

CABINET

10.00 A.M.

2ND SEPTEMBER 2014

PRESENT:- Councillors Eileen Blamire (Chairman), Janice Hanson (Vice-Chairman), Jon Barry, Abbott Bryning, Karen Leytham and David Smith

Apologies for Absence:-

Councillors Tim Hamilton-Cox and Ron Sands

Officers in attendance:-

| | |
|-----------------|---|
| Mark Cullinan | Chief Executive |
| Nadine Muschamp | Chief Officer (Resources) and Section 151 Officer |
| Mark Davies | Chief Officer (Environment) |
| Andrew Dobson | Chief Officer (Regeneration and Planning) |
| Liz Bateson | Principal Democratic Support Officer |

29 MINUTES

The minutes of the meeting held on Tuesday 29th July 2014 were approved as a correct record.

30 ITEMS OF URGENT BUSINESS AUTHORISED BY THE LEADER

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

31 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Councillor Barry declared a personal interest with regard to the Storey Update Report in view of his involvement with the Friends of the Storey Gardens.

32 PUBLIC SPEAKING

Members were advised that there had been four requests to speak at the meeting from members of the public in accordance with Cabinet's agreed procedure, as set out in Cabinet Procedure Rule 2.7, one with regard to the Assembly Rooms (Minute 33 refers) and three with regard to the Storey Update Report (Minute 34).

33 ASSEMBLY ROOMS

(Cabinet Member with Special Responsibility Councillor Barry)

Ms Fiona Gordon who had registered to speak in accordance with the City Council's agreed procedure and Cabinet Procedure Rule 2.7 addressed the meeting on this item and responded to questions raised by Cabinet Members.

Cabinet received a report from the Chief Officer (Environment) to enable Cabinet to consider an option for a future use of the Assembly Rooms.

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

| | Option 1: To agree to develop the business model outlined above in greater detail. | Option 2: To maintain the status quo until a range of options can be brought forward | |
|---------------|--|--|--|
| Advantages | <p>Consistent with Cairn report and previous decision of Cabinet</p> <p>Provides a sense of direction</p> <p>Provides a mandate to explore other options e.g. HLF bid</p> | Maintains the status quo but allows more time for other options to be brought forward | |
| Disadvantages | <p>Creates further uncertainty for existing traders and further destabilises the existing Assembly Room operation.</p> <p>The Fig Tree is not well known by Officers or Elected Members so difficult to establish at this stage what a partnership would entail and whether it would actually be advantageous.</p> | Requires further officer time and resource. | |
| Risks | The Council / Fig Tree may decide in developing the business case that it isn't in their interests so it will come to nothing. | <p>Unmanaged decline</p> <p>No guarantee that any of the other options will be without significant risks</p> | |

The Officer preferred option is option 1. However, it should be made clear that for the reasons outlined in the report there is no certainty that this option could be implemented.

Councillor Barry proposed:-

“(1) That the Council is committed to keeping on as many existing traders as possible

- and for the Assembly Rooms to be a tourist and resident attraction.
- (2) That it be agreed in principle for officers to proceed with actions in 2.17.
 - (3) That management details be requested when further reports are brought back."

However, it was noted that there was no seconder to the proposition, and therefore, the proposition was deemed to have fallen.

It was then moved by Councillor Hanson and seconded by Councillor David Smith:

"That Option 2, to maintain the status quo, as set out in the report be approved with officers requested to bring a further report back in conjunction with existing traders to propose how current arrangements can be improved including marketing."

Councillors then voted:-

Resolved:

(5 Members (Councillors Blamire, Bryning, Hanson, Leytham and David Smith) voted in favour, and 1 Member (Councillor Barry) abstained.)

- (1) That Option 2, to maintain the status quo, as set out in the report be approved with officers requested to bring a further report back in conjunction with existing traders to propose how current arrangements can be improved including marketing.

Officer responsible for effecting the decision:

Chief Officer (Environment)

Reasons for making the decision:

The decision is consistent with the Corporate Plan priority - Sustainable Economic Growth and the following outcome: *The attractiveness and offer of the district, as a place to invest in, will be improved.* Cabinet recognises that the Assembly Rooms are unique and welcomes the positive changes which have taken place over the last year. The decision enables officers to work with the existing traders to make the Assembly Rooms a viable attraction for residents and visitors.

34 THE STOREY: UPDATE REPORT

(Cabinet Member with Special Responsibility Councillor Hanson)

Annie Watson, Chair of Friends of Storey Gardens, Rachel-Ann Powers and Sue Widdon who had registered to speak in accordance with the City Council's agreed procedure and Cabinet Procedure Rule 2.7 addressed the meeting on this item and responded to questions from Cabinet Members.

