

COUNCIL – 21ST SEPTEMBER 2017

QUESTIONS RAISED BY MEMBERS OF THE COUNCIL

1. **Question submitted by Councillor David Barton to Cabinet Member – Regeneration and Skills (Councillor Atkinson)**

“Would the Council be able to pursue ways of generating revenue for essential public services such as the provision of Social Care for Adults and Children at future Golf Opens to be held at Royal Birkdale, Southport which could be fairly distributed across all three Sefton constituencies- Southport, Sefton Central and Bootle?”

Response:

“The Council are looking at a number of ways to generate revenue to mitigate the cruel and unfair cuts imposed on Sefton residents by the previous and current government”.

2. **Question submitted by Councillor David Barton to the Cabinet Member – Regeneration and Skills (Councillor Atkinson)**

“Does the Council have plans to work constructively with Royal Mail to re-open Post Offices across the Borough in previously convenient and prominent locations such as Lord Street, Southport?”

Response:

“The Council is not aware of any plans to reopen Post Offices across the borough.”

3. **Question submitted by Councillor David Barton to the Cabinet Member – Regeneration and Skills (Councillor Atkinson)**

“Which Councillors were responsible for the sandblasting of the 1882 Promenade Railings in Southport back in 2006 which have since caused tremendous strain on a local piece of Southport and Southport history which will require much and unnecessary restorative funding which could have been retained for other essential everyday services such as the provision of Adult and Children Social Care across the Borough?”

Response:

“Councillor Barton received a response to this question on 21st April 2017 from Council officers”.

4. **Question submitted by Councillor David Barton to the Cabinet Member – Locality Services (Councillor Fairclough)**

“Would the Council be able to provide a full detailed report on why various street lighting columns on Lord Street Southport on the westwards side of the boulevard had defective circuitry which included loose cabling an "out" clock as of late December 2016 upon inspection by Contractors?”

Response:

“The feeder pillar in question which is situated outside 219 was damaged in a RTC (road traffic collision) along with lighting column No 25. W.T. Jenkins were on site rectifying the damage to both the feeder pillar and the lighting column. The loose cabling and the damage to the clock within the feeder pillar was a direct result of this RTC. Please note all damaged equipment has now be replaced or rectified and at no point after the initial make safe was the public put at risk due to this damage”.

5. **Question submitted by Councillor David Barton to the Cabinet Member – Locality Services (Councillor Fairclough)**

“Would the Council like to provide an explanation as to why the ornamental lamp posts at No.91- 97 Lord Street are still defective having consulted with both Scottish Power and the Lighting Department back in December 2016?”

Response

“These balustrade columns outside 91 to 97 Lord Street, Southport were inspected by Sefton’s electrician on 12th September 2017 and found them on and working”.

6. **Question submitted by Councillor David Barton to the Cabinet Member – Regulatory, Compliance and Corporate Services (Councillor Lappin)**

“Would the Council be able to spend any more of its special reserves budget on maintaining its civic assets such as the Municipal Gardens, the Southport Town Hall fascia frontage, Cambridge Arcade and the Eco Centre bearing in mind the North of the Borough shall be shortly showcased to the entirety of the world where there may be potential long-term investors seeking to propel the Sefton economy and in turn everyday essential services such as Social Care and general highways safety measures such as resurfaced roads?”

Response:

“Sefton has an investment strategy for the Southport area. We are working with the Bid and various other partners to regenerate the area which Cllr Barton refers to. Cllr Barton (a former Conservative councillor) will also be fully aware that this Council has lost 50% of its funding up to 2020 and during the last 7 years the Conservative government has both in coalition and government on its own overseen this appalling travesty of injustice to the residents of Sefton. Despite this Sefton has maintained excellent standards in the face of appalling deprivation and will continue to do so. Cllr Barton is reminded that if he wishes to assist with the improvements of the properties he refers to, he always has access to his Area Committee funds”.

7. **Question submitted by Councillor David Barton to the Cabinet Member - Regulatory, Compliance and Corporate Services (Councillor Lappin)**

“Does the Council have plans to attract outside investment to not only restore but reutilise long vacant assets such as the former Manhattans Bar on the Promenade and if so what do these plans prescribe in full detail?”

