Strategy Documents; and that in addition, the Council had adopted and incorporated into both documents:

- (a) the requirements of the 2017 Prudential Code for Capital Finance in Local Authorities; and
- (b) an Investment Strategy produced in line with the Ministry of Housing Communities and Local Government (MHCLG) Statutory Guidance on Local Government Investments 2018. This set out the manner in which the Council would manage its investments, giving priority to the security and liquidity of those investments.

It was moved by Councillor Fairclough, seconded by Councillor Lappin and

RESOLVED: That:

- (1) the Treasury Management Policy Document for 2021/22 be approved;

- (2) the Treasury Management Strategy Document for 2021/22 be approved; and
- (3) the Minimum Revenue Provision Policy Statement 2021/22 be approved.

67. CAPITAL STRATEGY 2021/22 TO 2025/26

Further to Minute No. 101 of the meeting of the Cabinet held on 11 February 2021 the Council considered the report of the Executive Director of Corporate Resources and Customer Services indicating that the Capital Strategy set out the long-term context in which capital expenditure and investment decisions were made and considered the impact of these decisions on the priorities within the Council's Core Purpose and Framework for Change Programme and the promises made in the 2030 Vision for Sefton; that at the heart of the Capital Strategy was the Council's core objective to continue to deliver financial sustainability; and that as such, a flexible capital investment programme was more important than ever as a method to stimulate and enable economic growth and strategic investment, ensuring best use of existing assets and of generating future income streams to pay for and deliver day to day services.

The Capital Strategy, attached to the report as Annex A, was a statutory document that the Council was required to have in place and be reviewed on an annual basis.

It was moved by Councillor Fairclough, seconded by Councillor Atkinson and:

RESOLVED:

That the Capital Strategy as set out in Annex A to the report be approved.

68. ROBUSTNESS OF THE 2021/22 BUDGET ESTIMATES AND THE ADEQUACY OF RESERVES – LOCAL GOVERNMENT ACT 2003 - SECTION 25

Further to Minute No. 102 of the meeting of the Cabinet held on 11 February 2021 the Council considered the report of the Executive Director of Corporate Resources and Customer Services indicating that to comply with statute, the Chief Financial Officer was required to report to Council prior to the approval of the budget and the setting of the Council Tax, to give assurance that the budget was robust and that there were adequate reserves and balances.

The report also provided information on the following factors that had been considered:

- Financial Environment for Local Government and Sefton MBC

- Impact of previous years' budget - 2020/21
- Central Government funding
- Maintaining service delivery
- Inflation and annual cost increases
- Financial management
- CIPFA Financial Resilience Index and the CIPFA Financial Management Code
- Management of risk
- Capital Strategy and Strategic Investment
- External advice
- Reserves Strategy for 2021/22

The report concluded that as a result of considering the issues contained within the report, it was the view that the budget proposed was a robust budget package and the opinion provided was in accordance with Section 25 of the Local Government Act 2003.

It was moved by Councillor Fairclough, seconded by Councillor Lappin and

RESOLVED: That:

- (1) it be noted that the Local Government Act 2003, (section 25 as amended) requires the Chief Financial Officer to report formally on the following issues:
 - (a) an opinion as to the robustness of the estimate made and the tax setting calculations;
 - (b) the adequacy of the proposed financial reserves; and
 - (c) the production of longer-term revenue and capital plans; and
- (2) the matters raised in this report be taken into consideration during the final stages of determining the budget for 2021/22.

69. REVENUE AND CAPITAL BUDGET PLAN 2021/22 – 2024/25 AND COUNCIL TAX 2021/22

Further to Minute No. 103 of the meeting of the Cabinet held on 11 February 2021 the Council considered the joint report of the Chief Executive and the Executive Director of Corporate Resources and Customer Services that provided:

- an assessment of the Council's current financial position and approach to the 2021/22 Budget Plan and preparation for the three-year budget period 2022/23 to 2024/25;
- an update on the Government's announcement of resources that were available to the Council for 2021/22;

COUNCIL- THURSDAY 4TH MARCH, 2021

- the Council's current financial position and the assumptions built into the Medium-Term Financial Plan;
- the proposed Budget for 2021/22; and
- the proposed Capital Programme for 2021/22.

The report set out the financial strategy of the Council and the national and local financial context within which it was operating and indicated that the Council had a statutory requirement to remain financially sustainable and to balance its budget every year.

The report also indicated that the Council's Framework for Change Programme was a comprehensive and ambitious programme that sought to support the delivery of the Council's core purpose; and that as would be expected with a programme of this size and complexity that spanned a number of financial years, the detailed proposals had been and would continue to be the subject of change as they were developed and ultimately implemented.

