

CABINET

10.00 A.M.

28TH MAY 2013

PRESENT:- Councillors Eileen Blamire (Chairman), Janice Hanson (Vice-Chairman), Jon Barry, Abbott Bryning, Tim Hamilton-Cox, Karen Leytham and Ron Sands

Apologies for Absence:-

Councillor David Smith

Officers in attendance:-

Mark Cullinan	Chief Executive
Nadine Muschamp	Head of Resources and Section 151 Officer
Andrew Dobson	Head of Regeneration and Planning Service
David Lawson	Assistant Head (Policy and Delivery)
Simon Kirby	Assistant Head (Wellbeing)
Liz Bateson	Principal Democratic Support Officer

1 MINUTES

The minutes of the meeting held on Tuesday 23 April 2013 were approved as a correct record.

2 ITEMS OF URGENT BUSINESS AUTHORISED BY THE LEADER

The Chairman advised that there were no items of urgent business.

3 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Councillor Barry declared an interest with regard to the item on Storey Creative Industries Centre in view of him being a member of the Friends of Storey Gardens (Minute 9 refers).

4 PUBLIC SPEAKING

Members were advised that there had been no requests to speak at the meeting in accordance with Cabinet's agreed procedure.

5 CABINET LIAISON GROUPS AND APPOINTMENTS TO OUTSIDE BODIES, PARTNERSHIPS AND BOARDS

(Cabinet Member with Special Responsibility Councillor Blamire)

Cabinet received a report from the Chief Executive to consider the Cabinet Liaison Groups currently constituted and Cabinet appointments to Outside Bodies, Partnerships and Boards.

The options, options analysis, including risk assessment and officer preferred option,

were set out in the report as follows:

The options regarding Cabinet Liaison Groups were:

- To note existing arrangements and make no amendments.
- To consider and approve, where appropriate, any proposals from Cabinet Members.

With regard to Outside Bodies, Partnerships and Boards, Cabinet was requested to make appointments, as set out in Appendix C to the report.

It was recommended that appointments be aligned as closely as possible to individual Cabinet Members' portfolios.

Councillor Hanson proposed, seconded by Councillor Leytham:-

“(1) That the recommendations, as set out in the report, be approved.”

Councillors then voted:-

Resolved unanimously:

- (1) That the Cabinet Liaison Groups as set out in Appendix B to the report be re-convened, with revised terms of reference with regard to the Canal Corridor Cabinet Liaison Group being agreed by urgent decision prior to the Liaison Group meeting on 19th June 2013.
- (2) That the Lead Cabinet Member of each Cabinet Liaison Group be requested to inform the Chief Executive of the participants he/she wishes to invite to such meetings.
- (3) That the appointments to Outside Bodies, Partnerships and Boards as set out in Appendix C to the report be confirmed with the following revisions:
 - The appointment to the Lancaster District Children's Trust Board be deferred
 - Councillor Blamire be appointed as the named substitute to the Community Safety Partnership
 - Councillor Hamilton-Cox be appointed as the named substitute to the Health and Wellbeing Partnership

Officers responsible for effecting the decision:

Chief Executive
Head of Governance

Reasons for making the decision:

The establishment of Cabinet Liaison Groups assists the Cabinet in the discharge of executive functions. The Constitution stipulates that the terms of reference of Cabinet Liaison Groups need to be approved by Cabinet before they can meet. Since approval

is required prior to the next Cabinet meeting they will need to be approved using the urgent business procedure. Representation on Outside Bodies is part of the City Council's community leadership role.

6 LANCASTER SQUARE ROUTES

(Cabinet Member with Special Responsibility Councillor Hanson)

Cabinet received a report from the Head of Regeneration & Planning to report on further project implementation to improve key streets and spaces within the city centre and request that the decision on the centrepiece for Market Square be deferred to the June meeting.

The options, options analysis, including risk assessment and officer preferred option, were set out in the report as follows:

The proposal made in the report followed extensive community engagement. It was based on design concepts approved by Cabinet, which the Council had made budgetary provision for in the General Fund Capital Programme. The ERDF investment award was towards specific deliverables and to a whole programme of improvements. It could not be drawn down if the scope of works was reduced significantly. With this as the context, two options were presented. The difference between the two options concerned the centrepiece to Market Square. Option one included a single elevated structure as the centrepiece. Option 2 for a twin or divided structure. The plans and drawings in appendices 1 and 2 on the supplementary report refer. The two options had very similar seating capacities and both could be used for impromptu and informal performances.

