

**COUNCIL**

**MEETING HELD AT THE TOWN HALL, SOUTHPORT  
ON THURSDAY 19TH NOVEMBER, 2015**

PRESENT: The Mayor (Councillor Kermode) in the Chair  
The Deputy Chair (Councillor Cluskey) Vice Chair

Councillors Atkinson, Ball, David Barton, Jo Barton, Maria Bennett, Veronica Bennett, Bliss, Bradshaw, Brennan, Brodie - Browne, Byrom, Carr, Carragher, Cummins, Dams, Dawson, Dodd, Dutton, Fairclough, Maureen Fearn, Lord Fearn, Gatherer, Grace, Hale, Hands, Hardy, Hartill, Jamieson, Jones, Keith, John Kelly, John Joseph Kelly, Kerrigan, Killen, Lappin, Daniel Lewis, Dan T. Lewis, Maher, McGuire, Moncur, Murphy, O'Brien, Page, Preece, Robinson, Roche, Sayers, Shaw, Thompson, Tweed, Veidman, Weavers, Webster and Welsh

**54. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Ashton, Booth, Burns, Dowd, Friel, Mahon, McGinnity, McKinley, Owens and Spencer.

**55. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

No declarations of any disclosable pecuniary interest were received.

**56. MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING**

RESOLVED:

That the Minutes of the Council Meeting held on 17 September 2015 be approved as a correct record.

**57. MAYOR'S COMMUNICATIONS**

**1. Deaths of Former Councillors David Pearson and Charlie Hopkins and Terrorist Incidents in Paris**

The Mayor reported on the sad death of former Councillor David Pearson on 16 November 2015. David represented the Dukes Ward from May 1991 to May 2012 and was the Mayor of Sefton in 2003/04.

The Mayor indicated that the Civic Funeral would be held on Thursday 26 November 2015 at St. James Church, Lulworth Road,

Southport, commencing at 11.30am following a private cremation to be attended by family members only.

The Leader of the Council (Councillor Maher) also reported on the sad death of former Councillor Charlie Hopkins on 17 October 2015 and indicated that the funeral was held on 3 November 2015. Charlie represented the Netherton Ward from May 1973 to May 2000.

The Mayor extended his sincere condolences to the family and friends of David and Charlie on behalf of the Council.

Councillors Byrom, Dawson, Jones and Kerrigan paid tribute to the work which David Pearson had undertaken for the Borough and Councillors Brennan, Brodie – Browne and Maher paid tribute to the work which Charlie Hopkins had undertaken for the Borough.

The Mayor referred to the terrorist incidents, which took place in Paris, France on Friday 13 November 2015 and claimed at least 129 lives and resulted in widespread casualties.

The Mayor indicated that the Union Flags at the Town Halls had been lowered to half-mast and the Atkinson Building in Southport was lit up in the colours of the French Tricolour on Monday 16 November 2015 and that a book of condolence was available for people to sign in Bootle and Southport Town Halls.

The Council then stood in silence for one minute as a mark of respect for David Pearson, Charlie Hopkins and the people of Paris.

**2. Remembrance Sunday – 8 November 2015**

The Mayor reported that he was very honoured to lay the first wreath at the Remembrance Sunday service at King's Gardens, Bootle. The Mayor indicated that it was particularly poignant for the Mayoress and himself, as the name of the Mayoress' Grandmother's first husband was on the cenotaph there, as he was killed during the Battle of the Somme and 10 years ago they had laid flowers at his grave in St Helier.

**3. Annual Toy Appeal**

The Mayor reported that he would be officially launching the Annual Mayor of Sefton Toy Appeal on 20 November 2015, and encouraged everyone to make a donation to the appeal that would run right up until 23 December and indicated that there would be drop off points at Bootle and Southport Town Halls.

**4. Mayoral Engagements**

The Mayor reported that he had attended 147 engagements so far during his year of office with the Mayoress and that the Mayor's Twitter account currently had 175 followers.

**58. MATTERS RAISED BY THE PUBLIC**

The Mayor reported that no matters had been raised by Members of the Public.

**59. QUESTIONS RAISED BY MEMBERS OF THE COUNCIL**

The Council considered a schedule setting out the written questions submitted by:

- Councillor McGuire to the Leader of the Council (Councillor Maher)
- Councillor McGuire to the Cabinet Member – Localities (Councillor Fairclough)
- Councillor Dawson to the Cabinet Member – Adult Social Care (Councillor Cummins)

together with the responses given. A supplementary question was responded to by the Cabinet Member – Adult Social Care

**60. POTENTIAL DEVOLUTION OF POWERS AND RESOURCES  
LIVERPOOL CITY REGION**

The Council considered a report of the Chief Executive which provided an update for Members with regard to the proposed devolution of powers and resources from the Government to the Liverpool City Region (LCR), which indicated that:

- Following the election in May 2015, the new Government indicated their commitment to pursue the devolution agenda in England. The Cities and Local Government Devolution Bill was now progressing through Parliament; allowing for devolution of powers and resources to local areas alongside a preferred governance model of a directly elected Mayor.
- Devolution offered the City Region the opportunity to gain much greater control over its own destiny but it was important to state that devolution is about assuming additional powers, control and resource from central government to enable the City Region and local members to be better able to discharge their existing functions. It was not about assuming powers up from constituent local authorities. This is at the heart of the City Region's proposals which were being negotiated with Government.