Cabinet received a report from the Chief Officer (Resources) to provide a general update on the operation of the Storey and seek direction on the future of the remaining Storey Gardens artwork.

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

were set out in the report as follows:

| | Option 1: Seek to restore the artwork | Option 2: Remove / no longer recognise the art work in its physical form in the garden, supporting a master planning approach. |
|---------------|--|--|
| Advantages | <p>If the artwork was restored and resources provided to market it and maintain it an installation by an artist of international repute may attract additional tourism to the area.</p> <p>It may be possible to secure funding to restore the art work. As an example The Henry Moore Foundation may be interested.</p> <p>(If restored it would be possible to recast the sculptures in resin which would deter thieves, but not vandals).</p> | <p>The removal of the artwork would free up the second garden for wider development. Suggestions are on the line of a secret garden where people can meet, eat lunch, show temporary artworks, nature areas, etc.</p> <p>This is a sustainable option with no additional cost to the council. It is not envisioned there would be any additional cost charged direct to the Council for removing the artwork. The healthy trees will remain.</p> <p>Consistent with the overall vision for the Storey.</p> <p>Whilst initial consultation has shown an interest in artwork within the garden, this could be addressed with temporary / seasonal pieces to work. (which is preferred by some on the consultation responses)</p> |
| Disadvantages | <p>Requires one -off funding to refurbish the artwork, which would need to be considered during the budget. The cost is estimated at between £30,000 – £50,000. Could impact therefore on other arts support.</p> <p>All restoration and alterations would need to be in agreement with the artist for it to remain as his work.</p> <p>A reduced artwork would not be acceptable.</p> <p>It is estimated an additional £250 per annum would be required to maintain the restored artwork, excluding any required tree work.</p> | <p>Final end of an already defunct / dilapidated piece of artwork.</p> |

| | | |
|-------|--|---|
| | <p>(The Friends group have already indicated that they would not be interested in maintaining the artwork on the Council's behalf as they have little interest in it remaining).</p> <p>It takes up most of the garden area, only leaving the border to be developed. There is limited development opportunity in the other garden.</p> <p>The existence of artwork is not widely known or promoted.</p> | |
| Risks | <p>Funding is not secured.</p> <p>Restoration conflicts with the majority of the Friends group who then may lose ownership become disinterested and disband – this will have an impact on the quality of detailed work that could be undertaken in the borders and other areas.</p> | <p>Could impact on the Council's reputation in artistic circles, potentially (but bearing in mind the current condition of the installation and other arts support that the Council gives, this risk is considered to be very small).</p> |

The preferred option is Option 2. The artwork has been severely vandalised and would require major reconstruction and investment to return it to its original condition, with ongoing maintenance and marketing to bring the work up to standard so that it could be classed as a tourism asset for the district. The Council has no funds with which to restore the artwork and it is not even clear where external funding could be bid from. The proposed master plan will be reported back to Cabinet for consideration in due course.

Good progress is being achieved in operating the Storey; this will need to continue and strengthen if it is to break even by 2017/18. In terms of the Gardens, there is much support for improving them, without the artwork, in a way that would complement the main building and in terms of the far gardens, such improvements are unlikely to have much financial impact. This way forward, as part of the master planning approach, is considered to present a better opportunity to improve the gardens and their use in due course, still fitting with the Storey's business plan.

The meeting adjourned at 11.21am and reconvened at 11.26am.

With regard to recommendation (2) Councillor Barry proposed:-

"That City Council officers open a dialogue with Mark Dion to discuss:

- a) the feasibility of moving the artwork to Williamson Park or another suitable venue.
- b) To establish the extent to which a restored artwork in the tasting garden can co-exist with other aspects such as disabled access, other artworks, seating,

- growing areas and the use for events in the Storey.
- c) Cabinet to visit the Tasting Garden and to reconsider the proposal once details of a) and b) together with details of the consultation are available to Cabinet."

There being no seconder for part (b), of the proposal, that part of the proposition was deemed to have fallen.

Councillor Barry then proposed, seconded by Councillor Hanson:

- (1) "That the report be noted.
- (2) That City Council officers open a dialogue with Mark Dion to discuss:
 - a) the feasibility of moving the artwork to Williamson Park or another suitable venue.
 - b) That in view of references to funding opportunities within submissions received in support of restoring the Tasting Gardens, officers make approaches to explore the possibilities of alternative funding.
 - c) That Cabinet visit the Tasting Garden and reconsider the proposal once further details are available.
- (3) That the draft master planning approach for the Storey's gardens be supported, and presented to Cabinet for consideration in due course."