Option 1	To implement the proposal set out in section 2.0 of the report with a centrepiece to Market Square comprising a single elevated structure (as per the option 1 drawings in Appendix 1).
Advantages	<p>A full renewal of the length of Cheapside, Horseshoe Corner and Penny Street can be achieved in 2013/14 to a much higher specification than the county council could otherwise afford.</p> <p>The Lancaster Square Routes concept proposal for Market Square can be delivered in full by September 2014, including part of Market Street.</p> <p>The option represents a large investment for the city council with upwards of £2 of external investment secured for every £1 invested by the city council. Investments of this magnitude are hard won and unlikely to be available again.</p> <p>The proposal will give a better environment for trading in the established commercial and retail centre of the city. This should help the competitiveness of Lancaster centre with other centres and drive footfall.</p> <p>It will complement the Castle and Canal Corridor North developments should these come on stream.</p>

	<p>Market Square itself will be better laid out to support an improving Charter market. On non market days the improvements will be convivial for quiet enjoyment and best designed to accommodate events and a range of performances. The effect should be that at many times the Square becomes a much more vibrant place,</p> <p>The proposal makes it possible for the city council and the Arts Partnership to grow Market Square as a venue of choice for certain types of performance and events.</p> <p><u>Specific re. the centrepiece</u></p> <p>Is wholly consistent with the agreed concept design for Market Square, with the first phase completed last year.</p> <p>Centrepiece is multi-purpose as it can be used as seating and as staging for performances. It also fits well with other uses for the Square including the Charter Market.</p> <p>The linear length of seating made available effectively doubles on provision otherwise available in the Square.</p> <p>Builds in the ability to use the structure for a wide range of performances. The dimensions are proportional to the setting and the potential size of the audience.</p> <p>Builds in steps to meet building regulation requirements for staged performances</p>
Disadvantages	<p><u>Specific re. the centrepiece</u></p> <p>It is more obstructive to pedestrian movement than option 2.</p> <p>Will not offer a sufficient depth of stage for certain larger bands.</p>
Risks	<p>The Castle and Canal Corridor developments may shift the centre of gravity of the centre in terms of pedestrian activity. In this context therefore it is important to do what is possible to make Market Square and Market Street attractive and so to support trading now and into the future.</p> <p>The delivery programme builds in tolerances to cover for financial and programming risks.</p> <p><u>Specific re. the centrepiece</u></p> <p>That the centrepiece does not find favour with people. This is a risk with any public design installation and no more so here in the very centre of the city. The agreed concept design follows extensive consultation, which elicited a generally positive response. The extensive design and community engagement work informing the proposal suggests the square does need a fitting and multi-purpose centrepiece.</p>

Option 2	To implement in full the proposal set out in section 2.0 of the report with a centrepiece comprising twin elevated structures (as per the option 2 drawings in Appendix 1) and also including for investing in demountable units.
Advantages	<p>As per option 1.</p> <p><u>Specific to the centrepiece</u></p> <p>Is broadly consistent with the agreed concept design for Market Square.</p> <p>Centrepiece is multi-purpose, as seating and as a space for performance and fits well to other uses to be made of the Square including for the Charter Market.</p> <p>In the linear length of seating made available is comparable with that proposed in option 1.</p> <p>Gives better permeability for pedestrians than option 1.</p> <p>Makes it possible for people to sit facing one another.</p> <p>A stage area the same as that provided in the option 1 proposal is achievable via use of demountable units.</p>
Disadvantages	<p><u>Specific to the centrepiece</u></p> <p>Is a variant on and to some extent does depart on the agreed concept design for Market Square. This option will require officers to seek a discrete variation from DCLG in the ERDF investment concerning the form of the centrepiece.</p> <p>In many circumstances use as a stage will be dependent on installing the demountable units.</p> <p>Officer time involved in managing the design and placement of the demountable units. There will also be added officer time needed to plan and manage a system for storing and hiring these out. In turn any such system may have revenue costs for the council but that might be covered by charging.</p>
Risks	<p>As per option 1 - that the centrepiece does not find favour with many people.</p> <p>That the investment in demountable staging units proves not to give best value if 1) either the city council and its partners fail to drive and market use of the Square for performance and / or 2) demand to utilise the Square in ways requiring this prove limited.</p>

	The risk of not securing the specific variation required in the ERDF investment offer is considered very low.
--	---

Both options delivered improvements consistent with corporate policy and made full and best use of available finance including European funding. Both enabled the city and county councils to bring together their investments and benefit from strong partnership working to deliver long sought after improvements. Officers considered that both options presented for the centrepiece would prove fitting and beneficial and accordingly a preferred option was not suggested.