## COUNCIL- THURSDAY 19TH NOVEMBER, 2015

- The City Region's outline submission to Government as set out in Appendix 1 to the report was made on 4 September 2015 and was focused on a 'place-based' approach to:
  - Accelerate economic growth - growing jobs and increasing productivity;
  - Public service reform – local re-design and co-ordination of services to reduce costs and improve outcomes across the whole of the public sector; and
  - Improved social outcomes and better health and wellbeing of local residents.
- The submission and subsequent negotiations had focused on four key areas which needed to be considered by Government alongside their Comprehensive Spending Review (CSR) 2015. They are:
  - i. Economic Development including an investment fund, business support, European Funding, energy and culture
  - ii. Transport
  - iii. Housing and Planning
  - iv. Employment and Skills
- The City Region had undertaken stakeholder engagement and consultation on these themes and broader proposals. This had been a positive exercise with the findings outlined in the consultation section of the report.
- At the time of writing the report, negotiations were ongoing to determine the size and scope of a potential devolution agreement with Government and further details would be presented to Members when they become available.

The Council also considered the supplementary report of the Chief Executive, which indicated that on 17 November 2015, the Chancellor of the Exchequer had announced that a proposed Devolution Agreement had been reached with Liverpool City Region (subject to Council ratification) which was signed by the five local authority Leaders, the Mayor of Liverpool, and the Chair of the Local Enterprise Partnership. The Agreement would deliver a major transfer of resources, powers and responsibilities from Government to the City Region, alongside governance changes to adopt a directly elected City Region Mayor.

The City Region Leaders and the Mayor of Liverpool have negotiated hard to secure the best possible package of devolved powers and resources for the City Region, which would give the City Region greater control and influence over approximately £3bn of national funding over 5 years alongside increased powers and responsibilities in the key areas of; economic development, transport, employment and skills and housing and planning. This would enable elected Members, together with their communities and local businesses, to make more decisions locally which would otherwise have been made in Whitehall.

The chance to bring powers and resources down from Government directly to the City Region was important to all local authorities in the context of on-going austerity. Having local decision-making powers over significant areas of national government expenditure is a much better position to be in than having priorities for local services and funding determined by Whitehall officials and Government Ministers in London.

The key elements secured in the proposed Agreement set out in Appendix 1 to the supplementary report included:

- Establishment of a Single Investment Fund that draws together City Region and national funding streams as a single pot to invest in economic growth. This would be made up of a range of budgets to be determined after the Comprehensive Spending Review, including any successors to Local Growth Fund, Regional Growth Fund and Growing Places Fund. Instead of bidding for such funding streams, the commitment was for such funding to be given to the City Region as a flexible multi-year settlement;
- The Single Investment Fund would also benefit from an additional £30m annual allocation over the next 30 years, equating to £900m of total investment which the City Region would use to invest in projects to create jobs and drive forward economic growth;
- Longer term certainty over the Special Rail Grant to the City Region which would allow the procurement of new trains for the Merseyrail network, replacing existing rolling stock with newer, faster trains with greater capacity;
- A devolved and consolidated multi-year transport settlement;
- The ability to franchise bus services in the City Region to achieve an improvement in the local bus offer to residents and businesses;
- Devolution of the Government's business support services which would enable the City Region to provide a fully integrated and locally delivered business support service;
- Greater control over the skills system, including full devolution of the Adult Skills Budget which would enable the City Region to address the mismatch between the supply of skills and the needs of employers;
- The ability to co-design future employment support programmes with Government to ensure that they address local needs and to develop a new household approach to supporting residents into work;
- Strategic planning powers to accelerate economic growth and housing development and give clarity and certainty to potential developers. This included the establishment of a Mayoral Development Corporation with the power to establish Mayoral Development Zones to aid the development and delivery of the City Region's key strategic sites;

- Recognition of the unique asset and potential of the River Mersey including a commitment to consider a business case for a tidal power scheme for the River Mersey/Liverpool Bay area which could ultimately generate low carbon energy for business and consumers; and
- Support for a place based strategy for culture and creativity, a statement of support for the City Region’s ambition for a National Migration Museum and the exploration of options for a sustainable and viable business model for National Museums Liverpool.

