



**Committee: OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE**

**Date: WEDNESDAY, 28 OCTOBER 2015**

**Venue: MORECAMBE TOWN HALL**

**Time: 6.00 P.M.**

Councillors are reminded that as Members of Overview and Scrutiny they may not be subjected to the Party Whip, which is prohibited under the Lancaster City Council Constitution.

## **A G E N D A**

- 1. Apologies for Absence**
- 2. Items of Urgent Business authorised by the Chairman**
- 3. Declarations of Interest**

To receive declarations by Members of interests in respect of items on this Agenda.

Members are reminded that, in accordance with the Localism Act 2011, they are required to declare any disclosable pecuniary interests which have not already been declared in the Council's Register of Interests. (It is a criminal offence not to declare a disclosable pecuniary interest either in the Register or at the meeting).

Whilst not a legal requirement, in accordance with Council Procedure Rule 10 and in the interests of clarity and transparency, Members should declare any disclosable pecuniary interests which they have already declared in the Register, at this point in the meeting.

In accordance with Part B Section 2 of the Code Of Conduct, Members are required to declare the existence and nature of any other interests as defined in paragraphs 8(1) or 9(2) of the Code of Conduct.

- 4. Request to Call-in Cabinet Decision - Storey - Tasting Garden - Cabinet Minute 37 (Pages 1 - 12)**

The Cabinet decision on the Storey – Tasting Garden (Minute 37) taken by Cabinet on 6<sup>th</sup> October 2015 has been requested to be called in by Councillors Caroline Jackson and June Ashworth (Overview and Scrutiny Members) and by Councillors Tim Hamilton-Cox, Roger Mace and Nick Wilkinson.

This request was subsequently agreed by the Chief Executive. The decision has been called-in in accordance with Part 4 Section 5, Paragraph 16 of the Council's Constitution.

Councillor Eileen Blamire (Leader of the Council), Councillor Janice Hanson (Cabinet Member with responsibility for Economic Regeneration and Planning) and Mark Davies, Chief Officer (Environment), have been invited to attend to outline the basis on which the decision was made.

Included in the agenda :

- Call-in Procedure
- Call-in Notice
- Report to Cabinet and Cabinet Minute Extract

## **ADMINISTRATIVE ARRANGEMENTS**

### **(i) Membership**

Councillors Nigel Goodrich (Chairman), June Ashworth (Vice-Chairman), Lucy Atkinson, Alan Biddulph, Brett Cooper, Rob Devey, Caroline Jackson, David Whitaker and Phillippa Williamson

### **(ii) Substitute Membership**

Councillors Tracy Brown, Geoff Knight, Roger Mace, Terrie Metcalfe, Abi Mills and Nicholas Wilkinson and a Conservative vacancy.

### **(iii) Queries regarding this Agenda**

Please contact Jenny Kay, Democratic Services - telephone (01524) 582065 or email [jkay@lancaster.gov.uk](mailto:jkay@lancaster.gov.uk).

### **(iv) Changes to Membership, substitutions or apologies**

Please contact Democratic Support, telephone 582170, or alternatively email [democraticsupport@lancaster.gov.uk](mailto:democraticsupport@lancaster.gov.uk).

MARK CULLINAN,  
CHIEF EXECUTIVE,  
TOWN HALL,  
DALTON SQUARE,  
LANCASTER, LA1 1PJ

Published on Tuesday, 20<sup>th</sup> October, 2015.

**EXTRACT FROM THE CONSTITUTION****Part 4 – Rules of Procedure,  
Section 5 – Overview and Scrutiny Procedure rules,  
Sub-section 16 – Call-in Procedure.****Call-in Procedure**

In considering a Call-in decision the following procedure will be followed:

- The Councillors who have made the Call-in request (who shall be seated together) will outline the reasons for the Call-in;
- The relevant decision-maker(s), with support from the appropriate officer(s) (who shall be seated together), will outline the reasons for their decision and the issues that they took into account;
- Councillors who are signatories to the Call-in request will have the opportunity to question the decision-maker;
- Other Members of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee will have the opportunity to question the decision-maker;
- At the discretion of the Chairman, other Members present may have the opportunity to question the decision-maker;
- Before forming a decision, the Chairman may decide to adjourn the meeting in order to allow the Call-in signatories to reflect on the evidence received and to consider any recommendations they wish the Committee to consider.
- The meeting then moves to forming a decision in accordance with the Council Procedure Rules.

