

CABINET

10.00 A.M.

25TH JUNE 2013

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	Head of Resources and Section 151 Officer
Andrew Dobson	Head of Regeneration and Planning Service
Suzanne Lodge	Head of Health and Housing
Julian Inman	Senior Planner (Regeneration)
Gill Haigh	Assistant Head (Communications)
Liz Bateson	Principal Democratic Support Officer

12 MINUTES

The minutes of the meeting held on Tuesday 28 May 2013, were approved as a correct record.

13 ITEMS OF URGENT BUSINESS AUTHORISED BY THE LEADER

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

14 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

No declarations were made at this point.

15 PUBLIC SPEAKING

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

16 LANCASTER SQUARE ROUTES

(Cabinet Member with Special Responsibility Councillor Hanson)

Cabinet received a report from the Head of Regeneration & Planning which provided details on the decision required concerning a centrepiece for Market Square as part of the next phase of work to implement Lancaster Square Routes.

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

Both options presented fit to the concept design previously consulted on and approved. Both would add much seating capacity to the square, effectively doubling that planned elsewhere on the new benches. The options offered a similar capacity of seating, giving people opportunities to sit in a variety of arrangements. Both options for a centrepiece were

designed to fit to an improved layout of the Charter Market in the square and both took up much less space than did the arrangement of the former fountain in association with the benches around. As regards the potentials for using the centrepiece as a stage for performance both options offered this but there were differences. These and all other relative differences between the two options were considered further in the table below.

Option 1	The centrepiece to Market Square comprising a single elevated structure (as per the Option 1 drawings in Appendix 1).
Advantages	<p>Option is wholly consistent with the agreed concept design for Market Square, with the first phase completed last year.</p> <p>This option is consistent with the concept designs which went through extensive public and stakeholder consultation at the inception of Lancaster Square Routes.</p> <p>Centrepiece is multi-purpose as it can be used as seating and as staging for performances and fits well with other uses of the square including the Charter Market.</p> <p>Builds in the ability to use the structure for a wide range of performances and is readily useable without additional interventions. 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> <p>From a practical perspective it is much easier (eg no need for setting up, storage, transportation)</p>
Disadvantages	<p>It is more obstructive to pedestrian movement through the very centre of the square than option 2.</p> <p>Will not offer a sufficient depth of stage for certain larger bands.</p>
Risks	<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	The centrepiece to Market Square comprising twin elevated structures (as per the Option 2 drawings in Appendix 1) and also including for the council investing in demountable units that inserted between the two permanent structures would make it possible to provide for a full stage area equivalent to that offered in the option 1 proposal.

<p>Advantages</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 through the very centre of the square than option 1.</p> <p>A stage area the same as that provided in the option 1 proposal is achievable via use of demountable units.</p> <p>Even without such units the structures will be an elevated facility that could be utilised for impromptu performances and street theatre.</p>
<p>Disadvantages</p>	<p>Is a variant on and to some extent does depart on the agreed concept design for Market Square and which went through extensive public and stakeholder consultation at the inception of Lancaster Square Routes.</p> <p>This option will require officers to seek a discrete variation from DCLG in the ERDF investment concerning the form of the centrepiece – see risks below.</p> <p>Surface treatments for the 3.7m by 6.4 metre ‘gap’ between the two structures will need to be designed to readily accommodate the insertion of demountable units whilst not permitting vehicles to access this area.</p> <p>The option is requiring of additional officer time involved in designing the demountable units – compared to option 1.</p> <p>The fact that to make available a full stage area will require the demountable units to be installed when needed for performances. Therefore, this option would require the council to plan and manage a system for making these available and this means additional officer time and ongoing costs compared to option 1.</p> <p>There would be many practical aspects to consider in devising such a management system including storage arrangements and methods for transportation, placement, training of staff for placement and dismantling. Insurance. There would be a promotional and marketing aspect to communicate the availability of the facility. There would also be several financial considerations for the council to consider including whether the council would want management of such a system to be at no revenue cost to it i.e. requiring it to be self financing through</p>