The report set out how the council might move forward and deliver much needed improvements to public realm within the city centre, the main economic driver within the city. It was about opportunity to deliver in ways and to time frames that minimised financing implications for the city council, took maximum advantage of external funding available and thereby offered best value expenditure for both the city and county councils. It presented options for what officers considered to be a new fitting and beneficial centrepiece to Market Square.

Councillor Hanson proposed, seconded by Councillor Sands:-

“That the recommendations, as set out in the report, be approved.”

By way of amendment, Councillor Barry proposed and Councillor Hamilton-Cox seconded:

“That officers provide detailed breakdown of the costs of the two plinth options and consider the advantages and disadvantages of cheaper options.”

With the agreement of the meeting after some discussion and having been advised that the options he requested were capable of being provided through the original proposal, Councillor Barry withdrew the amendment.

It was proposed by Councillor Hamilton-Cox, seconded by Councillor Blamire and accepted as a friendly amendment by the proposer and seconder of the original proposal:

“That the decision regarding the gating of Chancery Lane be deferred.”

Councillors then voted on the substantive motion:-

Resolved unanimously:

- (1) That the proposal for public realm works made in section 2.0 of the report and as described in the supporting appendices be approved, with the decision on the detailed options for the centrepiece to Market Square deferred to the Cabinet meeting in June 2013, along with the decision regarding the gating of Chancery Lane.
- (2) That the Head of Regeneration and Planning be authorised to proceed with all work to implement the proposal but as regards the centrepiece not to make any commitments pending Cabinet deciding on the detailed option.

- (3) That the Head of Governance be requested to invite all council members to attend an informal briefing on the options for a centrepiece and the theme embodied artwork should take so that members can be fully informed and then advise the Portfolio Holder of their views.

Officers responsible for effecting the decision:

Head of Regeneration & Planning
 Head of Resources
 Head of Governance

Reasons for making the decision:

Lancaster Square Routes is to help support and sustain the commercial centre of the city as per the corporate priorities for economic growth and the environment. It fulfils the corporate priorities as contained in the 2012-15 Corporate Plan - Economic Growth, Health and Wellbeing, Clean Green and Safe Places and Community Leadership. It contributes, in particular, to Economic Growth by helping sustain the attraction of commercial centres and so support trading and jobs. The proposal is consistent with the Lancaster District Core Strategy and in particular Policy ER2. The initiative is highly complementary to the activity of the Lancaster BID Partnership that is demonstrating a unity of purpose and collective commitment to town centre improvement. Deferring the decision on the detailed options on the centrepiece would allow all councillors to be consulted on the two options whilst deferring the decision on the gating of Chancery Lane would enable further information to be sought from the Police.

7 MUSEUMS PARTNERSHIP SILVERDALE HOARD

(Cabinet Member with Special Responsibility Councillor Sands)

Cabinet received a report from the Head of Health & Housing to update Members on the position in relation to any potential purchase of the Silverdale Hoard.

The options, options analysis, including risk assessment and officer preferred option, were set out in the report as follows:

	Option 1 Lancaster City Council purchases the hoard alone (subject to referral on to Council)	Option 2 Request that Lancashire County Council purchases the hoard alone.	Option 3 Partnership purchase (subject to referral on to Council)
Advantages	The District Council area in which the hoard was found Demonstrates commitment to cultural heritage and economic growth.	The County Council area in which the hoard was found Demonstrates commitment to cultural heritage. More straight forward	Spreads the financial burden of the purchase across the two Councils.

		process for acquisition, display and funding applications. No financial commitment required by the City Council.	
Disadvantages	Considerable investment required in order to display on a permanent basis with reliance on external funding meeting these costs. Longer term commitments would need further investment over and above the initial Museum Acquisition Funding	Potentially less influence over where the collection is exhibited.	Requires formal agreement and clear understanding by both parties about how shared ownership will work in practice. Reliance on external funding to meet one-off purchase, re-display and conservation costs.
Risk	There is a realistic risk with this option that associated one-off purchase funds will not be generated. Risk increases with ongoing costs associated with conservation and temporary / permanent displays.	Minimal risk to City Council.	Risk to City Council remains as per option one.

