

## CABINET

10.00 A.M.

2ND DECEMBER 2014

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

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)
Suzanne Lodge	Chief Officer (Health and Housing)
Liz Bateson	Principal Democratic Support Officer

### 58 MINUTES

The minutes of the meeting held on Tuesday 4 November 2014 were approved as a correct record.

### 59 ITEMS OF URGENT BUSINESS AUTHORISED BY THE LEADER

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

### 60 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

No declarations were made at this point.

### 61 PUBLIC SPEAKING

Members were advised that there had been 4 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. Karen Chaplin and Andrew Kenyon had registered to speak on the Charter Market Review (Minute 62), with Helen Hicks and Rachel-Ann Powers having requested to speak on the Storey – Tasting Garden (Minute 63 refers).

### 62 CHARTER MARKET REVIEW

**(Cabinet Member with Special Responsibility Councillor Barry)**

***Karen Chaplin and Andrew Kenyon 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) which provided options for the layout of the market once the Square Routes work has been completed.

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

were set out in the report as follows:

Is a more radical overhaul of the Charter Market required than what officers have consulted on?

Some have suggested that the Council lacks a well thought out business plan and strategy for the market, and that without one the full potential of the city centre will not be realised and furthermore decisions cannot really be taken on the layout of the market. In putting forward this view it is suggested that a key point to consider is whether the newly refurbished Market Square should be left solely for entertainment / events and for people to congregate. The officer view of this is that actually the City Council is very clear in its view of the market. These have been articulated via the considerations made in arriving at the Square Routes project and the subsequent consultations and are underpinned by the Council's ethos and particularly the need for the Council to act as a steward. The Council's view of the market can be summed up as-

*The market is an attraction that makes the city centre an attractive and vibrant place and should be managed to take account of other users and to make sure it achieves high standards.*

The question is then to what extent does the Council feel it needs to further 'plan' the market to achieve the above?

The Council could take the view that to achieve the above it wants to completely overhaul the market. Some Councils have adopted a very interventionist route to market provision. To the extreme where the market is effectively an outdoor shopping mall with homogenised stalls selling prescribed products that complement what the shop based businesses offer. Other Councils have followed a less extreme route but have in place a very prescribed plan for their markets nonetheless. Such plans are still very interventionist in that they will specify which goods can be sold and from which pitches, where the goods should come from, the Council may also supply the stalls.

It would also be perfectly valid for the Council to take the view, as it has to date, that, as it is, the market supports the Council's strategic objectives. The current model of market provision is financially self-sufficient, creating no burden for the Council tax-payer and making a contribution to delivery of key Council priorities. The ongoing management input from the Council is streamlined to keep down costs and is focussed on day to day management activities that ensure that the market operates smoothly (e.g. managing pitches and stall location, ensuring traders comply with standards, complementing the other range of City Centre activities, collecting fees from traders). In this model traders bear the vast majority of the risk. The success or otherwise of individual traders, and the wider market, is largely determined by whether consumers want to buy the products. Critics of this approach will argue that shop based businesses suffer from increased competition because of lack of regulation and that the City Centre as a whole suffers because the overall look and appearance of the market is not tightly regulated.

Feedback from residents, visitors, users of the market and traders would suggest that generally people do not feel there is need to radically overhaul the market. Consumers actually seem to like the eclecticism and diversity of the Charter market. Those that suggest that the market is in need of a radical overhaul, say that now is the time to do so.

If Cabinet take the view that a radical overhaul is required then the view put forward that a business plan and strategy for the market needs to be developed and agreed is the best way forward. A radical overhaul will require significant officer input in terms of developing and agreeing a development plan. It would also be reasonable to expect that once implemented much more management input would be required in the day to day running of the market, which will require additional resources. In addition to this it will further extend the waiting time before a decision on the layout of the market is made. Already it is clear there is considerable uncertainty and resulting friction. This is of course a side effect of any change but is raised so that Cabinet are aware there is further potential were Cabinet to request a radical overhaul.

There has also been some suggestion that the BID would be best placed to deliver and manage the market. Whilst no detail of how this could work is available the principle of it and the potential implications of it would seem to be contrary to the Council's aims, objectives and ethos. It would effectively mean a delegation of stewardship.