Response:

“Sefton has an investment strategy for Southport Town Centre as well as others across the borough. We are working closely with our partners in the Bid, local residents and traders to avail ourselves of every opportunity to ensure that our assets in Sefton are utilised to their full capacity. So, yes, our commitment is obvious”.

8. **Question submitted by Councillor David Barton to the Cabinet Member – Regulatory, Compliance and Corporate Services (Councillor Lappin)**

“What measures is the Council undertaking to raise their environmentally-friendly profile, especially with regards to improving air quality in busy parts of the Southport, Crosby and Bootle town centres?”

Response:

“The Council has recently developed the Air Quality Strategic Group with Cllrs Lappin and Moncur chairing with representatives from Environmental Health, Public Health, Planning, Highways and Economic Development all attending. The group meets every 6 weeks and acts as the main forum for strategic discussions about air quality, including receiving and responding to consultations, approaches to work jointly with other organisations, and ideas for local action. One of the terms of reference is to engage with the public and communicate accurate and appropriate messages in relation to local air quality.

Officers from Public Health and Environmental Health regularly attend local groups and forums giving presentations to attendees on air quality matters with the next presentation planned for October 2017 to members of the Healthwatch group. All Councillors were invited to attend a recent presentation on Air Quality given by officers from Environmental Health and Public Health.

The Council monitors levels of air pollution across the Borough and provides the breathing space air quality website where detailed air quality information is made available to the public. Online air pollution monitoring data and historical air quality reports are available to view and download.

Officers from Environmental Health are in the process of drafting Sefton's Air Quality Annual Status Report 2017 for submission to DEFRA. This document will be made available to members of the public once published.

The Council is currently in the process of engaging a consultant to undertake a Clean Air Zone feasibility study to consider how to tackle traffic related air pollution in Sefton's Air Quality management Areas. The results of this study will be made available once the process has been completed.

A school air quality project is currently being developed to engage with local school children on Air Quality and health related matters. Once the project commences arrangements will be made to publicise the scheme”.

9. **Question submitted by Councillor David Barton to the Cabinet Member – Health and Wellbeing (Councillor Moncur)**

“What plans are in place to maintain all grass lawns owned by the Council and what criteria do volunteers need should they wish to maintain these within their local communities across the Borough?”

Response:

“All grounds management is undertaken by the Council unless there is a specific agreement in place. There are a number of places where community organisations have either a lease or licence with the Council to manage specific green spaces, most notably with bowling greens or cricket wickets. Sporting clubs on these sites will invariably have entire responsibility, including public liability insurance and must have trained competent persons undertaking such work as spraying chemicals.

The Council must all times have regard to volunteers and the public being kept safe and volunteer activity on Council managed land is limited to assisting with leaf collection, edging borders and litter picking.

The Council will always consider expressions of interest from community groups with an interest in entering into a legal arrangement to manage areas of land but we would need to be entirely satisfied that such a request will continue to ensure high standards of grounds management are continued”.

10. **Question submitted by Councillor David Barton to the Cabinet Member – Planning and Building Control (Councillor Veidman)**

“Will the Council support the wishes of communities across the Borough and utilise only brown-field sites where there is no risk to loss of civic heritage as part of its Local Plan?”

Response:

“I refer Cllr Barton to the report of the Local Plan Inspector, Mr Pike, who was appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government to preside over the ‘Examination in Public’ hearings into the Local Plan. He produced a report in March 2017 which, you will recall, was presented to Full Council in April 2017, at which Full Council confirmed adoption of Sefton’s Local Plan.

By way of recap and for clarification purposes, his report contained an assessment of the Sefton Local Plan in terms of Section 20(5) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 (as amended). It confirmed that the Plan’s preparation complied with the duty to co-operate. It then confirmed that the Plan was sound and compliant with the legal requirements. Paragraph 182 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) makes clear that to be sound, a Local Plan should be positively prepared, justified, effective and consistent with national policy. Subject to his incorporation of a small number of amendments discussed and agreed at the final hearings, he confirmed this to be the case.

In paragraph 90, the Inspector addresses specifically the issue relating to the preference of brownfield over Green Belt sites, which was raised by multiple individuals and organisations through the process.

