

## CABINET

10.00 A.M.

5TH JULY 2011

**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
Heather McManus	Deputy Chief Executive
Nadine Muschamp	Head of Financial Services and Section 151 Officer
Andrew Dobson	Head of Regeneration and Policy Service
Liz Bateson	Principal Democratic Support Officer

### 9 MINUTES

The minutes of the meeting held on Tuesday 7 June 2011 were approved as a correct record.

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

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

### 11 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

No declarations were made at this point.

### 12 PUBLIC SPEAKING

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

### 13 LANCASTER CULTURAL HERITAGE STRATEGY

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

Cabinet received a report from the Head of Regeneration and Policy to consider the outcome and recommendations of the final version of the Lancaster Cultural Heritage Strategy prepared by consultants Blue Sail following extensive consultation.

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

Option	Advantages	Disadvantages	Risks
1. Do not adopt final Cultural Heritage Strategy objectives/priorities.	No advantages identified.	No clear up to date and comprehensive statement of direction, in either strategic or development terms, of City Council priorities for Cultural Heritage.	Development of Lancaster's cultural heritage offer will have to take place on a piecemeal basis, lacking a strong and clear economic

			<p>justification, and without a strong and well developed strategic framework.</p> <p>The Council may miss an opportunity to build upon stakeholder engagement during strategy development.</p>
<p>2. Cabinet endorses Cultural Heritage Strategy objectives/priorities.</p>	<p>Clear commitment to and direction for Cultural Heritage as an economic and regeneration driver for the district.</p> <p>Clear economic justification for individual projects and a robust evaluation framework.</p> <p>Wide consultation and formal feedback has led to identification of priorities.</p>	<p>Bringing together all key partners to deliver a co-ordinated investment strategy in a manner that maximises the benefit to the local economy and tackles the long under investment in this aspect of the visitor economy will be difficult.</p>	<p>Normal risks associated with practical delivery: achieving development and revenue funding, managing and shaping individual projects and initiatives.</p>
<p>3. Cabinet endorses Cultural Heritage Strategy objectives/priorities with amendments / alternative actions.</p>	<p>Depending on time taken to review amendments there should still be:</p> <p>Clear commitment to and direction for Cultural Heritage as an economic and regeneration driver for the district.</p> <p>Clear economic justification.</p>	<p>Further delay possible in bringing together all key partners to deliver a co-ordinated investment strategy in a manner that maximises the benefit to the local economy and tackles the long under investment in this aspect of the visitor economy will be difficult.</p>	<p>Normal risks associated with practical delivery: achieving development and revenue funding, managing and shaping individual projects and initiatives.</p>

Option 2 was the preferred option as this provided a clear commitment and direction for Cultural Heritage and its contribution to economic regeneration work in the district

through the stated policy objectives, priorities and outline action plan. Option 3 was also available to Members and acceptable given the context of changing circumstances/funding environment noted in paragraph 2.6 of the report. Members were assured that the recommendations had been subject to independent appraisal and wide community consultation.

Essentially the Lancaster Cultural Heritage Strategy and the implementation plan was a programme rather than a collection of individual projects. It provided a strategic overview and a framework for any projects that were ultimately supported to move forward. As individual projects were developed, and if they had individual council resource/risk implications they would be subject to detailed internal appraisal within the council's own scrutiny and project management systems. Any individual project proposals would need to be considered as part of the annual budget and planning process, in context of future priorities and affordability

Councillor Sands proposed, seconded by Councillor Hanson:-

- (1) That the Lancaster Cultural Heritage Strategy and Action Plan are endorsed as the framework for prioritising actions and investment in the district's' cultural heritage assets.
- (2) That a presentation of the Strategy be arranged, to be open to all Members of Lancaster City Council.
- (3) That the Action Plan be considered in the context of an overall review of the Council's Priorities and Budget for 2012/13."

Councillors then voted:-

***Resolved unanimously:***

- (1) That the Lancaster Cultural Heritage Strategy and Action Plan are endorsed as the framework for prioritising actions and investment in the district's' cultural heritage assets.
- (2) That a presentation of the Strategy be arranged, to be open to all Members of Lancaster City Council.
- (3) That the Action Plan be considered in the context of an overall review of the Council's Priorities and Budget for 2012/13.

**Officers responsible for effecting the decision:**

Head of Regeneration and Policy

**Reasons for making the decision:**

The decision fits in with the Council's new corporate and strategic approach towards delivering economic regeneration placing emphasis on developing and focussing on key priorities, policy fit and deliverability. The Strategy should be welcomed for providing a renewed focus and for taking stock of the current situation. There are some criticisms of the district's current approach (or lack of approach) in the Strategy, but as an independent review all key stakeholders should recognise the consultant has acted in the capacity of a 'critical friend'. The review and outline action plan will assist more effective targeting on the deliverable 'high impact' priority projects that will build upon some of the positive changes seen in the district in recent years.

**14 LANCASTER MARKET****(Cabinet Member with Special Responsibility Councillor Barry)**

Councillor Barry confirmed that a meeting of the Lancaster Market Cabinet Liaison Group had been convened for 18 July 2011 and that a report on developments would be considered at the next Cabinet meeting on 26 July 2011.

***Resolved unanimously:***

- (1) That the oral update be noted.

**Officers responsible for effecting the decision:**

Deputy Chief Executive  
Head of Property Services

**Reasons for making the decision:**

The terms of reference of the Lancaster Market Cabinet Liaison Group stipulate regular reports to Cabinet.

**15 EXCLUSION OF THE PRESS AND PUBLIC**

The Chairman asked for any further declarations of interest from Cabinet Members regarding the exempt report.

It was moved by Councillor Barry and seconded by Councillor Hanson:-

“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:-

***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 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.

**16 FORMER SHELL/ICI SITE, MIDDLETON (Pages 1 - 3)****(Cabinet Member with Special Responsibility Councillor Hamilton-Cox)**

Cabinet received a report from the Head of Property Services which was exempt from publication by virtue of paragraph 3, 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 Smith recommendations 1, 2 and 3 as set out in the exempt report.

By way of an amendment Councillor Barry proposed, seconded by Councillor Leytham a revision to recommendation (1) as set out in the exempt report.

Councillors then voted on the amendment:-

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

Councillors then voted on recommendations (2) & (3)

***Resolved:***

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

(1) The resolution is set out in a minute exempt from publication by virtue of paragraph 3, Schedule 12A of the Local Government Act 1972.

**Officers responsible for effecting the decision:**

Head of Property Services

**Reasons for making the decision:**

The reasons for making the decision are set out in a minute exempt from publication by virtue of paragraph 3, Schedule 12A of the Local Government Act 1972.

---

Chairman

(The meeting ended at 10.50 a.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 7 JULY, 2011.**

**EFFECTIVE DATE FOR IMPLEMENTING THE DECISIONS CONTAINED IN THESE MINUTES:  
FRIDAY 15 JULY, 2011.**

By virtue of paragraph(s) 3 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A  
of the Local Government Act 1972.

Document is Restricted