Cabinet are therefore requested to consider whether a radical overhaul of the Charter Market is actually needed. If so consideration should be given to setting up a working group to develop a strategy and plan for future provision of the market.

If Cabinet take the view that a radical overhaul is required then no further decisions are required at this stage. However, if Cabinet take the view that no radical overhaul is required then consideration of a number of proposals is requested. These proposals are likely to be seen by some as being too regulatory. In response to this clearly a balance is needed. Even if Cabinet determine that a radical overhaul isn't required it is clear that as stewards of the City Centre the Council does have a responsibility to ensure a generally acceptable standard for the market. Having such a light touch that the market deteriorated into a city centre car boot sale would be to nobody's advantage either. Therefore the questions Cabinet are requested to consider are:-

#### How should current market pitches be laid out / and presented?

In the latest round of consultation 2 draft layouts were proposed (See Appendix B to the report).

#### **Layout A-**

Based around the current footprint of the market, Market Street, Market Square, Cheapside. This option means that all existing permanent traders will still be able to trade from pitches within this footprint (although in some cases the pitches will be smaller)

- Reduces the amount of stalls in Market Square by 2.
- Only allows food stalls in Market Square.
- Distributes pitches for existing stalls between Market Street, Market Square, Cheapside.
- New traders will be allocated pitches on Church Street / New Street if there are none vacant in Market Street, Market Square, Cheapside. (To encourage take up these will be free for an initial period).
- Existing traders will be given the opportunity to relocate to Church Street for a rent free period, on a voluntary basis

- Comes with the proviso that the standard of appearance of market stalls is maintained to a standard specified by the Council.
- Sets out the maximum size of pitch that will be allowed at each location. The pitch sizes have been selected to work in the given location and to allow for as many pitches as possible.

### **Layout B-**

Deliberately alters the current footprint of the market so that there are only pitches on one side of Cheapside. This means that some existing permanent traders will be moved to new pitches in Church Street. Pitches will still remain in Market Street and Market Square.

- Reduces the amount of stalls in Market Square by 2
- Only allows food stalls in Market Square.
- Distributes pitches for existing stalls between New Street, Market Street, Market Square, Cheapside (one side only) and Church Street.
- Existing traders allocated pitches on Church Street will be allowed them free for a limited period.
- New traders will be allocated pitches on Church Street / New Street. (To encourage take up these will be free for an initial period).
- Comes with the proviso that the standard of appearance of market stalls is maintained to a standard specified by the Council.
- Sets out the maximum size of pitch that will be allowed at each location. The pitch sizes have been selected to work in the given location and to allow for as many pitches as possible.

**Note-** in both options within the boundaries set out above the plan would be to seek to accommodate traders' views on where they were located as far as we reasonably could. Clearly though in both options there will need to be some movement of stallholders (e.g. in plan B it would not be simply a case of moving the traders who were displaced from Cheapside into Church Street - consideration would need to be given to what was best for the market) and some stallholders may have reduced pitches from previously.

Layout A is generally preferred by shoppers and market traders.

From a financial perspective option A is the best option for the Council.

Layout B is generally preferred by shop based businesses as it distributes the market around a larger area and takes positive action to use Church Street. Shop based businesses say that will increase footfall to Church Street (albeit only on 2 days per week). Traders generally say that they would sooner stop trading than trade on Church Street.

Neither layout is supported by those who say that now as the plinth is in place in Market Square there is an opportunity to further add to be vibrancy of the city centre by using it for entertainment events on Saturdays. To allow this Market Square should be kept clear. In turn the added footfall from the entertainment will benefit the market and shop based businesses.

### How much should pitches cost?

Based on consultation it's clear that pitches in Cheapside and Market Street are viewed by existing traders as the best to trade from. Current charges for pitches are £1.35 sq/m with £15 being the minimum charge. There is usually a waiting list for traders.

Traders are provided with a pitch immediately in the newly upgraded public realm of City Centre, with an existing footfall, which is likely to increase. Looking at comparable markets the current amount charged for pitches is very low. In some places comparable pitches are charged at double this amount. The cost of pitches has increased very little over the last few years. It is therefore proposed that from April 1<sup>st</sup>, 2015 the charge increases to £1.80 sq/m and £20.00 minimum charge.