However, he categorically discounted this, acknowledging an insufficient capacity and ability of the brownfield sites to deliver a 5-year housing land supply, as required by the NPPF:

90. Some representors argue that the housing delivery should be phased so that brownfield sites are prioritised for delivery before the Green Belt allocations are released. This is a laudable aim and, in practice, it has been the situation for the early years of the Plan period. However, it is clear from the analysis above that unless the Green Belt sites are delivered as soon as possible after Plan adoption, the Council will not be able to provide the five year supply required by national policy.

Furthermore, where former Green Belt sites were proposed to be allocation for development, heritage has been taken into account, and where appropriate the developable area of the site has been restricted to avoid harm e.g. housing allocation MN2.2 Bankfield Lane, Churchtown, where an area of 'proposed open space' shown on the Proposals Map is designated in part to protect the setting of the North Meols Conservation Area; at Moss Lane, Churchtown where this is covered in part 1f of policy MN5; and at Moor Lane, Ainsdale (site MN2.11) where the Local Plan Inspector specifically addressed the adjacent heritage asset in paragraphs 221 and 222 of this report (and included within Appendix 1 of the adopted Local Plan):

221. To the south-west of the site is the grade II listed Formby House Farm, an early 18th century white-rendered cottage which has been altered and extended, though the principal south elevation retains mostly original features.

There is a courtyard to the south of the cottage and a garden to the north, both enclosed by established hedges, walls and solid gates. Glimpses of the rear of the cottage are obtained from parts of the allocation site, though such views are interrupted by the hedges, new outbuildings in the rear garden and a large new barn to the east. The core elements of the listed building's setting relate to the southern and western elevation and the courtyard; views of (and from) these elements would not be affected by the proposed development. There would be limited, angled views from the rear of the cottage towards the allocation site, though visually the impact on the setting of the listed building would be minimal.

222. It is unclear from the evidence whether there was an historic agricultural association between the farmland of the allocation site and Formby House Farm. I accept that the rural surroundings of the cottage are important in appreciating the significance of the heritage asset, and clearly a small part of that rural setting would be lost. But in the context of a building whose principal historic aspect to the south and west would be unaltered, and where the field directly to the north would also remain undeveloped, the harm to the significance of the listed building and its setting would be limited. Consequently I consider that the undefined dog-leg boundary to the allocation site, which is intended to provide a buffer to the listed building, is arbitrary and is set back further than is necessary. In my view the new barn and its hardstanding provide a stronger boundary to the allocation, though again this would benefit from suitable landscaping. Notwithstanding this slight extension to the site, it is important that the Plan states the need for the housing scheme to preserve the setting of Formby House Farm. This was not a specific requirement of the Submission Plan and is one of the necessary additions to Appendix 1 comprised in MM74.

I hope the above clarifies the Council's position on the consideration of heritage and the need to develop former green belt sites alongside brownfield equivalents in the preparation and adoption of the Local Plan."

11. **Question submitted by Councillor Hands to the Cabinet Member for Locality Services (Councillor Fairclough)**

"The Cabinet Member made a decision recently which stated 'Ward Councillors and Area Committees will be consulted and requested to approve detailed designs of all schemes in accordance with the Council's constitution and approved protocols'.

Why was this not done with regards to the Lord Street resurfacing scheme?"

Response:

"The Lord Street resurfacing project is a routine highway maintenance activity and forms part of the 2017/18 Highway Maintenance Programme which was approved by Cabinet Member and subsequently published earlier this year. The scheme is not deemed to be a 'new' or 'improvement' scheme as there are to be no geometric amendments to the carriageway or inclusion of additional physical highway features such as, pedestrian refuges, mini roundabouts or pedestrian crossings.

The Constitution (Chapter 8 Cl' 21) only requires for Area Committees to consider the proposals of "improvements to highways" and as such the Lord Street project was not referred due to the reasons stated above.

The Area Committee can rest assured that for future highway "improvement" schemes that fall within the criteria, that they will continue to be consulted as they have been previously on many schemes before".