Councillors then voted:-

Resolved unanimously:

- (1) That the report be noted.
- (2) That City Council officers open a dialogue with Mark Dion to discuss:
 - a) the feasibility of moving the artwork to Williamson Park or another suitable venue.
 - b) That in view of references to funding opportunities within submissions received in support of restoring the Tasting Gardens, officers make approaches to explore the possibilities of alternative funding.
 - c) That Cabinet visit the Tasting Garden and reconsider the proposal once further details are available.
- (3) That the draft master planning approach for the Storey's gardens be supported, and presented to Cabinet for consideration in due course.

Officers responsible for effecting the decision:

Chief Officer (Resources)
Chief Officer (Environment)

Reasons for making the decision:

Cabinet commends the good progress which has been achieved in operating the Storey. The Storey contributes to the Council's priority of sustainable economic growth. The gardens may also contribute to the priority of 'Clean, Green and Safe Places'; one success measure being to increase the number of projects that directly involve local communities in improving local areas, parks and open spaces. Cabinet recognises the interest that the Tasting Gardens has generated and the decision enables further

consideration to be given to this issue when the views of the artist and clarification on funding opportunities has been ascertained.

35 MORECAMBE AREA ACTION PLAN – DELIVERING TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENTS AND PUBLIC REALM PROJECTS (PREVIOUSLY AGREED)

(Cabinet Member with Special Responsibility Councillor Hanson)

Cabinet received a report from the Chief Officer (Regeneration & Planning) to report on implementing the Morecambe Area Action Plan MAAP) and decide on specific expenditures by the City Council towards this from the established MAAP Implementation Reserve.

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

| | Option 1: Authorise use of the Implementation Reserve as set out in this report | Option 2: Decline to authorise use of the Reserve as set out. |
|---------------|---|--|
| Advantages | Consistent with the MAAP and so assists regeneration. Makes clear what the council can and cannot do towards MAAP implementation up to March 2016 and so giving certainty to others. Specifically, the new bus and coach parking facilities should be in place for the 2015 season. | None. |
| Disadvantages | None | Does not assist timely and joined up MAAP implementation. Shows no leadership and gives no certainty. Will not assist in securing external funding for further regeneration and increasing private sector investments into the future. |
| Risks | Risks are as for MAAP implementation generally. This includes the residual risk that improving conditions for the private sector will not be matched by subsequent investment, however, this is unavoidable. The MAAP is an integrated spatial plan with many dependencies. There is a risk | Will likely prejudice wider partnership working and impair regeneration. |

| | | |
|--|--|--|
| | that unless sufficient activity is undertaken, the full benefits will not be achieved and other regeneration activity will be impaired. Furthermore, clearly there is funding risk attached to the actions planned post 2016. | |
|--|--|--|

Option 1 is preferred as consistent with the needs for MAAP implementation and regeneration.

Councillor Hanson proposed, seconded by Councillor David Smith:-

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

Councillors then voted:-

Resolved unanimously:

- (1) That the MAAP implementation activities as set out in the report be approved.
- (2) That delegated authority be given to the Chief Officer (Resources) to allocate £110K from the MAAP Implementation Reserve and update the General Fund Revenue Budget and Capital Programme once profiling of expenditure is known between the 2014/15 and 2015/16 financial years.
- (3) That officers be requested to seek to secure additional contributions for the MAAP implementation Reserve from external funding sources towards further implementation of the MAAP.

Note: Having left the meeting during discussion of this issue Councillor Barry did not vote on this item.

Officers responsible for effecting the decision:

Chief Officer (Regeneration & Planning)
Chief Officer (Resources)

Reasons for making the decision:

The MAAP is part of the Local Plan which is part of the policy framework. The decision enables the use of limited Council financial resources and capacities to further the regeneration of central Morecambe and particularly its town centre, fitting to the MAAP.

36 MORECAMBE BUSINESS IMPROVEMENT DISTRICT (BID) - FEASIBILITY PROPOSAL

(Cabinet Member with Special Responsibility Councillor Hanson)

Cabinet received a report from the Chief Officer (Regeneration & Planning) to consider the proposal for reinstatement of Morecambe BID feasibility funding on the basis of a proposal from Lancaster District Chamber.