It was moved by Councillor Fairclough, seconded by Councillor Hardy

That:

- (A) in respect of the Budget 2021/22 and Medium-Term Financial Plan from 2022/23 to 2024/25:
- (1) the update of the Medium-Term Financial Plan for the period 2021/22 to 2024/25, be noted;
 - (2) the Revenue Budget for 2021/22 and authorisation for officers to undertake all of the necessary actions to implement the budget changes and proposals as detailed within the report, be approved;
 - (3) the continuation of the Framework for Change 2020 Programme (as described in Section 3) and agreement to the commencement of all appropriate activity as detailed, including for example, consultation with employees and engagement with partners and contractual changes as the programme develops, be approved;
 - (4) the current levels of trade union facility time and associated arrangements for the whole period of the budget plan for 2021/22 – 2024/25, be approved;
 - (5) it be noted that officers will comply with agreed HR policies and procedures including relevant consultation with Trade Unions and reports to the Cabinet Member Regulatory, Compliance and Corporate Services as required;
 - (6) the Schools' Forum decisions on the Dedicated Schools Grant and Individual School Budgets (Section 12), be noted;
 - (7) the allocation of specific grants as detailed in the report (Section 13), be noted;

COUNCIL- THURSDAY 4TH MARCH, 2021

- (8) the overall Council Tax resolution for 2021/22 including Police, Fire, Mayoral and Parish Precepts, be approved;
- (B) in respect of the Capital Programme 2021/22 to 2022/23:
 - (1) the supplementary capital estimate of £12.750m for the Street Lighting Asset Project detailed in Section 17 of the report be approved; and
 - (2) all of the remaining capital schemes as detailed in Section 17 of the report along with the full list of other projects in Appendix C of the report, be approved for inclusion within the Capital Programme.

Councillors Fairclough, Pugh, Brough and McCann each gave a statement expressing the views of their political groups on the content of the report and the budget proposals.

Following debate on the report, an **amendment** was moved by Councillor Pugh, seconded by Councillor Keith:

That the budget proposals set out in the report be amended by the addition of the following recommendation:

Gully Cleansing

Recognising

- (1) the many significant adjustments made in this budget due to Covid and other unexpected pressures
- (2) the increasing risks of flooding caused by Climate Change
- (3) that in excess of 95% of the borough's gullies are only cleared once a year

The Council allocates an additional 40K to fund additional gully cleansing in areas that have proved particularly susceptible to surface flooding to be funded at the discretion of Cabinet by the use of any of the following budget mechanisms or combination thereof

- (a) reducing the £1.5M planned contribution to balances
- (b) reducing the provision for ICT contract inflation
- (c) increasing the vacancy management target
- (d) varying the contribution from the school closure fund

OR

by any other means consistent with the Budget priorities laid out in Sec 11 of the Council's Agenda allowing an extra 7,500 gullies in flooding hotspots to be cleared more than once a year.

Following debate and in accordance with Rule 97 of Chapter 4 in the Constitution, the voting on the Amendment was recorded and the Members of the Council present at the time, voted as follows:

FOR THE AMENDMENT:

Councillors Brodie-Browne, Brough, Dawson, Dodd, Evans, Gannon, Irving, Keith, Lewis, Morris, O'Hanlon, Pitt, Pugh, Pullin, Sathiy, Shaw, Lynne Thompson and Sir Ron Watson.

AGAINST THE AMENDMENT:

Councillors Atkinson, Blackburne, Bradshaw, Brennan, Byrom, Carr, Carragher, Cluskey, Cummins, Dowd, Doyle, Fairclough, Friel, Grace, Halsall, Hardy, Howard, John Kelly, John Joseph Kelly, Killen, Lappin, McCann, McGinnity, McKinley, Moncur, Murphy, Myers, O'Brien, Robinson, Roche, Roscoe, John Sayers, Yvonne Sayers, Spencer, Anne Thompson, Tweed, Viedman, Waterfield, Webster and The Mayor

The Mayor declared that the Amendment was **lost** by 18 votes to 40.

Following the vote on the amendment, a further **amendment** was moved by Councillor Pugh, seconded by Councillor Brodie-Browne:

Democratic Services

Recognising

- (1) the huge democratic deficit that exists in Sefton
- (2) the need in all parts of the borough to provide the opportunity for citizen to cross question their elected representatives on local schemes and provision, facilitating public scrutiny and input

The Council allocates a sum of 20K to Democratic Services to cover the part-year cost of reintroducing Area Committee to be funded at the discretion of Cabinet by the use of any of the following budget mechanisms or combination thereof

- (a) reducing the £1.5M planned contribution to balances
- (b) reducing the provision for ICT contract inflation
- (c) increasing the vacancy management target
- (d) varying the contribution from the school closure fund

OR

by any other means consistent with the Budget priorities laid out in Sec 11 of the Council's Agenda.

Following debate and in accordance with Rule 97 of Chapter 4 in the Constitution, the voting on the Amendment was recorded and the Members of the Council present at the time, voted as follows:

FOR THE AMENDMENT:

Councillors Brodie-Browne, Brough, Dawson, Dodd, Dutton, Evans, Irving, Keith, Lewis, Morris, O'Hanlon, Pitt, Pugh, Pullin, Sathiy, Shaw, Lynne Thompson and Sir Ron Watson.