The supplementary report indicated that the proposed deal was the first step in a long term devolution journey towards a genuine place based relationship with national government which would, over time, provide for significant influence or control over all public expenditure in our local areas. It also reinforced the role of the City Region at the heart of the “Northern Powerhouse” and recognised the unique and significant contribution the City Region would play in driving forward the economy of the North.

The proposed deal was subject to the agreement of individual local authorities and endorsement was also being sought from the Combined Authority and Local Enterprise Partnership.

The Governance principles which the City Region would adopt were outlined in Appendix 2 of the supplementary report and demonstrated the safeguards that had been built into the arrangements. The Elected Mayor would act as the Chair of the Combined Authority and Members of the LCR Combined Authority would provide a supporting and advisory function to the Mayor and the Combined Authority.

The Liverpool City Region Mayor would be required to consult the Combined Authority on his/her strategies, which it may reject or amend if two thirds of the constituent council members agreed to do so. The Combined Authority would also examine the Mayor’s spending plans and would be able to reject or amend his/her plans, if two thirds of the members agree to do so. The Mayor and the Combined Authority would be scrutinised and held to account by the Combined Authority Scrutiny Panel.

The timescales for future action set out in the supplementary report indicated that there would be a period where the necessary legislative arrangements were made by Government, to allow for a directly elected Mayor for the City Region. The Cities and Devolution Bill would require Royal Assent and subsequently a Liverpool City Region Order would be laid by the Secretary of State to give effect to the necessary legislation to enable Mayoral elections to take place in May 2017. A separate “Buses Bill” was planned for introduction later in the current parliamentary session.

It was moved by Councillor Maher, seconded by Councillor Fairclough:

“That this Council:

## COUNCIL- THURSDAY 19TH NOVEMBER, 2015

- (1) Notes the report and supplementary report of the Chief Executive;
- (2) Approves the Liverpool City Region Devolution Agreement as outlined in Appendix 1 and agrees to adopt a Directly Elected Mayor with effect from May 2017 based on the Governance Principles outlined in Appendix 2 of the supplementary report;
- (3) Notes that the Governance Principles will be incorporated into a formal constitution and will be the subject of a further report in due course;
- (4) Agrees to explore with Government further opportunities for devolution, noting that any proposals will be presented to future meetings of the Council for consideration and approval before being agreed and implemented; and
- (5) Reserves the right to withdraw from the Devolution Agreement if Government fail to deliver on the proposals as outlined in the Devolution Agreement attached in Appendix 1 of the supplementary report.”

Following debate, on a show of hands, the Mayor declared that the Motion was carried by 43 votes to 13 and it was

RESOLVED:

That this Council:

- (1) Notes the report and supplementary report of the Chief Executive;
- (2) Approves the Liverpool City Region Devolution Agreement as outlined in Appendix 1 and agrees to adopt a Directly Elected Mayor with effect from May 2017 based on the Governance Principles outlined in Appendix 2 of the supplementary report;
- (3) Notes that the Governance Principles will be incorporated into a formal constitution and will be the subject of a further report in due course;
- (4) Agrees to explore with Government further opportunities for devolution, noting that any proposals will be presented to future meetings of the Council for consideration and approval before being agreed and implemented; and
- (5) Reserves the right to withdraw from the Devolution Agreement if Government fail to deliver on the proposals as outlined in the Devolution Agreement attached in Appendix 1 of the supplementary report.

### **61. GAMBLING ACT 2005 - FINAL DRAFT REVISED STATEMENT OF GAMBLING LICENSING POLICY**

Further to Minute No. 20 of the meeting of the Licensing and Regulatory Committee held on 21 September 2015, the Council considered the report

of the Head of Regulation and Compliance on the revised Statement of Gambling Licensing Policy.

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

**RESOLVED:**

That the revised Statement of Gambling Licensing Policy, as set out in Annex 2 of the report be approved.

## **62. MEMBERSHIP OF COMMITTEES 2015/16**

Councillor Grace proposed the following changes:

- Councillor Spencer to replace Councillor Veronica Bennett as a Member of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee (Regulatory, Compliance and Corporate Services and Councillor Roche to be her Substitute Member.
- Councillor O'Brien to replace Councillor Veronica Bennett as a Member of the Licensing and Regulatory Committee.

Councillor Keith proposed the following changes:

- Councillor Booth to replace Councillor McGuire as the Substitute Member for Councillor Jo Barton on the Overview and Scrutiny Committee (Regeneration and Skills).
- Councillor McGuire to replace Councillor Booth as the Substitute Member for Councillor Weavers on the Overview and Scrutiny Committee (Regeneration and Skills).

Councillor Jamieson proposed the following changes:

- Councillor Jones to replace Councillor Dutton as a Member of the Audit and Governance Committee and Councillor Dutton to be his Substitute Member.
- Councillor Hartill to replace Councillor Ball on the Licensing and Regulatory Committee.
- Councillor Jamieson to replace Councillor Ball as the Conservative Group Whip.