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

| | Advantages | Disadvantages | Risks |
|--|--|---|--|
| Option 1: Do nothing | No advantages. | Loss of credibility with business community. No contribution to council's Corporate objectives. | Council may be in breach of statutory duties to support BID proposer as defined in BID legislation. |
| Option 2: Reinstate £40K feasibility study budget for Morecambe BID and award via funding agreement to Lancaster Chamber | Successful BID should have benefits for the local authority as well as the business community. Clear and credible leadership for the business community to identify with. Potential for more effective use of council resources and innovation in town centre service delivery. Should engender a closer relationship between business community and statutory service providers. Fosters improved and clearer communication and genuine partnership with business Effective opportunity for local businesses | No guarantee that Morecambe BID ballot would ultimately be successful or voted in. Allocated resource for the Chamber as BID proposer to move to 'BID readiness' will need to be supplemented by council officer resources. Relatively long lead in period to ensure best possible chance of success. | Council and officer resources required pre and post ballot. Implications for council and other statutory services of committing to 'baseline' service provision over BID lifetime may reduce flexibility. |

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| | to have a voice on subjects relating to the environment in which they trade. | | |
| Option 3: Explore alternative routes for funding (for example Portas Pilot funds), reduce funding or secure an alternative BID Proposer | Could have same advantages as Option 2. Could reduce impact on council budgets. Could give certainty that Portas Pilot resources will be used by the target end date. | As Option 2 but with the following considerations: No alternative partnership/route to BID implementation that has current credibility with local stakeholders and the local business community. Town Team is working to allocate remaining Portas Pilot resources to projects. The Portas money is also focused on Victoria Street and the BID will inevitably be wider than this focus. Issue of equity between town centres where Lancaster has previously received full £40K allocation from the City Council. | As Option 2 but more difficult and time consuming to reach ballot stage |

There is a clear way forward for investigating the feasibility and progression of a Morecambe BID. The Lancaster District Chamber have confirmed that £40K resources agreed for the Lancaster BID are sufficient for the purposes of BID Proposal development. This follows the experience of successfully progressing the Lancaster BID through both proposal and implementation stages. **The preferred option is therefore**

Option 2 – to reinstate the £40K feasibility study budget and award via funding agreement to Lancaster District Chamber. Members should be aware that the £40K is not currently included in the council's agreed budget framework (refer to Financial Implications).

Should Members be minded to approve the recommendation it is intended to make the £40K allocation subject to a formal funding agreement administered by the Regeneration and Planning Service in line with processes used for Lancaster BID. This will ensure payments are staged according to the achievement of key activities/milestones, made in arrears and the BID proposer adopts governance arrangements and formal reporting systems consistent with the level of funding.

Enabling and assisting with the BID Proposal and post ballot BID body arrangements will require significant input from the city council over and above the feasibility cash resource. The duties and potential resource issues are discussed in more detail in Legal and Financial Implications sections. BID legislation allows for administrative costs to be absorbed in the BID levy. This must be discussed and negotiated with the BID proposer so that any charges are appropriate, commensurate with the task, and clear to those who will vote.

To date BID support work has been undertaken by officers within Regeneration & Policy team with assistance from other departments, particularly Revenues Section. A Regeneration & Policy officer will continue to lead and be the initial point of contact for BID development with the Lancaster District Chamber but cross-departmental work is needed over the next year which may have resource/business implications. An officer working group has been convened to support BIDs and manage and review implications arising from BID Proposal development and post ballot arrangements in. Any major resource implications which cannot be absorbed within existing budgets/resource will be referred to Members.

An immediate issue is the Morecambe BID proposed ballot date of March 2016. The timescale is in line with national BIDs best-practice and has also been prudently chosen to avoid a clash with the Lancaster BID renewal campaign which will end in a ballot around November 2015. However, should the Morecambe vote be successful, with regard to Revenues Service required lead in times for levy billing the following scenarios emerge:

- a) Morecambe levy billing is undertaken to the council's preferred standard rates billing run at the beginning of the financial year, which means implementation in April 2017 at the earliest.
- b) The first round Morecambe levy billing is undertaken part way through the 2016/17 financial year. Future years would be billed to the standard rates billing timetable.

Clearly the loss of the best part of a year for billing purposes as envisaged in scenario (a) is detrimental to the momentum of the Morecambe BID, although there could be some slippage in the project as it progresses, which would lessen any impact. However, while (b) is preferred by the Chamber, certainly there are implications for Revenues staffing and workload, which in turn could impact on the BID through higher administration charges in the first year. This scenario would need to be managed (refer to Financial Implications).