AGAINST THE AMENDMENT:

Councillors Atkinson, Blackburne, Bradshaw, Brennan, Byrom, Carr, Carragher, Cluskey, Cummins, Dowd, Doyle, Fairclough, Friel, Gannon, Grace, Halsall, Hardy, Howard, John Kelly, John Joseph Kelly, Killen, Lappin, McCann, McGinnity, McKinley, Moncur, Murphy, Myers, O'Brien, Robinson, Roche, Roscoe, John Sayers, Yvonne Sayers, Spencer, Anne Thompson, Tweed, Viedman, Waterfield, Webster and The Mayor

The Mayor declared that the Amendment was **lost** by 18 votes to 41.

Following the vote on the above amendment, a further **amendment** was moved by Councillor Pugh, seconded by Councillor Lynne Thompson:

School Deficits

The Council

- (1) notes that at the start of the global Covid pandemic accumulated revenue debts carried by hospitals were written off in order to enable the NHS to concentrate on dealing with the emergency
- (2) recognises that Sefton schools have also a difficult task ahead of them dealing with the consequences of Covid and prolonged lockdown
- (3) believes that parity of treatment should be extended to the Educational sector and that should be done through an upwards adjustment of the Dedicated Schools Grant for Sefton and for all Councils
- (4) agrees to write to the Secretary of State for Education and the Chancellor of the Exchequer requesting such a change.

Following further debate with the agreement of Councillor Pugh, the Mover of the Amendment, it was unanimously

RESOLVED:

That the Amendment be withdrawn.

Following further debate and in accordance with Rule 97 of Chapter 4 in the Constitution, the voting on the Motion was recorded and the Members of the Council present at the time, voted as follows:

FOR THE MOTION

Councillors Atkinson, Blackburne, Bradshaw, Brennan, Byrom, Carr, Carragher, Cluskey, Cummins, Dowd, Doyle, Fairclough, Friel, Gannon, Grace, Halsall, Hardy, Howard, John Kelly, John Joseph Kelly, Killen, Lappin, McCann, McGinnity, McKinley, Moncur, Murphy, Myers, O'Brien, O'Hanlon, Robinson, Roche, Roscoe, John Sayers, Yvonne Sayers, Spencer, Anne Thompson, Tweed, Viedman, Waterfield, Webster and The Mayor

AGAINST THE MOTION

Councillors Brodie-Browne, Brough, Dawson, Dodd, Evans, Irving, Keith, Lewis, Morris, Pitt, Pugh, Pullin, Sathiy, Shaw, Lynne Thompson and Sir Ron Watson.

The Mayor declared that the Motion was **carried** by 42 votes to 16 and it was

RESOLVED: That:

- (A) in respect of the Budget 2021/22 and Medium-Term Financial Plan from 2022/23 to 2024/25:
- (1) the update of the Medium-Term Financial Plan for the period 2021/22 to 2024/25, be noted;
 - (2) the Revenue Budget for 2021/22 and authorisation for officers to undertake all of the necessary actions to implement the budget changes and proposals as detailed within the report, be approved;
 - (3) the continuation of the Framework for Change 2020 Programme (as described in Section 3) and agreement to the commencement of all appropriate activity as detailed, including for example, consultation with employees and engagement with partners and contractual changes as the programme develops, be approved;
 - (4) the current levels of trade union facility time and associated arrangements for the whole period of the budget plan for 2021/22 – 2024/25, be approved;

COUNCIL- THURSDAY 4TH MARCH, 2021

- (5) it be noted that officers will comply with agreed HR policies and procedures including relevant consultation with Trade Unions and reports to the Cabinet Member Regulatory, Compliance and Corporate Services as required;
- (6) the Schools' Forum decisions on the Dedicated Schools Grant and Individual School Budgets (Section 12), be noted;
- (7) the allocation of specific grants as detailed in the report (Section 13), be noted;
- (8) the overall Council Tax resolution for 2021/22 including Police, Fire, Mayoral and Parish Precepts, be approved;
- (9) it be noted that at its meeting on 21st January 2021, the Council calculated the following amounts for the year 2021/2022 in accordance with the Local Authorities (Calculation of Council Tax Base) (England) Regulations 1992 (as amended):
- (a) 82,722.10 Band D equivalent properties, for the whole area [item T in the formula in Section 31B of the Local Government Finance Act 1992, as amended]; and
- (b) for dwellings in those parts of its area to which a Parish precept relates as shown in the table below:

Parish	<u>Council Tax Base</u> (Band D Equivalent Properties)
Aintree	
Village	2,017.80
Formby	9,010.70
Hightown	855.00
Ince Blundell	166.00
Little Altcar	327.20
Lydiate	2,028.60
Maghull	6,697.70
Melling	1,029.50
Sefton	247.50
Thornton	767.40