**REQUEST FOR CALL-IN**

This form is to be used when calling in a decision taken by the Cabinet, an Individual Member of the Cabinet or a committee of the Cabinet, or a key decision made by an officer with delegated authority from the Cabinet, or under joint arrangements. The full procedure is set out in paragraph 16, Part 4, Section 5 of the Constitution and page 7 of the Handbook.

<b>ITEM TO BE CALLED IN: Storey – Tasting Garden</b>	
<b>DATE DECISION TAKEN: Tuesday 6 October 2015</b>	
<b>DECISION TAKEN BY:</b>	<b>Tick</b>
Cabinet	√
Individual Member of Cabinet (please state) Councillor	
Committee of Cabinet (please state)	
Key Decision by Officer with delegated authority (please state)	
Joint Arrangements (please state)	
<b>REASONS FOR CALL-IN: (please indicate your reasons below)</b>	<b>Tick</b>
(a) Proportionality (i.e. the decision is not proportionate to the desired outcome).	
(b) Lack of, or insufficient consultation and the taking of professional advice from Officers.	
(c) Lack of, or insufficient respect for human rights.	
(d) Lack of openness.	
(e) The aims and desired outcomes of the decision are not clearly expressed.	√
(f) Insufficient information about the options that were considered or the reasons for arriving at the decision.	
(g) Other (please give your reason(s) in full below).	√

REASONS AND (IF APPROPRIATE) PROPOSED ALTERNATIVE COURSE OF ACTION:

**WE WISH TO CALL IN THE DECISION OF CABINET MADE 6/10/15 REGARDING THE FUTURE OF THE TASTING GARDEN AT THE STOREY. THE DECISION TO ACCEPT OPTION 4 AS SET OUT IN THE AGENDA PAPERS HAS LED TO CONFUSION DUE TO LACK OF CLARITY IN THE WORDING. IT WAS STATED IN CABINET THAT OPTION 4 WOULD NOT PRECLUDE CONTINUED ATTEMPTS TO RESTORE THE ARTWORK, QUOTE ‘DETAILS TO BE DETERMINED THROUGH THE MASTER PLANNING PROCESS THAT CABINET HAVE ALREADY AGREED’. THE FRIENDS GROUP HAVE SINCE HAD CONFIRMATION FROM OFFICERS THAT THE COUNCIL IS NOT PROCEEDING WITH THE MASTERPLAN OPTION FOR RESTORING THE ARTWORK. THIS ACTION WOULD APPEAR TO DIRECTLY CONTRADICT THE EXPRESSED WISHES OF CABINET AND ARISES FROM THE WORDING OF OPTION 4 NOT BEING CLEAR ABOUT WHAT WOULD ACTUALLY HAPPEN NEXT.**

**PROPOSED ALTERNATIVE:**

**THAT CABINET RECONSIDER THE DECISION SO AS TO ENABLE THE MEMBERS TRUE WISHES TO BE IMPLEMENTED IN ALLOWING FUND RAISING EFFORTS BY THE FRIENDS GROUP TO CONTINUE FOR A LIMITED PERIOD**