Members should also be aware there is no automatic exemption from the BID levy for

local authorities. The city council will be liable for the levy on the rateable property it occupies/holds should a ballot be successful (refer to Financial Implications). As a potential levy payer the council is also eligible to vote in a ballot. It will be up to Members to decide how the council's active participation in the ballot may be viewed in the light of the ongoing consultation and development of the BID proposals. The 'weight' of the council's property holding, both in terms of outright rateable value and number of hereditaments, could be significant in the ballot outcome.

It is generally accepted that BIDs create an effective opportunity for local businesses to have a voice and direct impact on subjects relating to the environment and circumstances in which they trade. Development of BIDs has been proven to help build business confidence, performance and encourage local economic growth. In the current economic climate, the City Council's ability to directly stimulate the visitor economy is limited although it can encourage investment through appropriate use of its regulatory functions e.g. property improvements through the Section 215 scheme. This means that it is increasingly important that the Town's businesses take the initiative in improving the trading environment.

This report has reminded Members of the BID concept and highlighted potential implications for the city council in supporting a Morecambe BID feasibility stage as proposed by The Chamber. Officers have a close working relationship with the staff and Board of The Chamber and a clear way forward has emerged. Members are invited to support the feasibility stage with £40K funding and nominate a cabinet member to represent the city council on the Morecambe BID Steering Group.

Councillor Hanson proposed, seconded by Councillor Leytham:

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

Councillors then voted:-

Resolved unanimously:

- (1) That Cabinet supports the intention of Lancaster District Chamber to lead on BID feasibility and BID Proposal development for Morecambe.
- (2) That Cabinet approves the reinstatement of a £40K budget, to be funded from corporate savings achieved to date, to be allocated to the Lancaster District Chamber via a funding agreement.
- (3) That the Morecambe Area Action Plan (MAAP) Implementation Reserve is updated to include the £40K reinstated budget for the purpose of supporting the Morecambe BID and that delegated authority be given to the Chief Officer (Resources) to update the MAAP Reserve and General Fund Revenue Budget once profiling of expenditure is known between financial years.
- (4) That Councillor Bryning be appointed to the Morecambe BID Steering Group.

Note: Councillor Barry returned to the room after Cabinet voted on this item.

Officers responsible for effecting the decision:

Chief Officer (Regeneration & Planning)
Chief Officer (Resources)

Reasons for making the decision:

In supporting progression towards a Business Improvement District for Morecambe the Council will be contributing to achieving and/or potentially impacting on a number of its Corporate Plan and Priorities for 2014/15 including Our Vision, Sustainable Economic Growth, Community Leadership and Clean, Green and Safe Places.

37 ARTS COMMISSIONING

(Cabinet Member with Special Responsibility Councillor Sands)

Cabinet received a report from the Chief Officer (Regeneration & Planning) which advised on the proposed means of managing the Council's funding for Arts in the district, in line with Corporate Plan priorities.

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

| | Option 1: Move to a commissioning approach for investment in the Arts by April 2017 | Option 2: Introduce a grants scheme |
|------------|--|--|
| Advantages | <p>Agreed outcomes provide clarity on what the City Council wishes to achieve as a result of investment in the Arts</p> <p>Improved information on need/demand and impact as a result of assessment and analysis</p> <p>A fair and transparent framework for investment decisions</p> <p>Competitive process provides assurance of Value for Money</p> <p>Generation of new ideas as a result of creative input from Arts providers</p> <p>A three year commissioning cycle provides an opportunity to plan and develop Arts provision more strategically</p> <p>Potential opportunity to work</p> | <p>Some assurance of Value for Money</p> <p>Fairness and transparency provided as part of a competitive process</p> <p>Potentially requires less officer time than commissioning to establish, although overall work will be dependent on numbers of applicants for bidding rounds</p> |

| | | |
|---------------|--|---|
| | strategically with other funders. | |
| Disadvantages | <p>Creates uncertainty over future investment for existing SLA partners</p> <p>Significant officer time required and it is likely there will be competing priorities</p> | <p>The City Council's strategic approach to investment in Arts in the district would not be developed</p> <p>No opportunity for research and engagement to inform the development of strategic outcomes</p> <p>Potential gaps in service provision</p> <p>Impact limited to projects coming forward</p> |
| Risks | Potential short term risk to Arts funding coming in to the district, as a result of uncertainty. Can be mitigated by clear communications with funding partners. | Management of expectations is a key risk with most grant schemes. Some mitigation can be achieved by clear scheme communications. |

The Officer Preferred Option is Option 1 as this provides a more strategic, long term approach to arts investment with the potential for improved outcomes that are clearly linked to the Council's priorities. Engagement with arts providers as part of the commissioning process is more likely to lead to the development of quality services that are informed by the needs and preferences of audiences.