- (10) the Council Tax requirement for the Council's own purposes for 2021/2022 (excluding Parish Precepts) is £141,828,695.
- (11) the following amounts be calculated by the Council for the year 2021/2022 in accordance with Sections 31 to 36 of the Local Government Finance Act 1992:

COUNCIL- THURSDAY 4TH MARCH, 2021

(a)	£636,901,681	Being the aggregate of the amounts which the Council estimates for the items set out in Section 31A(2) of the Act taking into account all precepts issued to it by Parish Councils.																						
(b)	-£493,864,785	Being the aggregate amounts which the Council estimates for the items set out in Section 31A(3) of the Act.																						
(c)	£143,036,896	Being the amount by which the aggregate at 3(a) above exceeds the aggregate at 3(b) above, calculated by the Council in accordance with Section 31A(4) of the Act as its Council Tax requirement for the year (item R in the formula in Section 31B of the Act).																						
(d)	£1,729.13	Being the amount at 3(c) above (item R), divided by the amount at 1(a) above (item T), calculated by the Council, in accordance with Section 31B of the Act, as the basic amount of its Council Tax for the year (including Parish Precepts).																						
(e)	£1,208,201	Being the aggregate amount of all special items (Parish Precepts) referred to in Section 34(1) of the Act.																						
(f)	£1,714.52	Being the amount at 3(d) above, less the amount given by dividing the amount at 3(e) above by the amount at 1(a) above (item T), calculated by the Council, in accordance with Section 34(2) of the Act, as the basic amount of its Council Tax for the year for dwellings in those parts of its area to which no special item relates.																						
(g)	<p>The amounts below, being the amounts given by adding to the amount at 3(f) above the amounts of the special items relating to dwellings in those parts of the Council's area mentioned above divided in each case by the amount at 1(b) above, calculated by the Council in accordance with Section 34(3) of the Act as basic amounts of its Council Tax for the year for dwellings in those parts of its area to which special items relate.</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Parish</th> <th>£</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Aintree Village</td> <td>1,790.44</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Formby</td> <td>1,724.48</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Hightown</td> <td>1,735.57</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Ince Blundell</td> <td>1,728.98</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Little Altcar</td> <td>1,724.48</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Lydiate</td> <td>1,800.44</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Maghull</td> <td>1,821.16</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Melling</td> <td>1,749.54</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Sefton</td> <td>1,754.92</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Thornton</td> <td>1,723.64</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>		Parish	£	Aintree Village	1,790.44	Formby	1,724.48	Hightown	1,735.57	Ince Blundell	1,728.98	Little Altcar	1,724.48	Lydiate	1,800.44	Maghull	1,821.16	Melling	1,749.54	Sefton	1,754.92	Thornton	1,723.64
Parish	£																							
Aintree Village	1,790.44																							
Formby	1,724.48																							
Hightown	1,735.57																							
Ince Blundell	1,728.98																							
Little Altcar	1,724.48																							
Lydiate	1,800.44																							
Maghull	1,821.16																							
Melling	1,749.54																							
Sefton	1,754.92																							
Thornton	1,723.64																							
(h)	The amounts below being the amounts given by multiplying the amounts at 3(f) and 3(g) above by the number which, in the proportion set out in Section 5(1) of the Act, is applicable to dwellings listed in a particular valuation band divided by the number which in that proportion is applicable to dwellings listed in valuation Band D, calculated by the Council, in accordance with Section 36(1) of the Act, as the amounts to be taken into account for the year in respect of categories of dwellings listed in different valuation bands.																							

COUNCIL- THURSDAY 4TH MARCH, 2021

Proportion of Band D	Property Valuation Band							
	A 6/9	B 7/9	C 8/9	D 9/9	E 11/9	F 13/9	G 15/9	H 18/9
	£	£	£	£	£	£	£	£
<u>Parish</u>								
Aintree Village	1,193.63	1,392.56	1,591.50	1,790.44	2,188.32	2,586.19	2,984.07	3,580.88
Formby	1,149.65	1,341.26	1,532.87	1,724.48	2,107.70	2,490.92	2,874.13	3,448.96
Hightown	1,157.05	1,349.89	1,542.73	1,735.57	2,121.25	2,506.93	2,892.62	3,471.14
Ince Blundell	1,152.65	1,344.76	1,536.87	1,728.98	2,113.20	2,497.42	2,881.63	3,457.96
Little Altcar	1,149.65	1,341.26	1,532.87	1,724.48	2,107.70	2,490.92	2,874.13	3,448.96
Lydiate	1,200.29	1,400.34	1,600.39	1,800.44	2,200.54	2,600.64	3,000.73	3,600.88
Maghull	1,214.11	1,416.46	1,618.81	1,821.16	2,225.86	2,630.56	3,035.27	3,642.32
Melling	1,166.36	1,360.75	1,555.15	1,749.54	2,138.33	2,527.11	2,915.90	3,499.08
Sefton	1,169.95	1,364.94	1,559.93	1,754.92	2,144.90	2,534.88	2,924.87	3,509.84
Thornton	1,149.09	1,340.61	1,532.12	1,723.64	2,106.67	2,489.70	2,872.73	3,447.28
<u>All Other Parts of the Council's Area</u>	1,143.01	1,333.52	1,524.02	1,714.52	2,095.52	2,476.53	2,857.53	3,429.04