The charge for traders wishing to trade from Church Street will remain £1.35 sq/m with £15 being the minimum charge. However for new traders wishing to trade from Church Street there will be an initial 6 month period where no fees will be charged. Clearly this proposal could result in reduced income and would not be welcomed by all traders. It would however encourage traders to think about where they might want to be located and what sort of products might they want to sell. The forecast financial implications of this are set out in the financial implications box in the report.

### Proposal Concessionary pitches, street cafes etc.

Besides Charter Market pitches the City Council also charges for the use of a number of concessionary pitches in the City Centre and also licenses a number of street cafes. There is clearly a need to ensure that these also complement the wider aims of the City Centre. As things stand further some further work is needed to review the locations and fees for concessionary pitches. Further work is also needed to ensure that street cafes, concessionary pitches and market pitches all work together. Cabinet are requested to delegate the implementation of this review to the Chief Officer (Environment) in consultation with the Cabinet Members responsible for Markets and Regeneration.

Councillor Barry proposed, seconded by Councillor Hanson:-

“(1) That Layout A be approved with the following revisions:

- inclusion of two extra stalls on Market Street (one at the top of Golden Ball Lane and one in between pitch 11 and pitch 21)
- To extend the length of stall 34 from 10 m to 12 m but with the loss of the dogleg
- Not to impose a food only restriction on stalls in Market Square but ensure that only attractive stalls are sited in that area to maintain the improved appearance of the square.

(2) That Cabinet reaffirms that traders are expected to follow market rules on matters such as appearance of stalls, tidiness of stalls, leaving the pitch clean and tidy, not encroaching beyond the pitch, being courteous to other city centre businesses etc. Furthermore officers are instructed to ensure that market rules are followed at all times and to take immediate action against traders who do not wish to comply with

the market rules.

- (3) That from April 2015 the cost of pitches on Market Square, Market Street and Cheapside be increased from £1.35 to £1.50 per square metre with a minimum charge of £16.00. Existing traders wishing to trade from Church Street/New Street to be charged at £1.35 per square metre and £15 minimum charge and new traders requesting a pitch on Church Street/New Street be given an initial 6 month period where no fees will be charged.
- (4) That the implementation of the review of City Centre concessions, street pitches etc. be delegated to the Chief Officer (Environment) in consultation with the Cabinet Members responsible for Markets and Regeneration.”

Councillors then voted:-

***Resolved unanimously:***

- (1) That Layout A be approved with the following revisions:
  - inclusion of two extra stalls on Market Street (one at the top of Golden Ball Lane and one in between pitch 11 and pitch 21)
  - To extend the length of stall 34 from 10 m to 12 m but with the loss of the dogleg
  - Not to impose a food only restriction on stalls in Market Square but ensure that only attractive stalls are sited in that area to maintain the improved appearance of the square.
- (2) That Cabinet reaffirms that traders are expected to follow market rules on matters such as appearance of stalls, tidiness of stalls, leaving the pitch clean and tidy, not encroaching beyond the pitch, being courteous to other city centre businesses etc. Furthermore officers are instructed to ensure that market rules are followed at all times and to take immediate action against traders who do not wish to comply with the market rules.
- (3) That from April 2015 the cost of pitches on Market Square, Market Street and Cheapside be increased from £1.35 to £1.50 per square metre with a minimum charge of £16.00. Existing traders wishing to trade from Church Street/New Street to be charged at £1.35 per square metre and £15 minimum charge and new traders requesting a pitch on Church Street/New Street be given an initial 6 month period where no fees will be charged.
- (4) That the implementation of the review of City Centre concessions, street pitches etc. be delegated to the Chief Officer (Environment) in consultation with the Cabinet Members responsible for Markets and Regeneration.

**Officers responsible for effecting the decision:**

Chief Officer (Environment)

**Reasons for making the decision:**

The decision is consistent with the ethos of stewardship set out in the City Council's Corporate Plan; ensuring the social, economic and environmental wellbeing of the local

area. The decision allows for implementation of the new charter market layout in January 2015. Once Officers allocate pitches to stallholders they will continue to monitor and adjust as necessary. Only fundamental changes will be referred back to Cabinet.