**RESOLVED:**

That the changes to the membership of the Committees be approved.



**63. MOTION SUBMITTED BY COUNCILLOR BRADSHAW**

It was moved by Councillor Bradshaw, seconded by Councillor Dan T. Lewis:

Trade Union Bill

“The Council notes:

- In July 2015, the Government announced its Trade Union Bill - a wide-ranging set of proposals which, taken as a package, will undermine the basic right to strike and make it harder for workers to organise effectively in trade unions.
- The proposals include ending the ban on employers bringing in agency workers to cover for permanent staff during industrial action - which fundamentally undermines the right to strike.
- The proposals will also bring in new restrictions on pickets and protests during strikes. Unions will have to give the details of a lead picketer on every picket line to the police and employers - and the Government have even floated the idea of making all picketers give their details to the police. They may even be required to submit a campaign plan to the police and employers two weeks in advance - setting out what they intend to do, whether they will use a loudspeaker or carry a banner and even what strikers intend to put on social media, such as Facebook or Twitter.
- The Government have also proposed new thresholds for turnout in strike ballots, plus additional thresholds for those working in "important public services".
- The Government want to grant Ministers the power to unilaterally cut so-called "facilities time" in the public sector. This is paid time-off mutually agreed between employers and unions for union reps to represent their members and negotiate with their employer.
- The Government also proposes to prohibit public sector employers assisting unions to collect their membership subscriptions through payrolls - even though this is used for a variety of other staff benefits such as cycle-to-work schemes and childcare vouchers, and even though unions often meet the costs of this.

The Council further notes:

- The human rights organisations Liberty, Amnesty International and the British Institute of Human Rights have said that the Government's proposals “would hamper people’s basic rights to protest and shift even more power from the employee to the employer”.

## COUNCIL- THURSDAY 19TH NOVEMBER, 2015

- The Government refuses to allow trade unions to ballot their members electronically, which could help increase engagement.
- Trade unions take industrial action for a wide range of reasons including defending wages and pensions, conditions at work and safety.
- Strikes in the UK are at historically low levels.

The Council believes:

- No worker ever wants to go on strike - but it is a crucial last resort for workers when their employer refuses to listen to their views, negotiate with them or compromise.

The right to strike and protest are fundamental rights which should be valued and respected in a free and democratic society.

- Without the right to strike, workers will be unable to defend their jobs or pay, stand up for decent services and achieve fairness and safety at work.
- The Government's proposals will undermine constructive employment relations in Sefton. We believe harmonious industrial relations are achieved by meaningful engagement with trade unions and their members.
- That, in the spirit of localism, councils should be free to build positive industrial relations that work for their communities without central government interference.

The Council resolves:

1. To support the trade unions campaign to protect the right to strike;
2. To write to the Secretary of State for Business, Innovation and Skills stating the Council's opposition to the Government's proposals on trade unions;
3. To write to the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government and the Minister for the Northern Powerhouse stating the opposition to the interference of Central Government in local industrial relations as it is against the spirit of localism;
4. Write to all MPs in Sefton informing them of our position and encouraging them to oppose the Trade Union Bill;
5. To continue to value the importance of meaningful workforce engagement and representation through trade unions in Sefton; and

6. In the event that the Government's proposals become law, in so far as is lawful for the council as an employer:
- (i) to continue to allow recognised trade unions to use subscriptions through payroll, or otherwise support trade unions' efforts to move members onto direct debit subscriptions, through allowing access to workers and as much notice as possible of any changed arrangements;
  - (ii) to maintain current arrangements on "facility time" for trade union reps to represent their members; and
  - (iii) to commit not to use agency workers to break strikes."

Following debate, on a show of hands, the Mayor declared that the Motion was carried by 49 votes to 7 and it was

**RESOLVED:**

Trade Union Bill

The Council notes:

- In July 2015, the Government announced its Trade Union Bill - a wide-ranging set of proposals which, taken as a package, will undermine the basic right to strike and make it harder for workers to organise effectively in trade unions.
- The proposals include ending the ban on employers bringing in agency workers to cover for permanent staff during industrial action – which fundamentally undermines the right to strike.
- The proposals will also bring in new restrictions on pickets and protests during strikes. Unions will have to give the details of a lead picketer on every picket line to the police and employers - and the Government have even floated the idea of making all picketers give their details to the police. They may even be required to submit a campaign plan to the police and employers two weeks in advance - setting out what they intend to do, whether they will use a loudspeaker or carry a banner and even what strikers intend to put on social media, such as Facebook or Twitter.
- The Government have also proposed new thresholds for turnout in strike ballots, plus additional thresholds for those working in "important public services".
- The Government want to grant Ministers the power to unilaterally cut so-called "facilities time" in the public sector. This is paid time-off mutually agreed between employers and unions for union reps to represent their members and negotiate with their employer.

