Durham County Council

RECORD OF EXECUTIVE DECISIONS

The following is a record of the decisions taken at the meeting of **CABINET** on **WEDNESDAY 17 JULY 2013**.

The decisions will come into force and may be implemented from **MONDAY 29 JULY 2013** unless the Overview and Scrutiny Management Committee or its Committees object to any such decision and call it in.

2012/13 Final Outturn for General Fund and Housing Revenue Account

Summary

The Cabinet considered a report of the Corporate Director, Resources which provided details of the Final Outturn for both the General Fund and the Housing Revenue Account (HRA) for 2012/13 including an Annual Treasury Management Review.

In setting the 2012/13 budget, the Council continued to face unprecedented levels of reductions in Government grants over the current Comprehensive Spending Review (CSR) period to 31 March 2015. The Council's Formula Grant for 2012/13 was £223.2m – a reduction of £17.1m when compared to 2011/12.

The Council agreed a net revenue budget of £432.58m for 2012/13. Factoring in inflation and other budget pressures required the delivery of £26.6m of savings in 2012/13 in order to deliver a balanced budget.

Forecast outturn figures based upon information as at 31 December 2012 were reported to Cabinet on 13 March 2013 and at that time it was forecast that there would be an increase in Cash Limit Reserves of £2.130m and an addition to the General Reserve of £2.779m.

The final outturn for 2012/13 is being determined as part of the production of the Statement of Accounts. During the process of finalising the Statement of Accounts, the Corporate Director, Resources will be required to make a number of technical decisions in the best financial interests of the Council. Such decisions will be fully disclosed in the Statement of Accounts.

Decision

The Cabinet noted:

- The addition to the Cash Limit Reserves of £4.018m in the year. These sums will be held as Earmarked Reserves and be available for Service Groupings to utilise to manage budgets effectively;

- The closing General Reserve balance of £24.412m;

- The closing balance on Earmarked Reserves (excluding Cash Limit Reserves) is £85.966m of which £19.418m relate to schools balances;

- The closing HRA balance of £7.155m;

- The closing balance on HRA Earmarked Reserves of £1.150m.

The Cabinet approved:

- That capital budget carried forward of £26.820m for the General Fund and £0.958m for the HRA is moved into 2013/14 and that Service Groupings regularly review capital profiles throughout 2013/14 reporting revisions to MOWG and Cabinet as necessary.

Medium Term Financial Plan (4), Council Plan and Service Plans 2014/15-2016/17
Key Decision: CORP/R/13/02

Summary

The Cabinet considered a joint report of the Corporate Director, Resources and Assistant Chief Executive on the development of the 2014/15 Budget, the Medium Term Financial Plan (MTFP (4)) and Council Plan / Service Plans. It was reported that the financial outlook for the council continues to be extremely challenging.

Council approved MTFP (3) on 20 February 2013 and at that point the forecast of total savings across the period 2011/12 to 2016/17 was £188m. Since the council's budget was set however the Government announced in the March 2013 Budget that local authorities will face an extra 1% budget cut in 2014/15 and the 26 June 2013 Spending Round announced a headline additional 10% funding cut for local authorities in 2015/16. The detail supporting the 10% funding cut announcement for 2015/16 is still to be released by the government so the forecasted total savings of £202m required by the council over the period 2011/12 to 2016/17 and included in the report is based on the most recent forecasts.

The council carried out an extensive consultation on the MTFP in 2010. The results of the consultation have formed the foundation for the council's approach to subsequent MTFP strategies. Key areas of the council's budget have been protected whilst savings have been achieved against the required target. To date £93m of savings have been achieved with excellent progress being made in realising the £20.9m savings target in 2013/14. Total savings achieved will be £113.9m by the end of 2013/14, but estimated, additional savings of £25.9m are going to be required for 2014/15 and a further £62.7m for 2015/16 to 2016/17 to reach the revised £202m total savings target. This figure will need to be revised further when the detail of 2015/16 Spending Round impact for the council is evaluated.

The council's forward planning which has underpinned the MTFP process to date has been extremely effective and has enabled the council to maintain its financial strength whilst still investing in key front line services and priorities including the capital programme. For the next phase of the MTFP process however, from MTFP (4) onwards, a full reassessment of priorities will be required.