The Council has invested in Arts in the district for many years and as a result of this and additional investment by, in particular, Lancashire County Council and the Arts Council, the district has a strong and growing creative arts economy. This offer is of great value to visitors, both local and from further afield, but also makes an important contribution to quality of life for local communities. In economic terms, quality of life is also a key component of the offer to potential inward investors, companies wishing to locate and invest in the district.

Councillor Hanson proposed, seconded by Councillor Blamire:-

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

Councillors then voted:-

Resolved unanimously:

- (1) That commissioning for the Council's investment in arts provision in the district

is implemented by April 2017, subject to budget and resource requirements.

- (2) That existing Service level Agreements continue until March 2017 but that broad criteria already agreed as part of the Commissioning Framework are used as the basis of monitoring and evaluation arrangements.
- (3) That the linkage between any Service Level Agreement funding to March 2017 and rent payable by arts organisations be removed, subject to any further consideration during the budget.
- (4) That the Arts Development budget is retained, to be considered alongside mainstream investment to support small scale, innovative or developmental arts activities, but that the budget is reviewed to ensure investments are broadly in line with criteria already agreed for commissioned services.
- (5) That early communication is undertaken with those organisations with which the Council has a current Service Level Agreement and also with other Arts funders.

Officers responsible for effecting the decision:

Chief Officer (Regeneration & Planning)
Chief Officer (Resources)

Reasons for making the decision:

Investment in the Arts supports delivery of the Council's Corporate Priority of Sustainable Economic Growth, specifically contributing to the delivery of the Corporate Outcome:- *"The attractiveness and offer of the district, as a place to visit or invest in, will be improved."* The decision will strengthen the Council's arrangements for meeting its statutory obligations around securing continuous improvement/value for money.

38 PROVISION OF ADDITIONAL FUNDING TO THE DUKES THEATRE TO PREPARE FOR ARTS COUNCIL BIDDING ROUNDS

(Cabinet Member with Special Responsibility Councillor Hanson)

Cabinet received a report from the Chief Officer (Regeneration & Planning) to obtain authority to make approved funding available to the Dukes Theatre.

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

| | Option 1: That the City Council attaches conditions to the grant awarded to the Dukes | Option 2: That the City Council awards the grant to the Dukes without conditions to spend as they see fit. |
|------------|---|---|
| Advantages | The City Council can ensure the scope of the work is specified but leave influence over delivery to the Dukes | None |

| | | |
|---------------|---|---|
| Disadvantages | This would require some officer time to manage and monitor the process, e.g. grant eligibility, output evidence, etc. | That the funds could be spent without delivering the project they were allocated for, or the project brief becomes wider. |
| Risks | That the Dukes introduce influencing factors in delivery that are outside the scope of the commission | That request for further funding are submitted |

The officer preferred option is option 1.

Councillor Hanson proposed, seconded by Councillor Smith:-

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

Councillors then voted:-

Resolved unanimously:

- (1) That the agreed funding be provided to the Dukes Theatre on the basis of the conditions highlighted in paragraphs 2.3 and 2.4 of the report.

Officers responsible for effecting the decision:

Chief Officer (Regeneration & Planning)
Chief Officer (Resources)

Reasons for making the decision:

The development of the district's arts offer is highlighted as a key economic development objective in the Council's Cultural Heritage Strategy. This form of economic development activity aligns with the corporate priority for economic growth in the Corporate Plan. The decision enables the Council to retain an element of control over how the grant is used by the Dukes and that it is spent for its intended purpose.

39 CORPORATE PERFORMANCE MONITORING 2014/15

(Cabinet Member with Special Responsibility Councillor Blamire)

Cabinet received a report from the Chief Officer (Resources) to present the corporate financial monitoring report and other supporting statements for Quarter 1 of the 2014/15 performance monitoring cycle. No corporate performance report was presented although it was noted that reporting would restart for Quarter 2.

The Corporate Financial Monitoring report included sections on General Fund Revenue Monitoring, General Fund Capital Programme, Revenue Collection Performance, Housing Revenue Account (HRA), Provisions and Reserves and Contract Procedure Rules and Other Exceptions to Tender. The latest position with regard to Treasury Management activities was included as well as a quarterly update regarding the property portfolio.

The report was for noting and comments.

Councillor Bryning proposed, seconded by Councillor Blamire:-

“That the report be noted”

Councillors then voted:-

Resolved unanimously:

- (1) That the report be noted.