## COUNCIL- THURSDAY 19TH NOVEMBER, 2015

- The Government also proposes to prohibit public sector employers assisting unions to collect their membership subscriptions through payrolls - even though this is used for a variety of other staff benefits such as cycle-to-work schemes and childcare vouchers, and even though unions often meet the costs of this.

The Council further notes:

- The human rights organisations Liberty, Amnesty International and the British Institute of Human Rights have said that the Government's proposals "would hamper people's basic rights to protest and shift even more power from the employee to the employer".
- The Government refuses to allow trade unions to ballot their members electronically, which could help increase engagement.
- Trade unions take industrial action for a wide range of reasons including defending wages and pensions, conditions at work and safety.
- Strikes in the UK are at historically low levels.

The Council believes:

- No worker ever wants to go on strike - but it is a crucial last resort for workers when their employer refuses to listen to their views, negotiate with them or compromise.

The right to strike and protest are fundamental rights which should be valued and respected in a free and democratic society.

- Without the right to strike, workers will be unable to defend their jobs or pay, stand up for decent services and achieve fairness and safety at work.
- The Government's proposals will undermine constructive employment relations in Sefton. We believe harmonious industrial relations are achieved by meaningful engagement with trade unions and their members.
- That, in the spirit of localism, councils should be free to build positive industrial relations that work for their communities without central government interference.

The Council resolves:

1. To support the trade unions campaign to protect the right to strike;

2. To write to the Secretary of State for Business, Innovation and Skills stating the Council's opposition to the Government's proposals on trade unions;
3. To write to the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government and the Minister for the Northern Powerhouse stating the opposition to the interference of Central Government in local industrial relations as it is against the spirit of localism;
4. Write to all MPs in Sefton informing them of our position and encouraging them to oppose the Trade Union Bill;
5. To continue to value the importance of meaningful workforce engagement and representation through trade unions in Sefton; and
6. In the event that the Government's proposals become law, in so far as is lawful for the council as an employer:
  - (i) to continue to allow recognised trade unions to use subscriptions through payroll, or otherwise support trade unions' efforts to move members onto direct debit subscriptions, through allowing access to workers and as much notice as possible of any changed arrangements;
  - (ii) to maintain current arrangements on "facility time" for trade union reps to represent their members; and
  - (iii) to commit not to use agency workers to break strikes.

**64. MOTION SUBMITTED BY COUNCILLOR CARRAGHER**

It was moved by Councillor Carragher, seconded by Councillor Dan T. Lewis:

Transatlantic Trade and Investment Partnership

"The Council notes:

1. That the EU and USA launched negotiations in July 2013 on a Transatlantic Trade and Investment Partnership (TTIP).
2. That negotiations are underway to determine which goods and services TTIP will apply to and if new rules can be agreed to protect

investors, harmonise standards, reduce tariffs and open new markets throughout the EU and USA.

3. That there has been no impact assessment about the potential impact on local authorities.
4. That there has been no scrutiny of the negotiating texts by local government and no consultation with local government representatives.
5. That MPs are also unable to scrutinise the negotiating documents.

This Council believes that:

1. TTIP could have a detrimental impact on local services, employment, suppliers and decision-making.
2. A thorough impact assessment of TTIP on local authorities must be undertaken before the negotiations can be concluded.
3. The proposed Investor State Dispute Settlement (ISDS) mechanism has been used by corporations to overturn democratic decisions by all levels of governments at significant public cost. Local decision-making must be protected from ISDS.
4. The EU's food, environmental and labour standards are better than those in the US and TTIP negotiations must raise and not lower these standards across the EU and USA.
5. Sourcing supplies and employment locally is important to strengthening local economies and meeting local needs. TTIP must not impact on local authorities' ability to act in the best interests its communities.

This Council resolves:

1. To write to the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government, local MPs, and all North West MEPs raising our serious concerns about the impact of TTIP on local authorities and the secrecy of the negotiating process;
2. To call for an impact assessment on the impact of TTIP on local authorities;
3. To publicise the Council's concerns about TTIP; join with other local authorities which are opposed to TTIP across Europe and work with local campaigners to raise awareness about the problems of TTIP; and
4. To contact the local authorities of municipalities twinned with Sefton Council asking them to consider passing a similar motion on TTIP."

Following debate, on a show of hands, the Mayor declared that the Motion was carried by 34 votes to 20 and it was

**RESOLVED:**

Transatlantic Trade and Investment Partnership

The Council notes:

1. That the EU and USA launched negotiations in July 2013 on a Transatlantic Trade and Investment Partnership (TTIP).
2. That negotiations are underway to determine which goods and services TTIP will apply to and if new rules can be agreed to protect investors, harmonise standards, reduce tariffs and open new markets throughout the EU and USA.
3. That there has been no impact assessment about the potential impact on local authorities.
4. That there has been no scrutiny of the negotiating texts by local government and no consultation with local government representatives.
5. That MPs are also unable to scrutinise the negotiating documents.