To assist in this reassessment, the council will carry out a comprehensive consultation process during the autumn of 2013. The key aim of this consultation will be to determine those council services which are seen to be a key priority to the public in County Durham and also those services which are not seen as being a priority. The results of this consultation will be key in assisting the council in planning the approach future budgets and in determining the future approach to meeting the challenging savings targets.

To ensure the MTFP (4), Council Plan and Service Plans can be developed effectively, it is important to agree a robust plan and timetable.

The Council's current MTFP, which is referenced as MTFP (3), covers the period 2013/14 to 2016/17. There is significant uncertainty in relation to a number of factors beyond this period, especially as regards to the level of future Government financial settlements. With this in mind, at this point MTFP (4) is being developed for a three year period only, being 2014/15 – 2016/17.

At this stage the following key areas were considered:

- The impact of the March 2013 Budget and the 26 June 2013 Comprehensive Spending Round (CSR) upon forecasts for future Government financial settlements;

- Options for addressing the 2014/15 Budget shortfall of £12.122m reported to Council on 20 February 2013 as part of MTFP (3);

- MTFP (4) – 2014/15 to 2016/17 position

- Proposed approach to the Council Plan and Service Plans;

- A draft MTFP (4) and Council Plan timetable;

- Proposed approach for consultation on MTFP (4) and the Council Plan;

- Equality considerations.

Decision

The Cabinet:

- Noted the updated 2014/15 budget position including the current £2.844 shortfall

- Noted the current £58.503m Budget Shortfall for the MTFP (4) period 2014/15 – 2016/17 which will need to be adjusted further when the impact of the Government's Spending Round for 2015/16 is evaluated

- Agreed the proposed approach to preparing the Council Plan and Service Plans

- Agreed the outlined approach to consultation

- Agreed the high level MTFP (4) and Council Plan timetable

- Agreed the proposals to build equalities considerations into decision making

Proposed change to the Age Range of St Oswald's Church of England (CE) Aided Infant and Nursery School from 3-7 to 3-11 from 1 September 2014, to establish a Primary School
Key Decision: CAS/01/13

Summary

The Cabinet considered a report of the Corporate Director, Children and Adults Services which sought approval to change the age range of St Oswald's CE Aided Infant and Nursery School from age 3-7 to age 3-11 to establish a primary school from 1 September 2014 and to agree that the admission limit is changed from 30 pupils to 15 from that date.

All of Durham County Council's Infant Schools, apart from St Oswald's, have a 'natural partner' in having a Junior School in the same locality where most children transfer to at the end of Year 2. About 30 pupils each year from St Oswald's apply for a place at another school at the end of Year 2 to complete their primary education. There is no single school that can accommodate all 30 pupils and this has caused a lot of anxiety for families for a number of years. About half of the pupils are successful in being allocated a place in Year 3 at St Margaret's Primary School but the others have to find places in other schools. St Margaret's has an admission number of 42 at Reception and 60 at Year 3. (42 of these 60 places in Year 3 are taken up by the 42 pupils that are already in the school).

Governors of St Oswald's and officers from the Local Authority agreed that the best way to address this situation was to consult on a proposal to extend the age range of St Oswald's to become a Primary School and also increase the admission number at St Margaret's at Reception.

There is not enough room on the St Oswald's site to have a school for 30 pupils x 7 year groups (210 pupils) and there is no need to have a school of this size as there are currently sufficient school places across other Durham City primary schools to accommodate the expected numbers seeking a school place in this area of the county. The proposal to change the age range of St Oswald's would therefore require the admission number to be changed from 30 to 15. Pupils would enter the school at Reception and stay there until they leave school at the end of their primary education. The capacity of the school would be 105 instead of 90. One extra classroom would be provided at St Oswald's.

An extra classroom would also be provided at St Margaret's Primary School. There would be an admission number of 60 at Reception with no separate admission stage at Year 3. The capacity of the school would increase from 380 to 420.

Making these changes at both schools would accommodate the number of pupils expecting a place at these schools in future years so that, in theory, no children would find themselves without a place in an 'all through' primary school in future.

St Oswald's CE Infant and Nursery School is a Voluntary Aided School, therefore any proposals to change the school are progressed by Governors of the school, however, all decisions on school organisation proposals are taken by the Local Authority. Governors consulted on the proposal to change the age range for 6 weeks and, following this, a Public Notice was issued. The report to Cabinet provided details of the consultation and a summary of the responses received. The school Governors, school management team and the Diocese worked closely to ensure that all concerns raised in the consultation were addressed. The significant support for the proposal convinced Governors that the move to become a Primary School was the most appropriate way forward.