	<p>charging or whether the council is prepared to meet some or all of the revenue costs. Any charging system and the levels of charging would need to be devised in the context of the council's Fees and Charging policy. Further information on all these considerations for option 2 will be provided prior to the meeting.</p>
<p>Risks</p>	<p>The risk of not securing the specific variation required in the ERDF investment offer is considered very low.</p> <p>The risk that the centrepiece does not find favour with many people is as per option1.</p> <p>A risk additional to option 1 is that the investment in demountable staging units proves not to give best value if either the city council and its partners fail to drive and market use of the square for performance and / or demand to utilise staging in ways requiring this proves limited. In this latter regard a particular risk of this option is that should the council decide to charge for making available the demountable units then it is inevitable that such charging will impact on take up of the facility by third parties - albeit the extent to which such take up would be impacted cannot at this stage be quantified.</p>

Both options delivered improvements consistent with corporate policy and made full and best use of available finance including European funding.

Option 1 was the better for making more use of the square for performances and events as the structure was readily useable without recourse to using demountable units as per option 2 and the risk that any charging system would deter take up. Option 1 was much more practical from a logistical and ongoing perspective as it did not require storage, transport, staff to set up etc.

Option 2 was the better in terms of facilitating pedestrian movement through the very centre of the square. However, it did present practical problems and increased ongoing costs when events were planned.

In the May 2013 report officers considered that both options presented for the centrepiece would prove fitting and beneficial and accordingly a preferred option was not suggested.

To try to give a little further guidance on this officers consider that any balance of advantage between the options really came down to how committed the council was to growing use of Market Square as a venue for performances and events. Should the council be strongly committed to this then officers advised that option 1 should be preferred as this was much the more straightforward option in this regard as it involved providing a structure readily useable for most types of performance and thereby the more likely to facilitate use for performance.

Councillor Hanson proposed, seconded by Councillor Barry:-

- “(1) That option 1, the centrepiece to Market Square, Lancaster to comprise a single elevated structure, finished in a mix of granite and natural stone, be approved.
- (2) That the Head of Regeneration & Planning be authorised to take actions to procure and install the centrepiece and artwork, details of which would be agreed by a Cabinet Committee.
- (3) That a Cabinet Committee consisting of Councillors Barry, Blamire, Bryning, Hanson and Leytham be established with terms of reference to consider and decide on the artwork.”

Councillors then voted:-

Resolved unanimously:

- (1) That option 1, the centrepiece to Market Square, Lancaster to comprise a single elevated structure, finished in a mix of granite and natural stone, be approved.
- (2) That the Head of Regeneration & Planning be authorised to take actions to procure and install the centrepiece and artwork, details of which would be agreed by a Cabinet Committee.
- (3) That a Cabinet Committee consisting of Councillors Barry, Blamire, Bryning, Hanson and Leytham be established with terms of reference to consider and decide on the artwork.

Officers responsible for effecting the decision:

Head of Regeneration & Planning
 Head of Governance

Reasons for making the decision:

Whilst both options would deliver improvements consistent with corporate policy and would make full and best use of available finance including European funding, option 1 was more practical from a logistical and ongoing perspective and was indicative of the City Council’s commitment to Market Square as a venue for performances and events. Establishing a Cabinet Committee would provide a member sounding board thereby ensuring officers were fully conversant with, and the resulting artwork fully reflected, members’ views.

17 BRAND ENGAGEMENT UPDATE

(Cabinet Member with Special Responsibility Councillor Sands)

Cabinet received a report from the Head of Regeneration & Planning which provided an update on the outcomes of a brand engagement exercise.