The most important issue was that this was an excellent opportunity to retain the Hoard in Lancashire. County council officers initially informally recommended that Lancaster City Council purchase the Silverdale Hoard for their City Museum collections. However, given both short and longer term financial commitments and the uncertainty of the success of funding applications and fundraising efforts, the situation had changed. The council would be facing difficult choices given the financial outlook for 2014/15 and beyond and therefore the best option might be for Lancashire County Council to look to purchase the hoard alone. There is, of course, a risk that the county council would decide not to purchase the hoard when considered against their priorities. This led to consideration of the options.

The officer preferred option was option 2. The uncertain short and long term costs associated with purchase, conservation and display meant a purchase by the city council alone was unaffordable based on current budgets and forecasts. Option 2 allowed for County to proceed with the purchase, should they decide to, thus enabling

Lancaster in the future.

The purchase of the hoard by County Council would enable it to remain within Lancashire and ensured the potential for future display within Lancaster's museums. The report acknowledged the importance of retaining the hoard in Lancashire and sought to find a solution to achieve this.

Councillor Sands proposed, seconded by Councillor Hanson:-

"(1) That the recommendations, as set out in the report, be approved."

Councillors then voted:-

Resolved unanimously:

- (1) That it be agreed that Lancaster City Council does not purchase the Silverdale Hoard.
- (2) That Cabinet formally request Lancashire County Council to purchase the Silverdale Hoard.

Officer responsible for effecting the decision:

Head of Health & Housing

Reasons for making the decision:

Management of the Museums is an important element of the Council's priorities of Economic Growth – and outcomes cited within the Corporate Plan include 'More tourists coming to the district and tourism income is maximised, the district's cultural, retail and tourism offer is maximised, Lancaster district's recognition as a visitor destination is enhanced and the district's local heritage is protected'. That said, the Council must consider value for money and affordability, taking account of the Medium Term Financial Strategy. Option 2 fits with this, as well as helping with museum objectives.

**8 CORPORATE NON-HOUSING PROPERTY PORTFOLIO IMPROVEMENT WORKS:
YEAR 1 DELIVERY PLAN**

(Cabinet Member with Special Responsibility Councillor Hamilton-Cox)

Cabinet received a joint report from the Head of Environmental Services and Head of Resources to provide information in respect of Mitre House Car Park and Lancaster Town Hall Memorial Gardens in accordance with Minute 149 as further information had been requested on those two proposed projects (Cabinet meeting 23 April 2013 refers). The options, options analysis, including risk assessment had been set out in Cabinet Minute 149.

- Mitre House Car Park - Why were the repair and maintenance costs included in the report (23 April 2013) not included in a previous report submitted to Cabinet in November 2012?
- Lancaster Town Hall Memorial Garden Railings - Subject to gaining clarification

on any listing, what options were there other than refurbishment of the railings to the memorial gardens?

The report provided additional information on these two projects, and sought approval for them to go ahead as originally planned.

Mitre House Car Park

The November report provided background information on the status of the car park and outlined options for the future management of the car park. Although the report considered by Cabinet in November 2012 dealt with both the financial and strategic issues, the financial appraisal was close and therefore it was considered that the decision reached was primarily based on the strategic issues. Therefore, the indicative cost of £60K for the works required to the structure, although not available for inclusion at the time of writing, was essentially immaterial because under the terms of the lease a surrender would have resulted in the landlord serving a schedule of dilapidations requiring the Council to carry out the work or alternatively considering the issue as part of financial settlement. The financial liability for the repairs would have remained with the Council in both the retention and surrender scenarios.

Lancaster Town Hall Memorial Garden Railings

The recent condition survey of the Memorial Garden provided an indicative cost for refurbishment of the existing railings although this was not seen as the only option. At the time there was some doubt around listed status of the railings because they were erected some time after the construction of the main building. However, further research had been undertaken and the relevant legislation stated that:

“Any object or structure fixed to the building; or any object or structure within the curtilage of the building which, although not fixed to the building, forms part of the land and has done so since before 1st July 1948, shall be treated as part of the building”.

Unless any further information came to light, removal of the railings would require listed building consent and it was the opinion of the Conservation Officer that removal or replacement of the railings would not be granted consent and therefore refurbishment was the only option.

The officer preferred option was to proceed with both projects.

Councillor Hamilton-Cox proposed, seconded by Councillor Sands:-

“(1) That the recommendation, as set out in the report, be approved.”

Councillors then voted:-

Resolved unanimously:

- (1) That the Mitre House Car Park Works and Lancaster Memorial Gardens Railings Refurbishment projects be completed in this year, as part of the Year 1 Delivery Plan.