Officers responsible for effecting the decision:

Chief Officer (Resources)

Reasons for making the decision:

The Council's Performance Management Framework requires the regular reporting of operational, as well as financial performance.

40 BUDGET AND PLANNING PROCESS 2015/16 (Pages 20 - 25)

(Cabinet Members with Special Responsibility Councillors Blamire and Bryning)

Cabinet received a joint report from the Chief Executive and Chief Officer (Resources) to agree a process for reviewing the Council's Budget and Policy Framework for 2015/16 and to update Cabinet on various policy and planning matters.

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

The following options are available to Cabinet.

- (1) Approve the proposals and timetable set out in the report for reviewing and revising the Council's Budget and Policy Framework.
- (2) Approve an amended version of the proposals, drawing on any specific issues that Cabinet have.

Assuming that Cabinet has no other specific issues to address, Option 1 is the Officer preferred option, as it sets out a structured approach for Cabinet to review the existing Budget and Policy Framework, to identify savings/efficiency options, and for it to bring forward its budget and policy framework proposals for 2015/16 and beyond, within statutory timescales. As usual, the consideration and management of risk will form a key part of the process.

Councillor Bryning proposed, seconded by Councillor Blamire:-

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

Councillors then voted:-

Resolved unanimously:

- (1) That the report be noted and the outline budget and planning timetable set out at Appendix A to the report, and appended to the minutes, be approved.

Officers responsible for effecting the decision:

Chief Executive
Chief Officer (Resources)

Reasons for making the decision:

The plans and strategies outlined in the report together make up the Council's Budget and Policy Framework. The annual review of the budget and policy framework helps ensure that the Council's plans and strategies are kept up to date, and their impact on local communities is assessed and considered. In particular, the outline plans regarding consultation and future place surveys will help develop the Council's understanding of the needs of its communities, in turn helping it to meet the Public Sector Equality Duty as a community leader, service provider and employer.

Chairman

(The meeting ended at 12.05 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 FRIDAY 5 SEPTEMBER, 2014.

**EFFECTIVE DATE FOR IMPLEMENTING THE DECISIONS CONTAINED IN THESE MINUTES:
MONDAY 15 SEPTEMBER, 2014.**

| | SERVICES | SCRUTINY & CONSULTATION | CABINET | COUNCIL |
|----------------------------------|--|---|--|--|
| On-going, throughout the process | <p>Revision of current year's budget and future years' draft base budgets and key strategies, in context of service plans.</p> <p>Alongside this, the Council's Change Management Programme is being developed (initial target date of 31 December for completion), which will help:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Development of savings options (efficiencies, income generation, service reductions) • Identification of potential growth / redirection of resource needs. • Further development of strategies to support organisational change (HR/OD ICT and property etc). <p>Take forward decisions of Cabinet, subject to call-in.</p> | <p>Consultation to be developed and undertaken as appropriate, for specific budget proposals.</p> <p>Budget and Performance Panel to consider Budget and Policy Framework matters as appropriate.</p> | <p>Appraise, redefine and reduce actions against existing corporate priorities as budget and planning develops and in view of future funding prospects, for referral on to Council as and when appropriate.</p> <p>Consideration of associated budget options.</p> | <p>Consideration of any referrals arising.</p> |
| 02 September | | | <p>Cabinet meeting – Current year Quarter 1 monitoring; approve 2015/16 Budget & Policy Framework timetable.</p> <p>Budget/policy implications of any other agenda items to be picked up.</p> | |
| 09 September | | Budget and Performance Panel meeting (Qtr 1 monitoring and timetable to be presented). | Cabinet budget briefing (provisional). | |
| 30 September | | | Cabinet briefing (including any budget briefing). | |
| 07 October | Take forward decisions of Cabinet, subject to call-in. | | Cabinet meeting - budget/policy implications of any agenda items to be picked up. | |
| 21 October | | | Cabinet budget briefing (provisional). | |

| | SERVICES | SCRUTINY & CONSULTATION | CABINET | COUNCIL |
|-----------------------|---|-------------------------------------|--|---|
| 22 October | | | | Consider whether existing Localised Council Tax Scheme (LCTS) be retained for 2015/16, or whether revised options be developed. |
| 28 October | | | Cabinet briefing (including any Budget Briefing). | |
| 04 November | Take forward decisions of Cabinet, subject to call-in. | | Cabinet meeting - budget/policy implications of any agenda items to be picked up. Quarter 2 monitoring reported. | |
| 11 November | | Budget & Performance Panel meeting. | Cabinet budget briefing (provisional). | |
| 13 November | Take forward decisions of Council. | | | Receive any Budget or Policy Framework updates. |
| 25 November | | | Cabinet briefing (including any budget briefing). | |
| Early December | Assumed timing for receiving and appraising provisional Local Government Finance Settlement (for General Fund). | | | |
| 03 December | Take forward decisions of Cabinet, subject to call-in. | | <p>Receive Budget and Policy Framework updates / half yearly reviews (General Fund and Council Housing):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Draft revenue budget • Capital programme update • Provisions and Reserves • Draft corporate priorities and implications • Fees and Charges Policy <p>Consider other budget proposals (savings/efficiencies/redirection/growth) in context of any emerging policy changes.</p> | |