Capital funding will be required to provide an additional classroom, lift and toilets on the St Oswald's school site and a classroom and kitchen re-wire at St Margaret's school. The cost of this will be met from DfE grant funding, the Diocese and school funding.

Decision

The Cabinet agreed:

- That the age range of St Oswald's CE Voluntary Aided Infant and Nursery School should be extended from age 3-7 to age 3-11 to become a Primary School from 1 September 2014

- That the admission number for the school be reduced from 30 pupils to 15 from 1 September 2014 to coincide with the increase in the standard intake number at St Margaret's Primary School.

Community Buildings: Progress Report
Key Decision: CORP/A/05/11/3

Summary

The Cabinet considered a Community Buildings progress report of the Assistant Chief Executive which sought agreement to further delegations required to address emerging issues.

The Community Buildings Strategy was agreed by Cabinet in February 2012. The ambition of the Strategy is to 'ensure that by 2014 the County has a network of sustainable, well placed, highly valued and well used community buildings which are controlled by local people'. To achieve this, the Council agreed to target investment of £2.15m on prioritised Council owned community buildings based on a principle of asset transfer and a maximum investment of 70%. 120 community buildings were identified to be included within this strategy and a timescale of two years was agreed to achieve it. Good progress is being made on the Community Buildings Strategy with 83% on track to be asset transferred or closed by June 2014.

Three buildings in which the Council was planning to invest require significant works which will be directly affected by the presence of asbestos. It is estimated that these three buildings will all require works costing in excess of £250,000 which raises the question of whether investing in the existing property is good value for money. The report therefore proposed that the Assistant Chief Executive, in discussion with the Cabinet Portfolio Holder is given delegated authority to reconsider how the capital investment set aside for each of these buildings is used, to ensure that the local community receive the best outcome and the Council ensures value for money.

Sixteen Management Groups are unlikely to fully complete the asset transfer process by June 2014. It is proposed that an individual solution is sought for each to facilitate asset transfer as quickly as possible. Some Management Groups have raised concerns about the need to carry out major repairs or maintenance immediately after asset transfer and before an emergency repair fund has been established. The report therefore recommended that the Council maintains £200,000 from the contingency element of the £2.15m capital investment fund so that groups can call upon this if a crisis occurs.

Decision

The Cabinet agreed:

- That the Assistant Chief Executive in discussion with the Cabinet Portfolio Holder be given delegated authority to reconsider use of the Capital investment set aside for community buildings where investment does not offer the best value for money. (This presently relates to community centres in Hunwick, Middleton-in Teesdale and Great Lumley).

- That where buildings require significant works and the community group are unable to raise the required funding before March 2014 they are considered for phased or alternative council investment by the Assistant Chief Executive in discussion with the Cabinet Portfolio Holder, on a case by case basis.

- That a £200,000 emergency repair and maintenance fund is established, from the contingency element of the £2.15M capital investment to address concerns regarding the need for expensive works to be carried out immediately after asset transfer.

Updated Street Lighting Policy
Key Decision: NS/21/13

Summary

The Cabinet considered a report of the Corporate Director, Neighbourhood Services, which sought approval for consultation to commence on the revised Street Lighting Policy.

The Council is required to reduce its carbon emissions by 40% by 2015 as part of the Council's wider Carbon Management Programme. Cabinet, at its meeting on 12th December 2012, approved the business case for the Street Lighting Energy Reduction Project which sets out the scope of the project, which is to achieve energy reduction through a combination of:-

- Retrofit with more energy efficient light sources
- Removal of unnecessary lighting
- De-illumination of signs
- Use of Central Management System or fixed settings to facilitate dimming

The business case indicates that the Street Lighting Energy Reduction Project achieves net total savings of £24 million in today's prices and £55 million taking into account inflation over a 25 year period. The business case also confirms that street lighting represents 18% of the Council's total carbon emissions of 105,816 tonnes (2008/09 baseline) and therefore reducing street lighting energy consumption is essential if the Council it to meet its target.

The current Street Lighting Policy was approved on 26th May 2010. The updated policy details where the Council will provide and maintain street lighting on the adopted highway and, to what standard, subject to available funding, which is consistent with British Standards.