- (12) Note that for the year 2021/2022 the major precepting authorities have stated the following amounts in precepts issued to the Council in accordance with Section 40 of the Local Government Finance Act 1992, for each of the categories of dwellings shown below:

Proportion of Band D	Property Valuation Band							
	A 6/9	B 7/9	C 8/9	D 9/9	E 11/9	F 13/9	G 15/9	H 18/9
	£	£	£	£	£	£	£	£
<u>Precepting Authority</u>								
Merseyside Fire & Rescue Authority	54.67	63.78	72.89	82.00	100.22	118.44	136.67	164.00
Merseyside Police	151.31	176.53	201.75	226.97	277.41	327.85	378.28	453.94

COUNCIL- THURSDAY 4TH MARCH, 2021

and Crime Commissioner								
Liverpool City Region Combined Authority	12.67	14.78	16.89	19.00	23.22	27.44	31.67	38.00

(13) the Council, in accordance with Sections 30 and 36 of the Local Government Finance Act 1992, hereby sets the aggregate amounts shown in the table below as the amounts of Council Tax for 2021/2022 for each part of its area and for each of the categories of dwellings; and

Proportion of Band D	Property Valuation Band							
	A 6/9	B 7/9	C 8/9	D 9/9	E 11/9	F 13/9	G 15/9	H 18/9
	£	£	£	£	£	£	£	£
<u>Parish</u>								
Aintree Village	1,412.28	1,647.65	1,883.03	2,118.41	2,589.17	3,059.92	3,530.69	4,236.82
Formby	1,368.30	1,596.35	1,824.40	2,052.45	2,508.55	2,964.65	3,420.75	4,104.90
Hightown	1,375.70	1,604.98	1,834.26	2,063.54	2,522.10	2,980.66	3,439.24	4,127.08
Ince Blundell	1,371.30	1,599.85	1,828.40	2,056.95	2,514.05	2,971.15	3,428.25	4,113.90
Little Altcar	1,368.30	1,596.35	1,824.40	2,052.45	2,508.55	2,964.65	3,420.75	4,104.90
Lydiate	1,418.94	1,655.43	1,891.92	2,128.41	2,601.39	3,074.37	3,547.35	4,256.82
Maghull	1,432.76	1,671.55	1,910.34	2,149.13	2,626.71	3,104.29	3,581.89	4,298.26
Melling	1,385.01	1,615.84	1,846.68	2,077.51	2,539.18	3,000.84	3,462.52	4,155.02
Sefton	1,388.60	1,620.03	1,851.46	2,082.89	2,545.75	3,008.61	3,471.49	4,165.78
Thornton	1,367.74	1,595.70	1,823.65	2,051.61	2,507.52	2,963.43	3,419.35	4,103.22
<u>All Other Parts of the Council's Area</u>	1,361.66	1,588.61	1,815.55	2,042.49	2,496.37	2,950.26	3,404.15	4,084.98

(14) the Council's basic amount of Council Tax for 2021/2022 is not deemed to be excessive in accordance with the principles approved under Section 52ZB of the Local Government Finance Act 1992; and

(B) in respect of the Capital Programme 2021/22 to 2022/23

- (1) the supplementary capital estimate of £12.750m for the Street Lighting Asset Project detailed in Section 17 of the report be approved; and
- (2) all of the remaining capital schemes as detailed in Section 17 of the report along with the full list of other projects in Appendix C of the report, be approved for inclusion within the Capital Programme.

70. PERSISTENT PUPIL ABSENCE WORKING GROUP FINAL REPORT

Further to Minute No. 87 of the meeting of the Cabinet held on 4 February 2021 the Council considered the report of the Chief Legal and Democratic Officer and the Final Report of the Persistent Pupil Absence Working Group.