| SERVICES | | SCRUTINY & CONSULTATION | CABINET | COUNCIL |
|-----------------------|---|-------------------------|---|--|
| 16 December | | | Budget & Performance Panel meeting. | |
| 17 December | Take forward any decisions of Council. | | | Approve Members Allowances Scheme |
| | Provide general budgetary update for staff, taking into account Provisional Settlement. | | | Approve MTFS review (including capital investment) and any changes to council tax targets. |
| By 31 December | Council tax base calculated and notified to precepting authorities, taking account of Charging Policy & LCTS Scheme. | | Any specific budget reviews completed, in conjunction with Chief Officers. | Consider any 2015/16 LCTS options (subject to October Council). |
| 06 January | Draft Organisational Change Programme completed. | | | |
| 13 January | | | Cabinet Budget Briefing (provisional) | |
| By 15 January | Council Tax Collection Fund Surplus or Deficit position determined and notified to relevant major precepting authorities. | | Cabinet briefing (including any budget briefing). | |
| 20 January | Take forward decisions of Cabinet, subject to call-in. | | Consider any draft Corporate Plan changes and their budgetary implications. Approve Housing Rents and recommend Housing Revenue Account (HRA) budget / MTFS proposals for Council. Agree council tax, General Fund Revenue Budget and Capital Programme proposals for initial consideration by Council. | |

| SERVICES | | SCRUTINY & CONSULTATION | CABINET | COUNCIL |
|---------------|--|--|---|---------|
| 27 January | | Cabinet's budget proposals presented to Budget and Performance Panel, other Members and economic stakeholders (and other major preceptors to present, as appropriate). | | |
| By 30 January | Assumed timescale for receiving final Local Government Settlement. Business Rates Collection Fund Surplus or Deficit position determined and notified to relevant major precepting authorities (with associated returns to Government). | | | |
| 03 February | | | Cabinet Budget Briefing (provisional). | |
| 04 February | Implement decisions of Council. | | Consider Cabinet's initial proposals regarding the Budget and Policy Framework: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Draft Corporate Plan implications.• Capital and Revenue proposals for General Fund and Housing Revenue Account.• Any other Policy Framework updates (following review). Approved (City's) council tax increase (%). | |
| 10 February | | | Cabinet briefing (including any budget briefing). | |

| | SERVICES | SCRUTINY & CONSULTATION | CABINET | COUNCIL |
|-------------|--|--|---|--|
| 17 February | Implement resolutions of Cabinet and produce referral reports for Council. | | Reconsider Budget and other Policy Framework proposals in light of feedback from Council, Budget and Performance Panel and any further consultation undertaken. Make full recommendations back to Council to complete Budget setting and corporate planning. | |
| 20 February | Deadline for completing council tax setting report (Final Settlement and all precept notices required head of this). | | | |
| 24 February | | Budget and Performance Panel meeting (treasury management framework, and any budget and planning updates). | Cabinet | |
| 03 March | | | Cabinet Budget Briefing (provisional) | |
| 04 March | Implement decisions of Council. | | | <p>Approve Budget: 3yr Revenue Budget and 5yr Capital Programme for both General Fund and Housing Revenue Account (latter if not already approved). Treasury Management Framework including Prudential Code Limits. Medium Term Financial Strategy (including future years' Council Tax Targets and incorporating future years' housing rents targets). Approve full Council Tax rates.</p> <p>Approve Policy Framework: Corporate Plan. Any other Policy Framework Updates (following review).</p> |

| | |
|--|-------------|
| | By 30 April |
|--|-------------|

| | |
|----------|--|
| SERVICES | <p>Complete the updating of service business plans to fit with approved Budget and Policy Framework.</p> <p>Establish financial and performance reporting arrangements for new year.</p> |
|----------|--|

| | | |
|-------------------------|---------|---------|
| SCRUTINY & CONSULTATION | CABINET | COUNCIL |
| | | |