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

	Option 1: To work with partners to	Option 2: To work with partners to	Option 3: Not to take forward
--	---	---	--------------------------------------

	develop all three plans	develop some of the three plans	
Advantages	Positioning Lancaster District's reputation and image so that it reflects the true quality of the offer available	Some improvements to the district's reputation and image	The council may decide not to deliver tourism services and therefore take the savings
	Positioning Lancaster District so that its economy achieves maximum benefits achievable via inward investment and leisure tourism	Some benefits to the economy as a result of inward investment or leisure tourism	
	A district prepared and ready to take advantage of the major regeneration initiatives planned	A district prepared and ready to take advantage of some regeneration activities	
	A coherent and partnership approach to development and implementation		
Disadvantages	Cost of funding further work on the Brand development Plan	Some aspects of district's leisure and commercial assets are undersold	District's leisure and commercial assets are undersold
			Lancaster District economy fails to achieve maximum benefits achievable via inward investment and leisure tourism
			District not fully prepared or able to take advantage of the major regeneration initiatives planned
			Risk of some partners becoming disillusioned with lack of action and going off and developing inconsistent and

			incoherent sporadic approaches and therefore failing to maximise true potential created by joint development and delivery
Risks	The success of brand development plan is reliant upon the appropriate resources and support of partners	Risk of some partners becoming disillusioned with lack of action and going off and developing inconsistent and incoherent sporadic approaches and therefore failing to maximise true potential created by joint development and delivery	
	Council spending reviews for future years may impact on the ability to implement outcomes of implementation plans.	Council spending reviews for future years may impact on the ability to implement outcomes of implementation plans.	
		Visitor and investor spend goes elsewhere and the district fails to realise the significant benefits arising out of regeneration developments.	Visitor and investor spend goes elsewhere and the district fails to realise the significant benefits arising out of regeneration developments.

Option 1 was the officer preferred option. Creating a relevant and up-to-date brand development plan was a major undertaking but was essential if the significant benefits arising out of developments such as Lancaster Castle and the Canal Corridor were to be fully captured. The appetite for partners to work together to develop and deliver this was also there.

The future growth of the district's economy would rely heavily on the perception of the area in the eyes of potential investors and visitors. Previous research has shown that the reputation and image of the district did not reflect the true quality of the area and the offer available.

Major regeneration initiatives were planned for the next five years. To gain the maximum benefits from this investment, a wide range of complementary activities were required ranging from (for example) physical intervention in upgrading the public realm through to "softer" measures such as interpretation and marketing. It was essential that these latter

activities were guided by a strong and clear brand and were delivered in a co-ordinated and consistent way.

The brand engagement exercise had brought a wide range of partners together to consider the nature of our district as a visitor and inward investment destination. This in turn had been tested with consumers both locally and from outside the district. The exercise had not only offered information on the approach to be taken to sell our district to visitors and potential investors but also brought together partners who would be keen to work alongside us in developing an implementation plan to ensure Lancaster District's reputation and image did reflect the true quality of the offer available and that our economy achieves maximum benefits achievable via inward investment and leisure tourism.

The next steps were to work with those partners to develop a draft implementation plan for consideration by Cabinet. This would include developing visitor facing creatives, branding toolkit, marketing and delivery plans. Whilst a precise timetable for completion of an implementation plan could not be provided at this stage, it would be a priority area of work for the council and any proposed implementation plans, once developed, would be fed back into Cabinet in a timely manner to inform budget setting and planning.

Councillor Sands proposed, seconded by Councillor Leytham:-

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

Councillors then voted:-

Resolved unanimously:

- (1) That Cabinet endorse the findings of the brand engagement exercise as the basis for preparing a brand development plan for Lancaster District.
- (2) That officers work with partners to prepare the brand development plan for future Cabinet consideration/approval.