It was moved by Councillor Carragher, seconded by Councillor Murphy and

RESOLVED: That the following recommendations be approved:

1. That the good practice regarding school attendance currently undertaken by the Council and schools, as outlined in the findings of the Final Report, be acknowledged and noted;
2. That the Interim Head of Education be requested to explore the possibility of:
 - (a) a campaign to tackle school attendance across all key stages with a specific emphasis on the early years and foundation stage, the campaign to focus on conveying clear messages about how absence affects attainment, wellbeing and wider outcomes;
 - (b) delivering of clear messages about expectations, routines and consequences to new pupils and families through prospectus and admission/transition events;
 - (c) ensuring that the attendance of vulnerable children is monitored across the early years stage;
 - (d) an aspiration for a post of a dedicated worker for children who are supported by Education, Health and Care Plans, in order to address any barriers for children and young people attending school; this aspiration could be considered in the future as part of the on-going work on school attendance;

- (e) attendance being part of the enhanced transition and not just for children and young people on the Special Educational Needs and disability (SEND) register, as this will address the early identification of any school attendance issues;
 - (f) sanctions for non-attendance being applied consistently across primary and secondary schools;
 - (g) schools providing an adult mentor to those children who have contact with the school Special Educational Needs Co-ordinator (SENCO) but who are not on the SEND register, with whom the children can have regular access and build up a relationship;
 - (h) strongly encourage schools to provide training in SEND and Autism spectrum disorder (ASD) conditions to all staff;
 - (i) Extending buddy schemes with older peers to all schools, pupils to be “matched up” to ensure they have something in common;
 - (j) Improving communication between primary and secondary schools at transition stage, to ensure children are “understood” by teaching staff in secondary schools and that any good practice is shared; and
3. That the Senior Democratic Services Officer be requested to liaise with relevant officers in order to ensure that the Overview and Scrutiny Committee (Children’s Services and Safeguarding) receives a six-monthly monitoring report, setting out progress made against each of the recommendations outlined above.

71. MEMBERSHIP OF COMMITTEES 2020/21

No changes to memberships of Committees were made.

72. MATTERS DEALT WITH IN ACCORDANCE WITH RULE 46 OF THE SCRUTINY PROCEDURE RULES (CALL-IN AND URGENCY) OF THE CONSTITUTION

The Council considered the report of the Leader of the Council in relation to a matter that was dealt with in accordance with Rule 46 (waiving call-In) of the Access to Information Procedure Rules of the Council Constitution, whereby “call in” was waived.

It was moved by Councillor Fairclough, seconded by Councillor Hardy and

RESOLVED:

That the report be noted.

73. MOTION SUBMITTED BY COUNCILLOR IRVING - TREE PRESERVATION ORDERS - LEGISLATION

Tree Preservation Orders – Legislation

It was moved by Councillor Irving, seconded by Councillor McCann that:

A Tree Preservation Order is an order made by a Local Planning Authority to protect specific trees, groups of trees or woodlands in the interests of amenity.

At present the Legislation relates to specific trees when in fact all trees play a huge role in reducing climate change, they are essential in the plight to reduce air pollution, control climate change, act as barriers to noise from motorways and public transport routes/links and provide vital shelter and support to our dwindling wildlife.

This Council believes that the Legislation in relation to Tree Preservation Orders is out of date and requires a review to respond to the environmental changes of the 21st Century and in line with the Climate Change Emergency declaration.

Individual Local Councils along with Parish Councils should be granted powers to use at their discretion, to approve individual or blanket tree preservation orders on mature trees and not only the specific trees, groups of trees or woodlands currently set out in Legislation.

This Council resolves:

To write to the Secretary of State asking him to review the legislation that covers Tree Preservation Orders in order that they are brought in line with 21st Century thinking due to climate change, biodiversity loss and unwarranted removal of mature trees that are not protected by present day tree preservation orders with a view to granting powers to allow Local Councils as well as Parish Councils, at their discretion, to approve individual or blanket tree preservation orders on mature trees.

An **amendment** was moved by Councillor Veidman, seconded by Councillor O'Brien that the Motion be amended by:

replacing the word "plight" with "fight" in the fourth sentence;

deleting the words "control climate change" in the fifth sentence;

replacing the word "believes" to "notes" in the second paragraph;

replacing the following words "that the Legislation in relation to Tree Preservation Orders is out of date and requires a review to respond to the environmental changes of the 21st Century and in line with the Climate Change Emergency declaration" with "Sefton Council has declared a

climate emergency and trees play an important role in helping us to meet our objectives. Sefton has hundreds of TPO's in place covering not just individual trees but wooded areas and is currently developing a Tree Strategy which will inform our future use of TPO's. Local authorities";

adding the word "additional" in between the words "granted" and "powers";

and replacing the following words in the paragraph that begins "This Council resolves"

"in order that they are brought in line with 21st Century thinking due to climate change, biodiversity loss and unwarranted removal of mature trees that are not protected by present day tree preservation orders with a view to granting powers to allow Local Councils as well as Parish Councils, at their discretion, to approve individual or blanket tree preservation orders on mature trees"

with the following words:

"with a view to bolstering the LPA's ability to protect trees and wildlife and help Local Authorities meet climate change objectives".

Following debate on the **amendment** Councillor Irving, as Mover of the Motion indicated that he accepted the **amendment** as a "friendly amendment" in accordance with paragraph 72 of Chapter 4 in the Constitution and it was unanimously:

RESOLVED: That:

A Tree Preservation Order is an order made by a Local Planning Authority to protect specific trees, groups of trees or woodlands in the interests of amenity.