### 63 STOREY - TASTING GARDEN

**(Cabinet Member with Special Responsibility Councillor Hanson)**

***Helen Hicks and Rachel-Ann Powers 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.***

***At this point Councillor Barry declared an interest in view of his involvement with the Friends of the Storey Gardens.***

Cabinet received a report from the Chief Officer (Environment) which sought a decision on the future of the tasting garden.

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

**OPTION 1- Consider that restoration of the artwork is a priority for the Council and that in its role as a steward the Council should properly lead on it.**

In order to arrive at this option Cabinet would need consider the following-

- What actual evidence is there that this is generally what our citizens want?
- How would the restoration be funded? If the Council was to allocate resources for the Garden, in effect they would need to be redirected from another initiative or activity. Realistically, therefore, it could be viewed that the Council does not have the resources to directly fund restoration and if so, external funds would need to be raised. We have been told that there are likely to be funds available out there. Experience tells us that obtaining external funding can be a complicated and time consuming exercise, depending on the regime under which funding is being sought, and match funding may well be required.
- How would the project be resourced? As stated above just raising the funds could be time consuming and complicated. Due to the need to prioritise and focus on core activities the Council does not have available officer time or expertise that could be allocated to this, if such a route was chosen. Therefore, Cabinet would need to consider this as an area for growth, as appropriate.
- How would the restored project be maintained? The ongoing maintenance of the artwork would be intensive and would again require ongoing growth – this need is a very real difficulty given the financial outlook.
- Even if funds are available obtaining them could take a number of years, depending on the route chosen, and in any event the timescales would not fit with the review of the Storey operation, required by 2017/18. What does the Council do with the garden in the interim and how will that support the Storey business plan? What about the future? What would need to change?

**OPTION 2- Consider that restoration of the artwork is a priority for the Council, but only on the firm basis that it was resource- and risk- free for the authority, and so could only take place if full responsibility could be transferred, in some way, to a third party.**

In order to arrive at this option Cabinet would need to consider the following-

- The Council are properly stewards of the garden. How would transferring/delegating this responsibility to a third party fit with that?
- What evidence is there that the general desire of our citizens is that a valuable space is delegated to a third party to manage in the hope that funds can be raised to restore the artwork therein?
- What would happen if the third party lost interest in the project, or got into difficulties, especially bearing in mind previous experience?
- How would the long term maintenance of the project be funded and managed?
- How would this fit in with the business plan of the Storey, and the requirement for the operation to be reviewed prior to 2017/18?
- What would happen to the garden whilst the funds are being raised?

Cabinet need to be aware that gaining satisfactory answers to these questions may prove impossible – there is no guarantee that this option is viable and it could tie up much Officer time pursuing it, to no avail.

**OPTION 3- Accept that ideally the artwork would be restored and would support the wider aims of the Storey and provide an attraction for our citizens but that the reality is that the policy and financial context of the Council mean that this is an unrealistic option. Therefore the most realistic option is to make the very best of the gardens, within the resources we have, and in a way that goes to meeting the needs of our citizens and the business plan for the Storey. The details to be determined through the masterplanning process that Cabinet have already agreed.**

In order to arrive at this option Cabinet would need to consider the following-

- What is the current and future financial position of the Council and what are the competing priorities?
- This option may be seen by some as not supporting wider aims and objectives for arts and culture in the District. However, this needs to be balanced by the fact that the Council already provides considerable ongoing support to arts and culture within the District.
- The view expressed by many citizens is that what really matters is that the gardens are brought back into use. Done properly this option could support the wider plans for the Storey and could (subject to testing through the masterplan process) reasonably include use of the garden to promote arts and culture.
- There is already an active 'Friends of ' group who the Council could continue to work with to improve the gardens in the short term and deliver aspects of the masterplan once agreed.
- This option is based around the current financial realities facing the Council so would be designed to be delivered within existing resources, and could fit with the future review of the wider Storey operation.