12. **Question submitted by Councillor Dawson to the Leader of the Council (Councillor Maher)**

"The Liverpool City Council has recently received publicity in respect of City Council officers intervening in email correspondence sent to an elected member of that Council by a member of the public when such intervention has apparently been made without the permission of either the member of the public or the elected member concerned. This intervention has not been denied.

The Sefton MBC Constitution states, in respect of emails sent to Councillors using the Council's email address for each elected member which is published:

"52. E-mail or text is not confidential and should not be treated as such. The Council will routinely monitor usage patterns for e-mail and Internet communication. The reasons for monitoring are many, including cost analysis/allocation and the management of the Authority's gateway to the Internet. All messages created, sent or retrieved over the Authority's e-mail and Internet are the property of the Council and should be considered public information.

The Council reserves the right to access and monitor all messages and files on the Authority's e-mail and Councillors should not assume electronic communications are totally private and should communicate confidential data in other ways."

Can the Leader of the Council confirm that each elected member has separate legal entity distinct from that of the Borough Council and holds complete personal responsibility as data controller over all data held by that elected member, wheresoever and however it is stored, and in respect of the confidentiality of all data transmitted between the Councillor concerned and any member of the public, however this transmission may be?

As such, can the Leader of the Council confirm that notwithstanding the technical exceptions outlined in paragraph 52 of the Constitution, Sefton MBC Councillors' emails to and from members of the public WILL generally always be treated as private and will NOT be copied to or observed by any non-audit officer of the Council or other member of the Council with the exception of processes related to alleged contravention of the Council's IT protocols which have been previously agreed to by the Councillor(s) concerned?"

Response:

"I believe that this question should be addressed to the Council's Legal Director and suggest Cllr Dawson does so".

13. **Question submitted by Councillor Dawson to the Leader of the Council (Councillor Maher)**

"Will the Leader of the Council provide members of the Authority and the public with a breakdown of the spending by Sefton MBC (individual headings over £1000 on any item or group of items) which was directly associated with the 2017 Open Golf tournament and inform the council of the extent of any unspent monies in the budgeted amount designated for this purpose?"

Response:

"Sefton Council is an open and transparent authority and as such all figures are published within the Council's normal processes. Cllr Dawson should be aware of this. Any underspend will revert to the Council's general funds to help enable us to deal with shortfalls created by the coalition and subsequent Tory government by them slashing Sefton's funding since 2010".

14. **Question submitted by Councillor Dawson to the Leader of the Council (Councillor Maher)**

"The decision to replace the red tarmac of Southport's Lord Street is now being reported as having been taken 'informally' by the Cabinet Member (Locality Services) on 14th June 2017. Yet, although the taking of this decision was not required in any emergency at that time, the matter was not consulted upon with the people of Southport or their elected representatives - or with the local Civic Society despite the fact that the effect of the decision would significantly affect the appearance of a Conservation Area.

The colour change decision was not even publicly-notified at the time and a press release issued by Sefton MBC on 10th August 2017 concerning the planned resurfacing of Lord Street did not even mention the proposed material change in the surfacing, not did it seek views about options for the re-direction of buses in Southport town centre.

A 'Key Decision' is defined in the Council's Constitution, as:

- any Executive decision that is not in the Annual Revenue Budget and Capital Programme approved by the Council and which requires a gross budget expenditure, saving or virement of more than £100,000 or more than 2% of a Departmental budget, whichever is the greater

or

- any Executive decision where the outcome will have a significant impact on a significant number of people living or working in two or more Wards

The decision to change Lord Street's colour from red to black during resurfacing is alleged to have made a £400,000 saving in a project which would otherwise cost over £800,000 and clearly affects a significant number of people living, working and shopping in Southport who live in all seven wards of Southport as well as others from further afield. This decision also makes considerable impact upon the general appearance of a Conservation Area and hence should also have been consulted with the Southport Civic Society and others because of this. Thus, it was a 'Key Decision' in a number of ways as well as being a decision which required proper consideration in respect of conservation matters.

Given the above, will you ask the Sefton MBC Cabinet to urgently reconsider this decision-making to see what can be done to mitigate the failures highlighted above and to take appropriate steps to ensure that significant decisions affecting Southport and/or any other major part of the Borough are, in future, only made through a process involving direct consultation with elected representatives of that 'major part of the Borough' concerned and appropriate organisations”?