At present the Legislation relates to specific trees when in fact all trees play a huge role in reducing climate change, they are essential in the fight to reduce air pollution, act as barriers to noise from motorways and public transport routes and provide vital shelter and support to our dwindling wildlife.

This Council notes

Sefton Council has declared a climate emergency and trees play an important role in helping us to meet our objectives. Sefton has hundreds of TPO's in place covering not just individual trees but wooded areas and is currently developing a Tree Strategy which will inform our future use of TPO's.

Local authorities should be granted additional powers to use at their discretion, to approve individual or blanket tree preservation orders on mature trees and not only the specific trees, groups of trees or woodlands currently set out in Legislation.

This Council resolves:

To write to the Secretary of State asking him to review the legislation that covers Tree Preservation Orders with a view to bolstering the LPA's ability to protect trees and wildlife and help Local Authorities meet climate change objectives.

**74. MOTION SUBMITTED BY COUNCILLOR BLACKBURNE -
DECLARING A POVERTY EMERGENCY**

Motion on Declaring a Poverty Emergency

It was moved by Councillor Blackburne, seconded by Councillor Halsall that:

This council notes the increase in food bank use around the country and in Sefton in particular.

Council also notes fuel poverty is also very evident in Sefton with the number of households being fuel poor being higher than the national average.

This council notes that the highest single reason for need is 'low income'.

Council also notes the success of the progress of the Climate Emergency declaration and that by aligning this with a Poverty Emergency believes that a commitment to a People and Planet approach will aid recovery and renewal.

This council believes it is time for change and that recognising socio-economic deprivation is an equality issue.

Therefore, this council resolves to:-

- Declare a Poverty Emergency.
- Ensure that the poverty emergency workstream sits alongside the Climate Emergency Declaration workstream.
- Develop a poverty emergency strategy which takes a people and planet approach.
- Take a collaborative and evidence-based approach, working more closely with health, trade unions, further education facilities and community groups.
- To share our approach with other councils and the LGA as best practice.

Following debate on the Motion the Chief Legal and Democratic Officer officiated a vote and the Mayor declared the Motion was carried by 54 votes to 5 and it was:

RESOLVED: That:

This council notes the increase in food bank use around the country and in Sefton in particular.

Council also notes fuel poverty is also very evident in Sefton with the number of households being fuel poor being higher than the national average.

This council notes that the highest single reason for need is 'low income'.

Council also notes the success of the progress of the Climate Emergency declaration and that by aligning this with a Poverty Emergency believes that a commitment to a People and Planet approach will aid recovery and renewal.

This council believes it is time for change and that recognising socio-economic deprivation is an equality issue.

Therefore, this council resolves to:-

- Declare a Poverty Emergency.
- Ensure that the poverty emergency workstream sits alongside the Climate Emergency Declaration workstream.
- Develop a poverty emergency strategy which takes a people and planet approach.
- Take a collaborative and evidence-based approach, working more closely with health, trade unions, further education facilities and community groups.
- To share our approach with other councils and the LGA as best practice.

75. MOTION SUBMITTED BY COUNCILLOR FRIEL - SAVE THE SOUTHPORT TO PICCADILLY SERVICE

Save the Southport to Picadilly Service

It was moved by Councillor Friel, seconded by Councillor Myers that:

This council objects in the strongest of terms to the consultation, namely "Timetable Options to Improve Rail Performance in the North of England." A consultation stacked against Southport.

The DfT have a full record of this following representation.

Timetable Options to Improve Rail Performance in the North of England.

The above consultation sets out three options which feature a variety of changes to service patterns, planned to be implemented from the May

2022 timetable. The three options affect a number of rail services which run across key city centre stations in Manchester - Victoria, Oxford Road and Manchester Piccadilly.

All 3 options are unacceptable as they remove the route from Southport to Piccadilly which was the subject of a successful campaign across political lines and with rail user groups to get this service returned, so we object strongly to a flawed consultation that does not retain this Southport to Piccadilly route within the options.

Southport has already lost the link to Manchester airport and another service cut is a blow from central government when many are working to improve the vitality of this resort town.

This Council resolves to:

request the Chief Executive to write to the Secretary of State for Transport and the Liverpool City Region Metro Mayor to point out that the current Southport to Piccadilly Service would be axed under all 3 of these proposals, despite the fact that this is probably the only line and route to have justified itself with a full business case in the last three years. Accordingly this Council requests that the Secretary of State for Transport and the Liverpool City Region Metro Mayor use every means possible to ensure retention of service.

An amendment was moved by Councillor Pugh, seconded by Councillor Dawson that the Motion be amended by the following additional paragraph being included at the end:

Puts on record its gratitude for the work of the Southport Rail Transport Forum (SRTF) and the Ormskirk and Preston's Passenger Association for their detailed research and consistent and effective non-partisan and cross-party campaigning on this important issue.