The need for street lighting varies by location. Therefore the level and standard of lighting provided will be dependent on a number of factors. In accordance with national standards each locality is placed into one of four Environmental Zones. These zones will be used to determine the suitable level and type of street lighting that is required in an area.

The main changes to the updated policy are detailed below.

A lot of the existing apparatus across the County is aged and would benefit from replacement. Over recent years there has been technological improvement in the energy efficiency and quality of light sources such as Light Emitting Diodes (LEDs). This provides the opportunity to retrofit aged apparatus across the County with up to date energy efficient apparatus that will produce savings in both energy and maintenance costs.

Some existing street lights on traffic routes in rural areas between towns and villages are unnecessary and can be removed. The updated policy permits the removal of street lighting where it is not specifically required by the Policy. The street lights that are not required by the Policy are mainly those on link roads with a de-restricted speed limit between settlements in rural areas. It is estimated that there are 7,000 street lights that are not required by this Policy in County Durham. The removal of any street light is subject to a risk assessment. This assessment is based on road safety and fear of crime. Street lights will only be removed if it is safe to do so. Local Members will be consulted on the proposed removal of any street light and will be provided with details and locations of any street lights identified for possible removal. No street lights will be removed in residential areas.

The updated Policy introduces two-stage dimming as follows:

10.00 p.m. to 12.00 a.m. : 25% dimming downwards
12.00 a.m. to 5.00 a.m. : 50% dimming downwards

The above reflects the reduction in road traffic flows and pedestrian activity late in the evening and early in the morning. However, it will still provide an acceptable level of lighting. Although there is the potential to switch off street lighting during the above mentioned hours, rather than dimming, the savings over and above dimming are relatively low. Therefore, after taking into consideration road safety and fear of crime, a decision was made not to switch off street lighting completely during these hours.

There is also some potential to de-illuminate signs based on recent changes to Department for Transport regulations.

The above changes will help facilitate the Street Lighting Energy Reduction Project which was approved by Cabinet on 12th December 2012. The net total savings from the Project over 25 years are £24 million in today's prices and £55 million taking account of inflation.

The updated policy will be subject to public consultation.

Although this project will require capital investment it will produce a very strong financial return in the form of revenue budget savings that significantly exceeds the prudential borrowing costs by a ratio of 2.07:1. In addition, the proposed investment also produces significant non quantified benefits in terms of lifecycle cost avoidance whilst reducing the Council's energy consumption and carbon emissions. The project will also reduce annual energy consumption thereby reducing the Council's exposure to increases in energy costs.

Approximately 45,407 of the 95,252 units will benefit from improved LED technology with the potential to retrofit the remainder of the inventory over time as the cost of LEDs reduces further.

The dimming of street lighting by up to 50% will generally not be perceivable to the human eye. In addition no street light will be removed in a residential area. This will minimise any potential impact on residents.

Decision

The Cabinet considered the proposed changes to the Street Lighting Policy which will be subject to a public consultation exercise prior to a final decision being made on the revised policy.

Corporate Asset Management Plan and Property Strategy

Summary

The Cabinet considered a report of the Corporate Director, Regeneration and Economic Development which sought approval for the Council's Corporate Asset Management Plan and Property Strategy.

The County Council currently owns and operates a portfolio of assets with a total value, excluding housing property for Capital accounting purposes of £1.9 billion. The Corporate Asset Management Plan (CAMP) sets out the Councils approach to ensuring that it optimises the use of its assets in terms of service benefit, financial return and value for money. It sets out the planning context and strategic direction for the management of property and considers the environment in which the Council is operating and the property priorities response to this. In broad terms it includes information on the size and nature of the property portfolio and the emerging issues. The Property Strategy sets out the overarching principles for managing assets as a corporate resource by:

- Providing a portfolio that is fit for purpose and capable of supporting service delivery objectives

- Managing the portfolio in a cost effective manner focusing on reducing direct property costs and increasing capital receipts and revenue income.

- Identifying opportunities for shared use of property.

- Using property, balancing opportunity with financial expediency to support regeneration and economic development.

The Property Strategy also incorporates a revised and updated Disposal and Acquisition Strategy. This was originally adopted by Cabinet in December 2010 and has been updated to reflect changes made necessary from experience of its usage over time.