Response

“The Cabinet Member was able to take the executive decision on the basis that the proposed expenditure had been identified and agreed in the Capital programme as approved by Council on 2nd March 2017. This was as part of the report referring to the “Budget 17/18 and Medium Financial Plan. A further ‘update’ report was taken to Cabinet on the 27th July 2017 providing a more detailed breakdown of the relevant Revenue and Capital Budgets/expenditure.”

15. Question submitted by Councillor Dawson to the Merseytravel Committee (Liverpool City Region Combined Authority Transport Committee) Spokesperson (Councillor Friel)

1. “How much, on average, does it cost to supply and install
 - (a) a freestanding bus stop including post?
 - (b) a freestanding bus timetable on a stand?

(c) a bus stop sign on a lamp post?

(d) a bus timetable strapped to a lamp post?

2. How many installations have there been, in the last year for which statistics are available, in the Borough of Sefton (alternately, for the Merseytravel area) for (a) to (d) above?
3. How much has been spent within the Borough of Sefton (or alternately, for the Merseytravel area) in the last year for which statistics are available, on bus sign and signposts of the types (a) to (d) above?
4. What is the Sefton MBC attitude to permitting the installation of new bus stop signs and timetables on lamp posts owned by the Council?
5. Besides Hillside Station, which other Merseyrail stations remain totally disabled-unfriendly?"

Response:

1. How much, on average, does it cost to supply and install

(a) a freestanding bus stop including post?

"The basic cost of a standard bus stop post is £800, this includes the plate and one timetable frame. It does not include any additional works that may be required such as a new hard standing area within a grassed verge. Equally, depending upon the environment, Traffic Management maybe required. Our contractor CCUK charge a 'standard' cost of £400 for this aspect, which is comparable to charges made by other contractors".

(b) a freestanding bus timetable on a stand?

"The basic cost of a freestanding pole with bus timetable frame is £450. It is unusual to 'just supply' this element as new shelters have integrated timetables and posts come with a timetable frame. The freestanding bus timetable is typically found alongside old-style shelters, such as "Abacus", or if a bus stop consists of a plate on a light column".

(c) a bus stop sign on a lamp post?

"The cost for a new style flag on a light column is £99.85 (which includes installation)".

(d) a bus timetable strapped to a lamp post?

"Standard cost is £166 but new installations are rare".

2. "We have ordered new flags for 514 freestanding bus stop posts and 176 light columns in Sefton in the last 12 months".
3. "The new flags for the 176 light columns in Sefton cost £17,573.60 whilst the new flags for the 514 posts cost £51,322.90".
4. "SMBC's attitude is ambivalent and there hasn't been any hard and fast rule of thumb from this particular district. WBC, KMBC & LCC do not particularly support

this practice. In order to avoid restricting access to the maintenance panel/cover on the lamp post, the timetable frame is often set too high and becomes unreadable.

This is particularly relevant to those with impaired mobility or sight, hence Merseytravel tends to avoid the installation of bus stop furniture on lighting columns whenever possible, unless it is of a temporary nature or unavoidable”.

5. In response to the step free accessibility status of stations on the Merseyrail network:

<i>Line</i>	<i>Step-free (and compliant) throughout</i>	<i>Step-free (compliance work required, e.g. ramp gradient)</i>	<i>Step-free but not between platforms</i>	<i>Step-free to one platform only</i>	<i>Not step free to either/all platforms</i>
<i>Northern Line</i>	17	7	2	1	8
<i>Wirral Line</i>	11	7	3	4	7
<i>Merseyrail Electrics total (67 stations):</i>	28 (19 through lifts)	14	5	5	15
<i>City Line</i>	8 (4 through lifts)	4	4	3	2
<i>Overall Total:</i>	36	18	9	8	17

16. Question submitted by Councillor Dawson to the Cabinet Member for Regulatory, Compliance and Corporate Services (Councillor Paulette Lappin)

“Could the Cabinet Member inform the public of the Borough of Sefton, as well as members of the Council:

- (a) whether any officers of the council have yet been involved in enforcing the PSPO in respect of 'dogs off leads' and where within the Borough such enforcement activity has taken place?
- (b) the extent to which those areas, particularly in public parks and council-controlled open land where there are, under the recently adopted PSPO (i) restrictions on dogs off leads and (ii) specific
- (c) how many signs of various types to sufficiently-inform dog owners and other members of the public about local permissions/prohibitions under the PSPO have been purchased or will shortly be purchased?
- (d) what will be the anticipated total cost of the PSPO dog walking permission and /off lead restriction signs and, given that this PSPO was not anticipated at the time of the Council's budget meeting, which budget the purchase/production of these signs will come from?"