This Council believes that:

1. TTIP could have a detrimental impact on local services, employment, suppliers and decision-making.
2. A thorough impact assessment of TTIP on local authorities must be undertaken before the negotiations can be concluded.
3. The proposed Investor State Dispute Settlement (ISDS) mechanism has been used by corporations to overturn democratic decisions by all levels of governments at significant public cost. Local decisionmaking must be protected from ISDS.
4. The EU's food, environmental and labour standards are better than those in the US and TTIP negotiations must raise and not lower these standards across the EU and USA.
5. Sourcing supplies and employment locally is important to strengthening local economies and meeting local needs. TTIP must not impact on local authorities' ability to act in the best interests its communities.

This Council resolves:

1. To write to the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government, local MPs, and all North West MEPs raising our serious concerns about the impact of TTIP on local authorities and the secrecy of the negotiating process;
2. To call for an impact assessment on the impact of TTIP on local authorities;
3. To publicise the Council's concerns about TTIP; join with other local authorities which are opposed to TTIP across Europe and work with local campaigners to raise awareness about the problems of TTIP; and
4. To contact the local authorities of municipalities twinned with Sefton Council asking them to consider passing a similar motion on TTIP.

**65. MOTION SUBMITTED BY COUNCILLOR KILLEN**

It was moved by Councillor Killen, seconded by Councillor John Joseph Kelly and following debate, unanimously

**RESOLVED:**

Children in Residential Care

The Children and Families Act 2014 amended the Children Act 1989 to place a statutory duty on local authorities to allow children in care to continue to live with their foster parents when they reach 18 in what is called a 'staying put arrangement'. The local authority must provide advice, assistance and support to the former looked after child with a view to maintaining the staying put arrangement and provide financial support to the former foster parent until the child reaches the age of 21.

The same statutory duty does not apply to children who are in residential care when they reach 18. These vulnerable children and young people in residential care can have complex needs and compared to those fortunate enough to have been placed in foster care, are being discriminated against by the government.

As corporate parents for all children in our care we have a moral obligation to ensure that all such children have the best services and support that we can provide.

The Council calls upon the Government to implement similar legislation in relation to children in residential care and for the same to be fully funded by Government.

**66. MOTION SUBMITTED BY COUNCILLOR O'BRIEN**

It was moved by Councillor O'Brien, seconded by Councillor Lappin and following debate, unanimously



**RESOLVED:**

Sefton Attainment of the Navajo Charter Mark

The Council notes:

- that the Navajo Merseyside & Cheshire LGBTI Charter Mark is an equality mark sponsored by In-Trust Merseyside & Sefton Embrace and supported by the LGBTI Community networks across Merseyside – a signifier of good practice, commitment and knowledge of the specific needs, issues and barriers facing lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender and intersex (LGBTI) people in Merseyside.
- that the Navajo Charter Mark was introduced in Merseyside following the creation of the Navajo Merseyside Consultative Partnership (NMCP) in 2010. The first awards ceremony was in 2012.
- the growing importance of the Navajo Charter Mark within the local LGBTI community, as evidenced by the successful awards events and the number of local organisations who have either obtained or who are working towards obtaining the Charter Mark.
- that Sefton Council already has a positive record of activity and support in relation to the LGBTI community and that the corporate achievement of the Charter Mark will cement this commitment.
- that there is no financial cost to the Council for the application and assessment process and that work will be undertaken with existing staff resource and partner support.
- that in recognition of capacity and resource issues of the Council and partner agencies the attainment of the Charter Mark will be done on an incremental basis based upon themes.

The Council resolves to:

Support a corporate ambition for Sefton Council to progress the attainment of the Navajo Charter Mark via the Corporate Equality Group.

**67. MOTION SUBMITTED BY COUNCILLOR PREECE**

It was moved by Councillor Preece, seconded by Councillor Shaw:

Ainsdale Beach

“This Council:

- (a) recognises that Ainsdale Beach is a fantastic local amenity in terms of natural habitat, sea bathing, water sports, horse riding and sea fishing for both residents of Sefton and visitors.

- (b) notes the considerable public concern regarding the limitations currently being placed on winter vehicular access to the entrance to Ainsdale beach.
- (c) calls upon the officers to explore with elected representatives and the Ainsdale Civic Society possible car parking options at this location which should allow all residents, including those with disabilities, to access the beach during winter months. Any such provision to be submitted to the Southport Area Committee, Cabinet Member or Cabinet, as appropriate, for consideration.

The Council agrees to investigate the long term future development of "Ainsdale on Sea" including access to possible external funding sources to develop a visitor centre, retail space and improved beach car parking."