Cabinet are requested to agree in principle the way forward. Whatever option is chosen it is expected further more detailed reports will be brought back to Cabinet.

Councillor Blamire proposed, seconded by Councillor Hanson:-

- “(1) That a further report be prepared with information on governance/land ownership issues, and a timescale together with a masterplan with two options: one option being the reinstatement of the artwork, the other a more broadly based opportunity for people to use the Storey Gardens.
- (2) That if following consideration of the report and masterplans, the decision is taken to restore the Tasting Gardens, the Council will not look to do that itself but would expect the supporters of the Tasting Gardens to undertake this recognising that there would be a cost implication to the City Council which would be responsible for any ongoing maintenance costs.”

Councillors then voted:-

***Resolved:***

***(7 Members (Councillors Blamire, Bryning, Hamilton-Cox, Hanson, Leytham, Sands and Smith) voted in favour and 1 Member (Councillor Barry) abstained.)***

- (1) That a further report be prepared with information on governance/land ownership issues, and a timescale together with a masterplan with two options: one option being the reinstatement of the artwork, the other a more broadly based opportunity for people to use the Storey Gardens.
- (2) That if following consideration of the report and masterplans, the decision is taken to restore the Tasting Gardens, the Council will not look to do that itself but would expect the supporters of the Tasting Gardens to undertake this recognising that there would be a cost implication to the City Council which would be responsible for any ongoing maintenance costs.

**Officer responsible for effecting the decision:**

Chief Officer (Environment)

**Reasons for making the decision:**

The decision recognises the polarisation of views. The Council has a clearly defined strategy for the Storey Institute and this includes the recognition that the gardens are an integral part of the business plan for the facility. This will be addressed in the forthcoming report and draft masterplans.

**The meeting adjourned at 11.35am and reconvened at 11.45am.**

Cabinet received a report from the Chief Officer (Health and Housing) which sought approval to introduce a voluntary code of no smoking within children's play areas and young people's play facilities located in parks and open spaces owned by the Council.

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

	<b>Option 1:</b> Approve the introduction of a voluntary code of no smoking in Council owned play areas.	<b>Option 2:</b> Do not approve the introduction of a voluntary code of no smoking in Council owned play areas.
Advantages	Reduce child exposure to smoking and help to decrease the number of young people starting to smoke. Decrease cigarette litter such as cigarette butts, empty packets and wrappers to make play areas more pleasant and to protect wildlife. Encourage play area users to discourage smokers in play areas. Project contributes to health and wellbeing targets.	None
Disadvantages	Cost of installing the signs. There may be opposition from smokers who feel we shouldn't go beyond the statutory controls.	Missed opportunity to work in partnership with county public health to help address a health and wellbeing issue.
Risks	Future maintenance costs could be high. However, this is unlikely as the signs will be of robust quality and require little maintenance.	Reputational risk – not implementing this would be at odds with our health and wellbeing priority.

Option 1 – The introduction of a voluntary no smoking code is entirely consistent with the Council's health and wellbeing corporate priority and can be achieved with minimum impact on Council resources.

Councillor Leytham proposed, seconded by Councillor David Smith:-

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

Councillors then voted:-

**Resolved:**

**(7 Members (Councillors Blamire, Bryning, Hamilton-Cox, Hanson, Leytham, Sands and Smith) voted in favour, and 1 Member (Councillor Barry) abstained.)**

- (1) That the introduction of a voluntary code of no smoking within Council owned play areas, skate parks and multi-use play areas be approved.

**Officer responsible for effecting the decision:**

Chief Officer (Health and Housing)

**Reasons for making the decision:**

Reducing child exposure to smoking and de-normalising tobacco use within the community is desirable to try to reduce smoking uptake rates amongst young people. Smoking is still a major public health problem and implementing a voluntary code of no smoking in play areas is one way of the Council contributing to addressing the health, social and financial impacts of smoking. In addition, smoking related litter should reduce in play areas and this also addresses another important priority of the Council.

**65 CORPORATE PERFORMANCE MONITORING 2014/15****(Cabinet Member with Special Responsibility Councillor Bryning)**

Cabinet received a report from the Chief Officer (Resources) which presented the corporate performance and financial monitoring reports at quarter 2 of the 2014/15 performance monitoring cycle.