Inevitably issues will change and progress as the needs of the Authority emerge, Property Reviews are completed and Service Asset Management Plans are reviewed and developed. It is vital therefore that these key documents are reviewed by the Assets Team on a regular basis to reflect service asset requirements and the drive for continuous improvement within the organisation.

Decision

The Cabinet approved the Corporate Asset Management Plan and Property Strategy.

Residential Car Parking Standards

Summary

The Cabinet considered a report of the Corporate Director, Regeneration and Economic Development, proposing a change to the current guidance on residential car parking standards. The report recommended that the current guidance is withdrawn and new guidance is approved and adopted. The new standard will be incorporated into the emerging Durham Plan and adopted as Council Policy.

The County Council published guidelines for maximum parking standards in the Accessibility & Parking Guidance document produced in 2001. Those guidelines are used by developers for the design of new residential developments and by officers to assess suitability of parking provision for new developments. The 2001 guidelines were prepared in accordance with a policy approach set out in Planning Policy Document 13 (PPG13). This aimed to reduce reliance on car use by promoting more sustainable forms of transport. PPG13 advocated 'maximum' parking standards for new development in an attempt to restrict private car use. Since the first publication of PPG 13 and the policy which aims to restrict parking, it has been acknowledged that little impact on car ownership and use has been achieved. It is widely recognised that restricting parking at the origin of a journey is less effective than restricting parking at the destination, in achieving a change of use.

The effects of maximum residential parking standards can be witnessed throughout new development in the county where lack of off street parking availability can simply result in on street demand, and subsequent obstructive parking in residential areas.

The current guidance limits developers to a maximum provision of 1.5 spaces per residential unit. The 0.5 space is included to reflect that a garage space may or may not provide for parking.

A revision of PPG 13 was published in 2011. The most significant effect was the removal of requirement for "maximum" parking standards for residential developments and the deletion of the reference to the influence of parking supply on mode choice. The revised guidance also deleted a statement claiming that reducing parking supply is essential to promote sustainable travel choices.

Current guidance was adopted in 2001 before the PPG13 revision. It is considered that, due to the PPG13 revision and need for review of standards, any planning appeal to a refusal on the grounds of parking provision would be difficult to defend and justify to a Planning Inspector. The new National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) was published in March 2012 and supersedes guidance offered in PPG 13. The framework guides authorities to take a more pragmatic view at the local level when considering setting parking standards. It is recommended authorities consider:-

- the accessibility of the development;
- the type, mix and use of development;
- the availability of and opportunities for public transport;
- local car ownership levels; and
- an overall need to reduce the use of high-emission vehicles

The new parking standards have been prepared by Highways Development Management in conjunction with planning policy colleagues. A full consultation exercise has been undertaken with Durham Constabulary, Neighbourhood Services, and with the house builder's forum. Responses from the house builder's forum varied but it was widely recognised that new guidance is overdue. Support was expressed from The Police and Neighbourhood Services colleagues who address issues of residential parking conflicts.

The current parking standards for non residential uses are generic, apply a sound base position, and will continue to be applied for non residential use. Restricting parking provision to maximum provision at destination should assist in encouraging more sustainable travel.

The points listed above from the NPPF will be considered when applying these standards to future development applications.

It is proposed to include a full set of revised parking standards within the Durham Plan including the proposed revised residential guidance.

Decision

The Cabinet approved the change to the Council's Accessibility and Parking Guidelines.

Restoration of Wharton Park Project

Summary

The Cabinet considered a report of the Corporate Director, Neighbourhood Services on the Wharton Park restoration project. The report provided an overview of the project, highlighting the on-going increased revenue and capital implications of the project and sought approval to proceed with a Stage 2 Heritage Lottery Fund (HLF) Parks for People bid.

The park has lacked investment for a number of years. Following LGR and the setting up of Area Action Partnerships (AAP), the Durham AAP agreed to develop the restoration project and resurrect a bid to HLF. Following a successful stage 1 bid to HLF the project management was transferred from the AAP to Neighbourhoods, Culture and Sport. A Member Steering Group was set up with cross party, portfolio-holder and Friends Group representation. A Project Board chaired by the Corporate Director of Neighbourhood Services including representatives from all relevant service groupings is in place to oversee the development of the project. A Friends of Wharton Park Group has been set up to ensure that the local community are actively involved in the development of this project and the running of the park.