Councillor Hartill proposed that the Motion be amended by deleting the text in Paragraph (c) and substituting the following text:

"commits to re-opening Ainsdale Beach to all vehicular access with immediate effect, will open wide ranging, open and honest consultation before any other decisions are made regarding Sefton's coastline and open spaces and that officers be requested to submit the details of the financial costs of providing such provision to the Southport Area Committee, Cabinet Member or Cabinet, as appropriate, for consideration."

The Head of Regulation and Compliance advised the Council that the amendment was invalid because the vehicular access could not be reopened with immediate effect, as the financial implications of such action would need to be considered and approved by the Cabinet prior to implementation, in accordance with the provisions set out in Chapter 4 of the Constitution.

Following debate on the Motion, on a show of hands, the Mayor declared that the Motion was **lost** by 33 votes to 21 and it was

**RESOLVED:**

That no action be taken.

**68. MOTION SUBMITTED BY COUNCILLOR DAWSON**

It was moved by Councillor Dawson, seconded by Councillor Brodie – Browne:

Government Attempts to Cut Tax Credits

"This Council:

- (a) Recognises the severe negative impact which the Government's proposed alterations to Tax Credits would have had upon the net

incomes of approximately one million of Britain's less well - off families including thousands within the Borough of Sefton.

- (b) Notes that the Prime Minister specifically, before the 2015 General Election, publicly stated that he would not be cutting Child Tax Credits.
- (c) Congratulates the House of Lords in delaying the implementation of the secondary legislation which would have brought in the Government's proposed changes to Tax Credits.
- (d) Adds its voice to those who have called upon the government to think again before submitting unfair tax credit measures for further consideration by Parliament.”

An **amendment** was moved by Councillor Jones, seconded by Councillor Hartill that the Motion be amended as follows:

- (i) deletion of the text in Paragraph (b) and the renumbering of the remaining paragraphs; and
- (ii) By the addition of the following text:
  - “(d) That this Council understands the financial cost of tax credits to the tax payer and that it understands changes need to be made.
  - (e) That this Council understands changes will have effects and suggests that the Government introduces a balancing module, to decrease tax credits as the increase in the living wage takes effect.”

Therefore allowing people to be less reliant on the state and more reliant on their income from their employers”

Following debate, on a show of hands, the Mayor declared that the amendment was **lost** by 47 votes to 7.

Thereafter, following further debate, on a show of hands, the Mayor declared that the original Motion was carried by 47 votes to 7 and it was

**RESOLVED:**

Government Attempts to Cut Tax Credits

This Council:

- (a) Recognises the severe negative impact which the Government's proposed alterations to Tax Credits would have had upon the net incomes of approximately one million of Britain's less well – off families including thousands within the Borough of Sefton.

- (b) Notes that the Prime Minister specifically, before the 2015 General Election, publicly stated that he would not be cutting Child Tax Credits.
- (c) Congratulates the House of Lords in delaying the implementation of the secondary legislation which would have brought in the Government's proposed changes to Tax Credits.
- (d) Adds its voice to those who have called upon the government to think again before submitting unfair tax credit measures for further consideration by Parliament.

**69. MOTION SUBMITTED BY COUNCILLOR JONES**

It was moved by Councillor Jones, seconded by Councillor Hartill:

Councillors

“Elected members cost the council tax payer £760,191 in allowances and a further £33,412 in employer NI contributions for the year 2014/15, this makes a total of £793,603.

During these hard financial times where this council has to make tough decisions to try to balance our books, it is time we as elected members lead by example. By cutting councillor numbers by a third it could save this Council £193,476 based on the basic allowance (plus Employer NI contributions) a year. Whilst this is not something the Council can do for itself, it is something the Council can ask the Boundary Commission to consider.

Elections

Each year the local elections, unless they are combined with a national election, cost on average around £250,000 with members being elected by thirds.

2017 is a fallow year with no scheduled local elections. The next four year election cycle, beginning in 2018 under the current system of election by thirds will see scheduled combined events in 2019 and 2020.

Year	Scheduled Elections under the current system of elections by thirds & all other election events excluding referendum events	Scheduled elections if change to all out elections in 2018
2017	No scheduled elections	No scheduled elections
2018	Local Elections only (Year 1)	All out local elections Cost to Council - circa

COUNCIL- THURSDAY 19TH NOVEMBER, 2015

	Cost to council – circa £250K	£275K
2019	Local Elections only (Year 2) Parish Council Elections European Parliamentary Elections Cost to Council - circa £125K	Parish Council Elections European Parliamentary Elections Cost to Council – nil NB Parish Council would have to bear the full cost of their elections, whereas currently their costs are shared.
2020	Local Elections (Year 3) Parliamentary General Election Police & Crime Commissioner Elections Cost to Council circa £80K	Parliamentary General Election Police & Crime Commissioner Elections Cost to Council – nil
2021	No scheduled elections No cost to Council	No scheduled elections No cost to Council
<b>TOTAL COST TO COUNCIL</b>	<b>£455,000</b>	<b>£275,000</b>