**THAT CABINET CONSIDER APPROVING THE FOLLOWING DECISION:**

**Consider that restoration of the artwork is not a high priority for the Council, but nevertheless a minimal amount of officer time will be provided to clarify the governance issues necessary to enable the Friends group to apply for major grant funding to restore the artwork as the lead partner with the Council. This funding would need to include a reasonable sum to cover appropriate project management of the restoration, plus insurance and future maintenance costs of the artwork to minimise any future liability on the Council’s budget. Following the clarification of governance issues and clear permission to proceed the Friends group to be given 12 months to raise the necessary funds. If fundraising is unsuccessful in this timescale the Council to revert to the alternative masterplan option of improving the gardens without restoring the artwork.**

<b>SIGNED:</b>	Members of Overview & Scrutiny Committee		
	Cllr C Jackson	Cllr J Ashworth	
	Three Further Councillors		
	Cllr R Mace	Cllr N Wilkinson	Cllr Hamilton Cox

*(Note: A valid request for call in must be signed by a total of 5 Members of the Council, including 2 or more Members of the Overview & Scrutiny Committee, and all 5 Councillors must not be from the same political group.)*

**DATE:14.10.15**

**This request for call in must be submitted to the Chief Executive (by post, fax or e-mail) within 5 working days of the date of publication of the decision.**

<b>CABINET</b>
----------------

**STOREY- Tasting Garden  
6<sup>th</sup> October 2015  
Report of Chief Officer (Environment)**

<b>PURPOSE OF REPORT</b>			
To seek a decision on the future of the tasting garden			
<b>Key Decision</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>Non-Key Decision</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>
		<b>Officer Referral</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<b>Date of notice of forthcoming key decision</b>	NA		
<b>This report is public</b>			

**RECOMMENDATIONS OF CHIEF OFFICER (Environment)**

- (1) That Cabinet decides 'in principle' on the best option for the future of the Storey Tasting Garden.
- (2) That once an in principle decision has been made further reports on the how the decision will be delivered will be brought back to Cabinet, as required, and during the current budget process as appropriate.

**1.0 Introduction**

1.1 Following consideration of the report 'Storey- Tasting Garden' at Cabinet (2nd December 2015) the following decisions were made-

- (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.*
- 1.2 The work on the two masterplans is currently underway. Cllr Blamire has however requested that an early report be brought to Cabinet so that positive direction on their preference for the future of the gardens can be provided.

- 2.0 Part of the Council's ethos as set out in the corporate plan is that of stewardship. This involves ensuring the social, economic and environmental wellbeing of the local area. In practice active stewardship involves a number of things including taking the key role in engaging, co-ordinating and mobilising other public, private and voluntary bodies in delivering the council's strategic objectives for the place. How stewardship is exercised is a local issue and needs to be determined by the Council in partnership with local citizens.
- 2.1 The Council has a clearly defined interim strategy for the Storey Institute up to 2017/18, and this includes the recognition that the gardens are an integral part of the business plan for the facility. Prior to 2017/18, a formal review must be completed to evaluate performance and take account of any changing circumstances, particularly at the Castle.
- 2.2 As a means of promoting economic growth in the District, the Council directly contributes to a number of artistic and cultural activities.
- 2.3 Since the writing of the report in December 2014 there is now more certainty as to the financial future of Local Government. This being that the future financial position of the Council is very bleak with the need to reduce overall spending by up to £4million per year.
- 2.4 Based on previous reports and meetings with interested parties there are essentially two different views as to the future use of the Tasting Garden-
- That Mark Dion's art installation is reinstated
  - That the Tasting Gardens is 'developed' to a Masterplan as a garden that complements the Storey Institute and can be enjoyed by the public-when the Storey is open.
- 2.5 Neither option has either funding or resource allocated to it presently. Cabinet's intention with regards to first option was that it would need to be funded externally and the fundraising and subsequent bidding would need to be undertaken by the community group who desired to see this option.