Following debate on the **amendment** the Chief Legal and Democratic Officer officiated a vote and the Mayor declared the **amendment** was lost by 40 votes to 17 and the Motion was carried unanimously, and it was:

RESOLVED: That:

This council objects in the strongest of terms to the consultation, namely "Timetable Options to Improve Rail Performance in the North of England." A consultation stacked against Southport.

The DfT have a full record of this following representation.

Timetable Options to Improve Rail Performance in the North of England.

The above consultation sets out three options which feature a variety of changes to service patterns, planned to be implemented from the May

2022 timetable. The three options affect a number of rail services which run across key city centre stations in Manchester - Victoria, Oxford Road and Manchester Piccadilly.

All 3 options are unacceptable as they remove the route from Southport to Piccadilly which was the subject of a successful campaign across political lines and with rail user groups to get this service returned, so we object strongly to a flawed consultation that does not retain this Southport to Piccadilly route within the options.

Southport has already lost the link to Manchester airport and another service cut is a blow from central government when many are working to improve the vitality of this resort town.

This Council resolves to:

request the Chief Executive to write to the Secretary of State for Transport and the Liverpool City Region Metro Mayor to point out that the current Southport to Piccadilly Service would be axed under all 3 of these proposals, despite the fact that this is probably the only line and route to have justified itself with a full business case in the last three years. Accordingly this Council requests that the Secretary of State for Transport and the Liverpool City Region Metro Mayor use every means possible to ensure retention of service.

76. MOTION SUBMITTED BY COUNCILLOR SHAW - BIRKDALE VILLAGE CYCLE LANES

Birkdale Village Cycle Lanes

It was moved by Councillor Shaw, seconded by Councillor Brodie-Browne

That this Council:

- (1) notes that there have been repeated recent claims made in the local Southport media that Sefton Council plans to introduce Cycle Lanes in Birkdale Village (i.e. that part of Liverpool Road between Welbeck Road/Bolton Road and the railway line, and that part of Weld Road between the railway line and York Road)
- (2) notes that a report to the Cabinet Member Locality Services in August 2020 included, in paragraph 4.8 the following statement: "Phase two proposals, which could be considered as part of Tranche 2, could see this route extended both north and south to serve a wider area of the town, to the south along Alma Road to Birkdale and York Road and Trafalgar Road to Smedley Hydro and to the north along the A565 to connect Churchtown and Crossens to the town centre."

- (3) notes, however, that paragraph 4.8 referred to does not refer to Cycle Lanes (as opposed to "safer cycling routes"), or to Birkdale Village and anyway says "could".
- (4) notes that there have been no further relevant reports or announcements since August 2020 and that, accordingly, there are currently no plans to introduce Cycle Lanes in Birkdale Village.
- (5) believes that, were Cycle Lanes to be proposed in Birkdale Village, this would be wrong for a number of reasons including them being
 - (a) unnecessary, (b) dangerous and (c) damaging.
 - (a) Unnecessary because motor traffic speeds in Birkdale Village are already low because of driver awareness of the high number of pedestrians crossing at multiple points from one pavement to the other.
 - (b) Dangerous because the introduction of Cycle Lanes in Birkdale Village would significantly increase the risk of cyclist/pedestrian collisions as pedestrians crossing the road would have no alternative but to also cross the Cycle Lane(s).
 - (c) Damaging because such Cycle Lanes within Birkdale Village could not be introduced without having profound adverse effects on parking provision.

In the light of the above, this Council states its opposition to any proposal to introduce Cycle Lanes in Birkdale Village.

An **amendment** was moved by Councillor Watson, seconded by Councillor Brough that the Motion be amended by the inclusion the following sixth paragraph:

- (6) agrees to withdraw for further consideration and consultation the latest set of proposals for cycle lanes in the Birkdale area.

In view of the difficulties caused by the first phase of the programme now agrees to review the first set of cycle lanes as a matter of urgency and not to wait until September in view of the damage that has been done to the commercial and retail sector in parts of the area involved.

Following debate on the **amendment** the Chief Legal and Democratic Officer officiated a vote and the Mayor declared the **amendment** was lost by 42 votes to 14 and on the Motion it was lost by 38 votes to 17 with 3 abstentions.

**77. MOTION SUBMITTED BY COUNCILLOR DAWSON - PROPOSED
NHS CHANGES AFFECTING PRINCIPALLY SOUTHPORT,
FORMBY AND WEST LANCASHIRE COMMUNITIES**

The Mayor reported that she had received notice that Councillor Dawson had requested to withdraw his Motion from the Agenda and it was:

RESOLVED:

That the Motion in relation to the Proposed NHS Changes affecting Principally Southport, Formby and West Lancashire Communities be withdrawn from the Agenda.