That the Council resolves:

1. That the Council change its current electoral system of electing by thirds to a system of whole Council elections every four years.
2. That the Council's electoral system be changed in May 2018
3. It be noted that this would deliver savings of around £180,000 which would contribute to the Council's estimated budget shortfall.
4. That the Council requests the Boundary Commission to undertake an Electoral Review of the Borough to consider the appropriateness of the number of Councillors currently serving the Borough to allow it to make savings towards the budget shortfall.
5. That in undertaking this review the Boundary Commission be informed that the Council's preferred option is to see a reduction in the number of Councillors.
6. It be noted that a reduction of one third (22) of Councillors would deliver savings of around £193,476 a year which could contribute to the Council's estimated budget shortfall."

An **amendment** was moved by Councillor Shaw, seconded by Councillor Dawson that the Motion be amended as follows:

- “(a) deletion of Paragraphs 1, 2 and 3, and re-numbering existing Paragraphs 4, 5 and 6 accordingly;

- (b) in new Paragraph 3 (previously 6), after the words "... one third (22) of Councillor" add "to have two Councillors per Ward rather than three"; and
- (c) add new paragraphs 4 and 5 as follows:
  - “4. That the Council believes that the election of two councillors per ward rather than three should best be obtained by having elections of one councillor per ward every two years, each for a four-year term. Introducing this change with effect from the elections of 2018 would deliver savings of around £125,000 over the next five years in addition to the annual budget reductions achieved by reducing the numbers of councillors.
  - 5. That the Council believes that reducing the number of councillors in the above manner is necessary in order that this element of the Council's provision bears a share of the enforced budget reductions thereby protecting other services.”

Following debate, on a show of hands, the Mayor declared that the amendment was **lost** by 41 votes to 14.

Thereafter, following further debate, on a show of hands, the Mayor declared that the original Motion was **lost** by 32 votes to 21 and it was

**RESOLVED:**

That no action be taken.

**70. MOTION SUBMITTED BY COUNCILLOR BRENNAN**

In accordance with Rule 89 of Chapter 4 in the Council Constitution, the following Motion had been signed by 22 Members of the Council to enable the Motion to be considered by Council. A similar Motion submitted by Councillor Dawson was rejected by the Council under Minute No. 53 at its meeting held on 17 September 2015.

The Motion had been signed by Councillors Brennan, Atkinson, Bradshaw, Cummins, Dowd, Fairclough, Friel, Hardy, John Kelly, John Joseph Kelly, Kerrigan, Lappin, Maher, Mahon, Moncur, O'Brien, Robinson, Spencer, Thompson, Tweed, Veidman and Webster.

It was moved by Councillor Brennan, seconded by Councillor Cluskey and unanimously

**RESOLVED:**

This Council welcomes any genuine moves which can be made to provide better opportunities for people with disabilities, including serious mental health problems, to obtain forms of employment which they are able to undertake while dealing with their condition.

The Council believes that the greater the proportion of the population who are skilled, supported and able to share in suitable employment, the better this will be for the health of more people and the health of our nation as a whole. Council believes that this requires a focused and supportive regime, not one based upon fear.

The Council notes:

- (a) the New Deal for disabled people and Pathways to work both introduced by Labour and aimed solely at people with health conditions and disabilities was replaced in 2011 by the work programme a single mainstream programme for all benefit claimants.
- (b) disabled people placed in the ESA Work Related Activity Group (WRAG) programme are compelled to prepare for work because they are deemed capable of work related activity and notes the gap between the work related activity and the capacity to secure and sustain employment in a competitive labour market and further note that this gap is not caused by a culture of dependency.
- (c) the expressed concern of leading mental health charities and Royal College of Psychiatrists at the impact of welfare reform on people with mental health problems and those with learning disabilities as they are amongst the most vulnerable members of society and further note that the number of people with mental health problems are disproportionately sanctioned through the work programme. Council recognises that disabled people want to work and require support not sanctions.
- (d) the introduction of Personal Independent Payments (PIP) to replace Disability Living Allowance (DLA) for adults has created serious problems and assessment delays for many people with physical and mental disabilities.
- (e) the continued lack of sufficient disability employment advisors within the DWP to assist people with disabilities and long term health conditions to find appropriate employment.
- (f) nearly 11 million adults including one in four Jobseeker's Allowance claimants in the UK, have one or more common mental health conditions.

The Council declares that any assessment process for work related disability benefits should be reformed to make it a secure gateway to specialist disability employment support for those either with a good medical prognosis for recovery and those with impairments that can be accommodated with effective adjustments or assistance.