### **3.0 Proposal Details**

- 3.1 It has already been established that Mark Dion's artwork cannot be replicated in another location in the District.
- 3.2 Parties interested in restoring the artwork tell us that funding may be available for restoration of the artwork in its current location.
- 3.3 With regards to external funding the usual model is that for a community group to make a bid; what it requires is the support of the landowner and an assurance that ongoing maintenance and revenue costs will be covered in the future. Clearly the ongoing maintenance and revenue costs could be covered by the community group that submitted the project but generally any funder would want reassurance that in the event this was not sustained the landowner would take over the liability.
- 3.4 As was made clear in the previous report there is a polarisation of views on this subject, and there still is. In essence some people would like to see the art installation restored to how it was originally intended. Some take the view that this is unrealistic and the best thing to do is to make the best use of this space in a way that it can be enjoyed by our citizens and complement the wider business plan of the Storey Institute.
- 3.5 Restoring the art work and then ensuring the Tasting Garden could be enjoyed by our citizens and complement the wider business plan of the Storey Institute is clearly the ideal solution, although based on the current financial context of

the Council not necessarily a realistic one.

- 3.6 It needs to be remembered that the reason why the artwork and garden is in its current condition is not because the Council has been neglectful in its duties but because for a significant period, the Storey was undergoing refurbishment and thereafter, it was outside of the Council's direct management and control. There appears to have been no major outcry regarding the condition of the Tasting Gardens during this time. Furthermore, over many years now the Council has been forced to make very difficult decisions on how it prioritises its scarce resources, and this situation will continue for the foreseeable future
- 3.7 The harsh realities of the process of prioritisation of resources become more and more apparent as funding available to Local Government is further and further reduced. The reality is that the Council will be forced to cut or cease all together the provision of some services. This will have a very real impact on our citizens. It will also provoke debates about where the Council should be focussing diminishing resources. Therefore, this issue provides an example of the difficult decisions that Councils are forced to make, albeit one that will not have as detrimental an impact on our citizens as some of the others that will be required further on.
- 3.8 In determining the best way forward in this situation Cabinet have the following options-
- 3.9 **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, 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 is a complicated and time consuming exercise and match funding may well be required.
- How would the project be resourced? As stated above just raising the funds is likely to be time consuming and complicated. Due to the need to prioritise and focus on core activities the Council does not currently have available officer time or expertise that could be allocated to this, if such a route was chosen. Therefore, in theory Cabinet would need to consider this as an area for growth. In practice budget reductions from central government mean that 'growth' is not an option that can be realistically considered, so Cabinet would have to consider redirection of resource.
- 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 and the same point referred to above would apply.
- Even if external 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?

- 3.10 **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.**

There are some examples of this type of model that work well within the District (e.g. Fairfield). Typically land is leased to a community group for a specific purpose, with strict stipulations. However, the examples we have are ones where the risks are much less than this and the projects are of much lower profile.

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 of 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?
- This is the most risky of all the options. Does the Council really want to agree to a project that creates so many potential risks?

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.

- 3.11 **OPTION 3- Consider that restoration of the artwork is a priority for the Council but on the basis that the work involved in identifying funding and then bidding for it is undertaken by a specifically constituted 'Friends of' group, supported by an officer. In this case the ownership and ongoing management would still rest with the Council.**

In order to arrive at this option Cabinet would need to consider the following (much of which is in common with the considerations of previous options)-

- Where would the funds and resources for the long term maintenance of the project come from?
- What would happen if there was not enough interest to form a Friends Of group and if formed there was not sufficient capacity to identify and put together funding bids etc. This would be supported by an officer but the Officer would only have time to advise as opposed to doing the actual work. Were the Officer to do the actual work then it would be effectively OPTION 1.
- 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?

**3.12 OPTION 4- 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 pragmatic 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 master planning 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.
- As this option would be accompanied by a Masterplan it provides the opportunity for the Council and Friends Of Group to bid for funds as they become available. Working in this way is far less intensive and resource draining as the options that are focussed on the main aim of restoring the Tasting Garden.