HLF will only accept one bid per organisation into the two annual Parks for People bidding rounds. The DCC Corporate Funding Group liaises with all Service Groupings to ensure bidding is controlled and prioritised across all services. Initially the Stage 2 HLF bid was targeted for the August 2012 bidding round although the Project Board decided to delay this until the August 2013 bidding round to enable the designs/plans to be further developed to ensure the full cost implications are fully identified. This is the last possible date for a stage 2 bid and the HLF will rule the project 'out of time' if this bidding round is missed. The opportunity to apply for HLF funding provides the council with an opportunity to restore the park whilst attracting significant external funding to repair its infrastructure therefore reducing costs to the council.

The project has now reached a stage in which a key decision is required with regards to the submission of the HLF bid. The following options were considered:

Option 1 – Stop the project with no bid to HLF and deal with the significant repairs and maintenance problems facing the park on an ad hoc basis. Given the very poor condition of the park including the North Road wall, footpaths and steps in the park, the deteriorating condition of the Grade 2 listed Battery, and the rapidly deteriorating condition of Wharton Park House this was not considered to be a feasible option if the park is to be kept open to the public over the longer term.

Option 2 - Deliver Smaller Project with no bid to HLF. This would include doing a basic makeover of the park with all of the capital / on-going revenue costs being met by the Council. Capital works which would require funding in the short term (5 years) would include:-

Replace existing Play Area £100,000

Demolishing Wharton Park House / Garage £37,000

Essential improvements to walls, footways, steps, access £260,000

Basic safety improvements to Amphitheatre £120,000

Battlements Improvements £220,000

Total Capital Costs £737,000

This option gives little overall benefit other than to retain the park at its current offer i.e. keep the park open to public use. In addition to the above, it is likely that an enhanced maintenance regime would be required which would result in an additional revenue MTFP pressure of around £20,000 per annum.

As this option excludes a heritage centre and is a significant departure from the original Stage 1 HLF bid, it is highly unlikely that this option would have qualified for any HLF funding. This option would miss the opportunity of external investment and much of the design work in developing a stage 2 bid would also be lost. It would however, allow the park to remain open to the public.

Option 3 proceed with the project and Submit a Stage 2 Bid to HLF. This option results in a total investment amounting to £3.44m over the period of the project, and a total investment by the HLF (if the Stage 2 bid is successful) and other external funding, amounting to £3.12m. It provides a one off opportunity to greatly restore / improve Wharton Park after many years of under investment.

Although bidding is a highly competitive process, HLF are impressed by the project to date and if it is agreed to submit the project to the HLF, it is considered that it will have a strong chance of success. This option will involve closing the park during the construction period which is likely to take 12 months. From the 2018/19 financial year this option requires an on-going increased revenue contribution, currently estimated to be £67,000 per annum, which is linked to the requirement for a heritage centre and the enhanced maintenance regimes. The HLF bid will include a revenue contribution for the maintenance of the park for the first five years; therefore there will be no revenue impact for the Council until 2018/19. There is also a requirement to commit £255,000 capital expenditure to provide match funding into the project. £129,600 of this amount can be met from the capital programme contingency budget. A summary breakdown of funding was provided in the Cabinet report.

The Cabinet report recommended that Option 3 be approved. This will create a budget pressure of £67,000 from 2018/19, however, it should be noted that the overall increased expenditure is £94,000 which is offset by £22,000 of new income and a saving against the closure of North road Public Toilets of £5,000.

In summary the report sets out the potential for external investment of £3.12m. This does however come with the requirement to take on £67,000 additional revenue costs from 2018/19. Clearly the council is focused on reducing revenue costs rather than absorbing new costs at a time of severely reduced Government grant. A successful bid as set out in Option 3 would bring £3.12 million external funding to the park, enhance the tourist offer and address the essential maintenance issues described in the report. For this reason Option 3 offers the best outcomes on a value for money analysis. If the HLF bid is unsuccessful, then given the financial pressures facing the authority, only the essential maintenance and works described in Option 2 can be funded by the authority.

Decision

The Cabinet agreed to:

- Submit a stage 2 HLF bid

- That if the bid is successful, the council provides the match funding as outlined in the report

- That if the bid is unsuccessful, the Council undertakes the essential work outlined in option 2.

Colette Longbottom
Head of Legal and Democratic Services
19 July 2013