Response

“Since introduction of the PSPO-Dog Control the main focus has been to continue to raise awareness of these new requirements across the Borough through various media including local press, Council website, My Sefton, twitter, signage and engagement with dog owners etc. Officers, as part of their normally day-to-day duties across the whole of the Borough, undertake enforcement were they encounter a dog walker not complying with the requirements of the Order. To-date one FPN has been served in the Westwood View area of Waterloo.

The extent to which the dogs on leads controls will be enforced is detailed in the Order, in particular this involves 17 parks that will have such controls. These sites are listed with specific maps included.

In order to raise awareness various methods have been adopted of which signage plays a role. In order to keep costs to a minimum signage placed throughout the Borough has been in the form of laminated A4 sheets. In total in excess of 80 signs have been placed on highway locations with more than 50 signs placed in Libraries, sports centres, parks and cemeteries.

Zonal maps of sites are currently being designed by Community parks and Green space Service to further inform the public. These will be posted across park sites, on social media and distributed to Friends of Parks Groups. Workshops will also be offered within parks to further inform residents. The mapping will be printed in house and laminated to keep the costs as low as possible. These will be posted in noticeboards where available and around other key locations in park sites.

Due to adopting laminated signage, costs will be minimal. It is anticipated that a small number of plaques and stickers will be purchased for use in parks at an approximate cost of £500 and this expenditure will be funded through existing Parks and Green spaces Service budget.”

17. Question submitted by Councillor Jo Barton to the Cabinet Member for Regulatory, Compliance and Corporate Services (Councillor Lappin)

“In order to reduce paper waste and to cut costs Councillors were persuaded last year to use a Galaxy hand held device for the viewing of agendas and minutes etc and so that we could view emails and conduct our council business more effectively. In order to achieve this at least sixty six such devices were bought and distributed along with a contract for a wireless dongle. Why then is it that Councillors are still receiving paper agendas for all meetings which are hand delivered by an employee of the council?”

Response

“There is an ambition for the Council to go paperlite. Members were therefore issued with a Samsung Galaxy tablet computer and a mobile wifi box. The majority of Members accepted and are using the tablet; however there are still a number of members who are not using the tablets and so the Head of Regulation and Compliance will be contacting those Members to ascertain what can be done to help them in their transition from paper to tablet.

The tablets are pre-loaded with a number of apps, including the Modgov Public App, which gives the user access to documents for Council and Committee meetings. The Council are in the process of purchasing a further App which will permit access to restricted documents. This municipal year is being used to support the transition from reliance on paper to tablets and to iron out any difficulties members may experience before becoming reliant on the tablets entirely.

I would like to reassure Members that this will be a phased project with an ambition of the Council going paperlite by May 2018 in terms of circulation of paper agendas. This ambition ties in with the 3 Year Budget Plan that the Council set 2017 - 2020 of which a review of the Mail Delivery Service is part of Year 2018/19”.

18. Question submitted by Councillor Bliss to the Cabinet Member for Planning and Building Control (Councillor Daren Veidman)

“Families neighbouring the Slaidburn Crescent industrial estate have expressed concern over the use of potentially carcinogenic materials in factories on the site. What assessments does the Planning Department carry out before allowing factories using carcinogenic fibres to be located within metres of a residential area?”