Officers responsible for effecting the decision:

Head of Regeneration & Planning

Reasons for making the decision:

The development of our economy relating to inward investment and opportunities arising from our outstanding culture, heritage, entertainment offer, coastline and outstanding natural landscapes is set out as one of the Council's current four core priorities. Given the City Council's challenging financial outlook, it is imperative that any future development plans for branding are considered as an integral part of the Council's annual corporate planning and budgeting exercise, to inform future visioning, priority setting and resource allocation, given the Council's many competing demands.

18 SENIOR MANAGEMENT STRUCTURE UPDATE AND DEPUTISING ARRANGEMENTS

(Cabinet Member with Special Responsibility Councillor Blamire)

Cabinet received a report from the Chief Executive to advise on the current position following the retirement of the Head of Community Engagement and sought Cabinet's agreement to

recommend that Personnel Committee approve the disestablishment of the post of Head of Community Engagement.

No options were provided as the decision would be made by the Personnel Committee but the report outlined the senior management restructure, chief officer designations and deputising arrangements for the Chief Executive.

Councillor Barry proposed, seconded by Councillor Sands:-

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

Councillors then voted:-

Resolved unanimously:

- (1) That Cabinet recommend to Personnel Committee that the post of Head of Community Engagement be disestablished and that the revenue budget be updated accordingly, if approved.

Officers responsible for effecting the decision:

Chief Executive
Head of Resources

Reasons for making the decision:

The deletion of the Head of Community Engagement post would result in savings of approximately £82K plus inflation each year, and after funding the implementation of the living wage and senior emergency officer cover would still result in extra net savings of around £20K this year, rising to around £40K in future years although these savings would be subject to any further management changes arising and the pay and conditions review.

19 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 Bryning and seconded by Councillor Sands:

“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.

20 UPDATE ON THE HOMELESSNESS CHANGE PROGRAMME**(Cabinet Members with Special Responsibility Councillors Leytham & Hamilton-Cox)**

Cabinet received a report from the Head of Health & Housing which provided an update on progress with the Homelessness Change Programme and outlined the options to deliver the new hostel for rough sleepers and single homeless households. 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 Leytham proposed, seconded by Councillor Hamilton-Cox:-

“That the recommendations, 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 but in the event of Option 1 not being deliverable, Option 2 be approved.
- (2) That the Head of Resources, in consultation with the Portfolio Holder for Property Services, be given delegated authority to negotiate the terms and conditions of the removal of the restrictive covenant, and implement accordingly.
- (3) That the land referred to in the exempt report be transferred using specific powers in accordance with the 2010 General Consents under Section 25 of the Local Government Act 1988, as set out in the exempt report.

Officers responsible for effecting the decision:

Head of Health & Housing
Head of Resources

Reasons for making the decision:

The decision is consistent with the Corporate Plan 2012 - 2015 which seeks to improve the health and wellbeing of vulnerable people, reduce the number of homeless people in the district and reduce the number of people sleeping rough in the district, increase the number of affordable homes and manage the impact of welfare reforms and fits with the following strategies/policies:

- Lancaster District Homelessness Strategy 2008 – 2013 aims to reduce the number of vulnerable groups becoming homeless including young people, those affected by domestic violence and offenders/rough sleepers.
- ““No Second Night Out” – Government initiative to end rough sleeping nationally, leading to a Lancashire NSNO strategy and policy, and local policy and protocols.
- Supporting People Commissioning Plans 2010/2011. The proposed scheme will meet the needs of the intended client group that were identified and consulted upon

by each district/locality within Lancashire which highlighted a need for supported accommodation for single homeless households over 25.

- The Core Strategy 2008 – to provide 60 units of affordable housing annually.
- The Housing Strategy and Housing Action Plan 2012-2017 – sets out the need for the Council to support Registered Providers to deliver affordable housing on its own land.

.....
Chairman

(The meeting ended at 10.35 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 FRIDAY 28 JUNE, 2013.

**EFFECTIVE DATE FOR IMPLEMENTING THE DECISIONS CONTAINED IN THESE MINUTES:
MONDAY 8 JULY, 2013.**