**4.0 Details of Consultation**

4.1 Consultation has taken place to get the report to this stage.

**5.0 Officer Preferred Option (and comments)**

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

**RELATIONSHIP TO POLICY FRAMEWORK**

As outlined within the report

**CONCLUSION OF IMPACT ASSESSMENT**

**(including Health & Safety, Equality & Diversity, Human Rights, Community Safety, HR, Sustainability and Rural Proofing)**

As outlined within the report

**LEGAL IMPLICATIONS**

There are no direct legal implications arising from the report.

**FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS**

There are no direct financial implications arising at this time, but clearly there could be in future, depending on what option is chosen.

**OTHER RESOURCE IMPLICATIONS**

**Human Resources:**

None

**Information Services:**

None

**Property:**

As outlined within the report

**Open Spaces:**

As outlined within the report

**SECTION 151 OFFICER'S COMMENTS**

The s151 Officer has been consulted and her comments reflected within the report. In short, this is another matter that Cabinet needs to consider during the 2016 budget, i.e. in context of spending priorities/needs and what is affordable in the longer term, and in the interests of council tax payers generally. A whole life approach should be considered, taking into account future management and maintenance requirements.

**MONITORING OFFICER'S COMMENTS**

The Monitoring Officer has been consulted and has no further comments.

**BACKGROUND PAPERS**

none

**Contact Officer: Mark Davies**

**Telephone: 01524 582401**

**E-mail: mdavies@lancaster.gov.uk**

**Ref:**

CABINET MINUTE – 6<sup>TH</sup> OCTOBER 2015

37 STOREY - TASTING GARDEN

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

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 to 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, 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 is a complicated and time consuming exercise and match funding may well be required.
- How would the project be resourced? As stated above just raising the funds is likely to be time consuming and complicated. Due to the need to prioritise and focus on core activities the Council does not currently have available officer time or expertise that could be allocated to this, if such a route was chosen. Therefore, in theory Cabinet would need to consider this as an area for growth. In practice budget reductions from central government mean that 'growth' is not an option that can be realistically considered, so Cabinet would have to consider redirection of resource.
- 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 and the same point referred to above would apply.
- Even if external 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.**

There are some examples of this type of model that work well within the District (e.g. Fairfield). Typically land is leased to a community group for a specific purpose, with strict stipulations. However, the examples we have are ones where the risks are much less than this and the projects are of much lower profile.

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?
- This is the most risky of all the options. Does the Council really want to agree to a project that creates so many potential risks?

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- Consider that restoration of the artwork is a priority for the Council but on the basis that the work involved in identifying funding and then bidding for it is undertaken by a specifically constituted 'Friends of' group, supported by an officer. In this case the ownership and ongoing management would still rest with the Council.**

In order to arrive at this option Cabinet would need to consider the following (much of which is in common with the considerations of previous options)-

- Where would the funds and resources for the long term maintenance of the project come from?
- What would happen if there was not enough interest to form a Friends Of group and if formed there was not sufficient capacity to identify and put together funding bids etc. This would be supported by an officer but the Officer would only have time to advise as opposed to doing the actual work. Were the Officer to do the actual work then it would be effectively OPTION 1.
- 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?

**OPTION 4- 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 pragmatic 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 master planning 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.
- As this option would be accompanied by a Masterplan it provides the opportunity

for the Council and Friends Of Group to bid for funds as they become available. Working in this way is far less intensive and resource draining as the options that are focussed on the main aim of restoring the Tasting Garden.

Whatever option is chosen it is expected further more detailed reports will be brought back to Cabinet.

Councillor Hanson proposed, seconded by Councillor Leytham:-

“That the recommendations, as set out in the report, be approved with Option 4 being the preferred option.”

Councillors then voted:-

***Resolved unanimously:***

- (1) 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 pragmatic 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 master planning process that Cabinet have already agreed.
- (2) That further reports on how the decision will be delivered be brought back to Cabinet as required.

**Officer responsible for effecting the decision:**

Chief Officer (Environment)

**Reasons for making the decision:**

The financial position of the Council is very bleak. The decision to pursue option 4 is based around current financial constraints and can be delivered within existing resources.