Response

“When considering developments, the local planning authority are advised under the National Planning Policy Framework to focus on whether the development itself is an acceptable use of the land rather than the control of processes where these are subject to approval under other legislation and control of other pollution control authorities. In this instance, the Health and Safety Executive (HSE) would be the responsible body where a business premises is using substances in its processing which may cause harm to human health. Subsequently, the Local Planning Department would not be expected to obtain or require the submission of an assessment for such matters as part of a planning application. Nevertheless, the Councils Environmental health Service are key consultees to the planning process, and will provide further advice on the impacts of development, and the other licensing/permitting controls that uses/operations will need to comply with. Thresholds have been set which trigger the licensing/permitting schemes and it has been determined, by Central Government, that where emissions from commercial/industrial operations fall below these thresholds , no proactive controls are required as the potential environmental and health impacts are considered negligible.”

19. Question submitted by Councillor Shaw to the Cabinet Member for Regulatory, Compliance and Corporate Services (Councillor Paulette Lappin)

- A. “If the Trade Union pay claim for 2018 for NJC staff of 5% for all such staff (with additional pay rises for those on the four lowest NJC pay points) were implemented from 1st April 2018, what would the extra cost be to Sefton MBC in 2018/19?
- B. (1) Excluding teachers, how many staff does Sefton MBC employ other than under the terms of the NJC for Local Government Services (e.g. under JNC for Chief Officers, Soulbury etc)?

(2) If a 5% pay rise were given to such staff and implemented from 1st April 2018, what would the extra cost be to Sefton MBC in 2018/19?

C. In her motion to this week's Council Meeting, the Cabinet Member is proposing that "this Council supports the NJC pay claim for 2018, submitted by UNISON, GMB and Unite." That pay claim calls for the deletion of NJC pay points SCP 6-9 as well as a 5% increase on all NJC pay points.

(1) Will the Cabinet Member confirm that, in Sefton MBC's case, this would mean that all those employees currently in Grades A and B will move to the same salary as those currently on the bottom SCP of Grade C?

(2) Is there any extent to which employees in Grade C supervise those in Grades A and B?

(3) In proposing her motion, what consideration has the Cabinet Member given to the possibility that the point raised in (2) above could give rise to significant increases in the very "equal and fair pay risks" referred to in her motion?

(4) If her motion is passed, what, if anything, would the Cabinet Member propose to address this problem?"

Response

Question A:

"The cost to Sefton MBC would be nil due to the fact that we are asking the Government to fund it.

Question B:

(1) Not including schools, the Local Authority employs on JNC and Soulbury specific arrangements, the following:

Chief Executive and HAY 1-5	22
Soulbury	36
Youth	34

(2) I refer you to my answer to Question A.

Question C:

(1) No, this does not mean that.

(2) Under our current pay spine, some employees at Grade C do supervise some lower graded employees. However, the overwhelming very high majority do not.

(3) Equal pay risks would always be considered and advice given by officers to appropriately deal with risk (to re-iterate, taking place nationally).

(4) The Cabinet Member would receive advice on such matters from officers".

20. **Question submitted by Councillor Pullin to the Cabinet Member for Regeneration and Skills (Councillor Atkinson)**

“With regards to the resubmission to the Heritage Lottery Fund of the Southport Town Centre - Townscape Heritage Lottery Application what safeguards and checks did the Cabinet Member undertake to ensure that the removal of the distinctive red appearance from Lord Street’s historic boulevard would not adversely affect this and future funding re-generation applications?”

Response

"Can I suggest Cllr Pullin direct the question to the appropriate Cabinet member."

21. **Question submitted by Councillor Dawson to the Chair of the Southport Area Committee (Councillor Hands)**

“Whether he is satisfied that, in matters where input from Southport councillors, into forthcoming decisions to be made by Cabinet Members and officers of the Council, would be helpful or necessary to good decision-making, this input is appropriately and routinely sought from Southport Councillors either by communication or via the Southport Area Committee to the optimum extent? - and if he will give examples which support his answer.”

Response

“Thank you for your question.

In response to your question I will say that on some occasions the council’s Highway Department do talk and negotiate with Southport ward councillors prior to a decision being taken and in previous years the Transport Programme has come to Southport Area Committee for discussion. Unfortunately this year the Transport Programme for 2017/18 did not come to Southport Area Committee for discussion and the information on the resurfacing on Lord Street Southport was not given to Southport ward Councillors and local businesses until after the decision had been taken. This is one example of if the council had followed their procedure, as laid down in the Constitution, the upset caused by the Lord Street resurfacing could have been minimal”.