Officer responsible for effecting the decision:

Head of Resources

Reasons for making the decision:

The decision seeks to ensure that the Council's property portfolio is fit for purpose in terms of supporting the Council's corporate plan and policy framework, recognising the financial pressures. The proposed building works would address any related statutory responsibilities.

9 STOREY CREATIVE INDUSTRIES CENTRE DRAFT BUSINESS PLAN**(Cabinet Member with Special Responsibility Councillor Hanson)**

Cabinet received a report from the Head of Resources to consider the draft emerging options for The Storey's business plan which sought Cabinet's direction on the way forward. Whilst the report attached to the agenda was exempt from publication by virtue of paragraph 3, of Schedule 12A of the Local Government Act 1972, a public version of the report had been made available on the City Council's website.

Detailed option analysis, including risk assessment were set out in the exempt report although the options and officer preferred option, were set out in the public report as follows:

The report sought Cabinet's direction on various Officer proposals, in particular:

- (a) key business planning principles
- (b) business space letting and development
- (c) catering provision
- (d) overall management capacity; and
- (e) consideration of a community interest group

In view of the many proposals, there were various permutations of options but the following broad summary and analysis of options was provided.

	Option 1: The Council continues with a private operator for the café / bar, but provides specific management capacity and presence, and events programming/support.	Option 2: As Option 1 but with overall co-ordination provided by officer group with specific focus on events/programming support, rather than dedicated management.	Option 3: City Council takes on full management and operation of The Storey in-house, including operation of the Bar & Catering concession.
--	--	--	--

In considering progress to date and the financial projections, Cabinet could determine that none of the options represented an acceptable way forward, and it could instruct Officers to consider more radical alternatives for the operation or the building itself. This might require referral back to Council, depending on what was put forward.

In summary terms Option 1 was the officer preferred way forward. More specifically and where appropriate, the detailed Officer preferences underpinning Option 1 were set out in the various sections listed above and it was on these detailed aspects that Officers

sought specific decisions.

Consideration of this report should help test out the primary role of the Storey. Members had previously resolved to retain its role as a Creative Industries Centre, which implied that its main focus should be an economic development one. However, it also provided an important cultural and community role, some of which also had economic benefits. Furthermore, the direction given by Cabinet would ultimately determine where responsibility for the Storey best fit within the Council's management and democratic structures.

The report provided a base on which Cabinet could give direction regarding The Storey's future, in advance of producing a more detailed and fully costed business plan.

The press and public were excluded from the meeting at this point when it became necessary to refer to information in the exempt report.

It was moved by Councillor Hanson and seconded by Councillor Leytham and resolved unanimously:-

Resolved unanimously:

- (1) That, in accordance with Section 100A(4) of the Local Government Act 1972, the press and public be excluded from the meeting for the following items of business, on the grounds that they could involve the possible disclosure of exempt information as defined in paragraph 3 of Schedule 12A of that Act.

Councillor Hanson proposed, seconded by Councillor Bryning:-

"That in support of The Storey's Business Plan, Cabinet approves Option 1 as set out in the report, in that the Council continues with a private operator for the café/bar, but provides specific management capacity and presence, and events programming/support. More specifically, Cabinet approves:

- the key business planning principles and supporting business space letting targets and development plans, as set out in the report and as appended to these minutes;
- the appointment of a dedicated manager for the Storey, with support being provided from other council services as appropriate"

It was moved by Councillor Barry, seconded by Councillor Blamire and accepted as a friendly amendment by the proposer and seconder of the original proposal:

"That market testing for the bar/catering operation be undertaken to inform future provision and lease arrangements with effect from 01 April 2014, the outcome of which be considered by Cabinet later this year."

Councillors then voted:-

Resolved unanimously:

- (1) That in support of The Storey's Business Plan, Cabinet approves Option 1 as set

out in the report, in that the Council continues with a private operator for the café/bar, but provides specific management capacity and presence, and events programming/support. More specifically, Cabinet approves:

- the key business planning principles and supporting business space letting targets and development plans, as set out in the report and as appended to these minutes;
- the appointment of a dedicated manager for the Storey, with support being provided from other council services as appropriate;
- market testing for the bar/catering operation to inform future provision and lease arrangements with effect from 01 April 2014, the outcome of which is to be considered by Cabinet later this year.

Officer responsible for effecting the decision:

Head of Resources

Reasons for making the decision:

The future of The Storey should be considered in context of the Council's regeneration priorities, as well as its core values of providing value for money, drawing on medium term financial and property strategies.