Following the approval of the Corporate Plan on 16 July 2014, Officers have been developing the performance monitoring process to ensure the 'right' measures are in place and that they can be measured accurately and appropriately. Planned performance reporting in Quarter 2 has been deferred in light of a revised performance management framework currently being developed and actions arising from a recent Investors in People assessment. The report therefore focussed on financial, property and treasury management activities.

The second quarter's update on Property matters was included at Appendix B to the report, and the position with regards to treasury management activities was included at Appendix C to the report.

Councillor Bryning proposed, seconded by Councillor Barry:

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

**Resolved unanimously:**

- (1) That the report be noted.
- (2) That the Treasury Management report, as set out at Appendix C to the report, be referred on to Council for noting.

**Officer 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.

**66 BUDGET AND POLICY FRAMEWORK UPDATE 2015/16**

**(Cabinet Member with Special Responsibility Councillor Bryning)**

Cabinet received a report from the Chief Officer (Resources) which provided an update on the Council's financial position to help inform development of Cabinet's budget proposals. Given that the Local Government Settlement had not yet been received, the report was an interim update only, primarily for information and no specific options were put forward.

Councillor Bryning proposed, seconded by Councillor Sands:-

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

Councillors then voted:-

***Resolved unanimously:***

- (1) That Cabinet notes the draft budgetary position for current and future years as set out in the report, accepting that this is an interim update.
- (2) That the update be referred on to December Council for information.

**Officer responsible for effecting the decision:**

Chief Officer (Resources)

**Reasons for making the decision:**

To note the latest position and to provide an update to full Council.

**67 EXCLUSION OF THE PRESS AND PUBLIC**

It was moved by Councillor David Smith and seconded by Councillor Leytham:-

"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 item of business, on the grounds that it could involve the possible disclosure of exempt information as defined in paragraph 3 of Schedule 12A of that Act."

Members then voted as follows:-

***(6 Members (Councillors Blamire, Bryning, Hanson, Leytham, Sands and Smith) voted in favour and 2 Members (Councillors Barry and Hamilton-Cox) voted against.)***

**Resolved:**

- (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 item of business, on the grounds that it could involve the possible disclosure of exempt information as defined in paragraph 3 of Schedule 12A of that Act.

**68 SITES OFF BAILRIGG LANE, SCOTFORTH, LANCASTER (Page 15)**

**(Cabinet Member with Special Responsibility Councillor Hamilton-Cox)**

Cabinet received a joint report from the Chief Officer (Regeneration and Planning) and Chief Officer (Resources) to approve the freehold and leasehold disposal of the land south of Bailrigg Lane, Lancaster (the 'Science Park' site). 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 Hanson proposed, seconded by Councillor Bryning:-

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

Councillors then voted:-

**Resolved:**

***(6 Members (Councillors Blamire, Bryning, Hanson, Leytham, Sands and Smith) voted in favour and 2 Members (Councillors Barry and Hamilton-Cox) abstained).***

- (1) That the land south of Bailrigg Lane, Lancaster, as shown edged red and coloured blue on the plan attached, be disposed of on the terms and conditions as set out in section 2 of the exempt report.

**Officers responsible for effecting the decision:**

Chief Officer (Resources)  
Chief Officer (Regeneration and Planning)

**Reasons for making the decision**

The Lancaster Science Park (or Innovation campus) is a long-standing regeneration priority of the Council and is identified as such in the Local Development Framework Core Strategy.

The Council's acquisition of the land was funded by the former North West Development

Agency (NWDA) to facilitate specifically the Science Park idea. This places significant restrictions and obligations on the Council in terms of its disposal of the land and also on the future use and development of the site.

Furthermore, 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, generally they should be disposed of at best value. This sale allows the Council to improve the management of its assets

---

Chairman

(The meeting ended at 12.20 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 TUESDAY 9TH DECEMBER, 2014.**

**EFFECTIVE DATE FOR IMPLEMENTING THE DECISIONS CONTAINED IN THESE MINUTES:  
WEDNESDAY 17TH DECEMBER, 2014.**