10 DISPOSAL OF LAND AT WELLINGTON TERRACE, MORECAMBE

(Cabinet Member with Special Responsibility Councillor Hamilton-Cox)

Cabinet received a report from the Head of Resources to consider the revised options for the disposal of land at Wellington Terrace, Morecambe which was exempt from publication by virtue of paragraph 3, of Schedule 12A of the Local Government Act 1972.

The options, options analysis, including risk assessment and officer preferred option, were set out in the exempt report:

Councillor Hamilton-Cox proposed, seconded by Councillor Leytham:-

“(1) That option 1, as set out in the exempt report, be approved.”

Councillors then voted:-

Resolved unanimously:

(1) That option 1, as set out in the exempt report, be approved.

Officer responsible for effecting the decision:

Head of Resources

Reasons for making the decision:

The proposal supports the objective of the Morecambe Action Plan to address housing related issues in the central area of Morecambe and the Housing Strategy. The proposal will also support the Corporate Plan and coalition priorities to implement housing renewal and neighbourhood management in the Poulton Ward. The Corporate Property Strategy requires that the Council review its asset base and only retain those assets required to meet its agreed objectives and priorities. Where assets are not required for this purpose they should be disposed of at best value. This is an opportunity sale and removes a liability from the City Council's property portfolio and is an opportunity for the Council to improve the management of its assets.

11 SALE OF LAND AT MOSSGATE, HEYSHAM

(Cabinet Members with Special Responsibility Councillors Hamilton-Cox & Leytham)

Cabinet received a report from the Head of Resources to obtain a decision regarding offers received for the land at Mossgate, Heysham. The report was exempt from publication by virtue of paragraph 3, of Schedule 12A of the Local Government Act 1972.

The options, options analysis, including risk assessment and officer preferred option, were set out in the exempt report.

Councillor Hamilton-Cox proposed, seconded by Councillor Leytham:-

“(1) That the recommendations, as set out in the exempt report, be approved.”

Councillors then voted:-

Resolved unanimously:

- (1) That Cabinet approve Option 1 as outlined in the exempt report.
- (2) That the Head of Resources be authorised to update the General Fund Capital Programme to reflect the Section 106 grant allocation as set out in the exempt report.

Officer responsible for effecting the decision:

Head of Resources

Reasons for making the decision:

In line with the Council's Corporate Property Strategy, the Council had planned to dispose of this asset at best value. Separately, the Council's Corporate Plan includes Housing Regeneration as a priority as well as seeking new opportunities to include affordable housing within schemes. There is a relationship to the Core Strategy adopted in July 2008, setting out a sufficient supply of affordable housing as being a key local priority. The Housing Strategy and Housing Action Plan 2012 – 2017 – paragraph 2.16 specifically sets out the need for the Council to support Registered Providers to deliver

affordable housing schemes on its own land. The decision is in support of all these aims and objectives.

Chairman

(The meeting ended at 12.10 p.m.)

**Any queries regarding these Minutes, please contact
Liz Bateson, Democratic Services - telephone (01524) 582047 or email
ebateson@lancaster.gov.uk**

MINUTES PUBLISHED ON THURSDAY 30 MAY, 2013.

**EFFECTIVE DATE FOR IMPLEMENTING THE DECISIONS CONTAINED IN THESE MINUTES:
FRIDAY 7 JUNE, 2013.**

APPOINTMENTS MADE BY CABINET

ORGANISATION
Lancaster District Children's Trust Board – Appointment deferred
Historic Towns Forum Councillor Sands
Lancashire Leaders Meeting (Leader) Councillor Blamire
LGA Coastal Issues Special Interest Group Councillor Leytham
LGA Executive (Leader) Councillor Blamire
LGA Rural Commission (Cabinet Member for Rural Affairs +1 Member appointed by Group on rotation) Councillor Hanson
Morecambe Bay Partnership Councillor Sands
Museums Advisory Panel Cabinet Member Councillor Sands
North Lancashire Local Action Group executive Group (Member + named substitute) Councillor Hanson (substitute to be confirmed)
Lancashire Waste Partnership : Councillor Smith
Community Safety Partnership Cabinet Member (+ Cabinet Member substitute): Councillor Smith (substitute Councillor Blamire)
Health and Wellbeing Partnership Cabinet Member (+ Cabinet Member substitute) : Councillor Leytham (substitute Councillor Hamilton-Cox)
Management Group of the Lancaster Business Improvement District (BID) (Cabinet Member for Economic Regeneration) Councillor Hanson