

## **DURHAM COUNTY COUNCIL**

At a Special Meeting of **Corporate Overview and Scrutiny Management Board** held in Council Chamber, County Hall, Durham on **Wednesday 28 July 2021 at 1.30 pm**

**Present:**

**Councillor C Martin (Chair)**

**Members of the Committee:**

Councillors R Crute, A Batey, E Adam, P Jopling, R Manchester, B Avery, J Charlton, R Charlton-Lainé, B Coult, J Elmer, D Freeman, O Gunn, C Hood, J Howey, A Jackson, C Marshall, B Moist, K Shaw, A Surtees, M Wilson, J Nicholson and L Brown

**Also in attendance:**

Councillors L Brown, J Rowlandson and M Wilkes (Cabinet)

Councillors J Blakey, P Heaviside, L Holmes, C Hunt, G Hutchinson, D McKenna and P Molloy.

### **1 Apologies for Absence**

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors C Lines and M Stead.

### **2 Substitute Members**

Councillor J Nicholson substitute for Councillor C Lines  
Councillor L Brown substitute for M Stead

### **3 Declarations of Interest**

Councillor D McKenna declared an interest as a Trustee of East Durham Veterans Trust and Chairman of the Fusiliers Branch Sunderland.

Councillor K Shaw declared an interest as a Trustee of East Durham Veterans Trust.

### **4 Review of the Durham Light Infantry (DLI) Collection and Archive**

The Management Board considered a report and presentation of the Corporate Director of Regeneration, Economy and Growth which provided

the Corporate Overview and Scrutiny Management Board (COSMB) with an opportunity to contribute to a review by Cabinet of the options for the future storage, care, and display of the Durham Light Infantry (DLI) Collection, archive, museum buildings and grounds (for copy see file of Minutes).

The Chair welcomed representatives from stakeholder organisations who were present at the meeting and also members of the public attending.

The Head of Transformation, Planning and Performance explained the Corporate Overview and Scrutiny Management Board had been tasked by Cabinet to hold an open consultative session of members and key stakeholders to consider recommendations to support Cabinet's review on the options for the future of the DLI collection and archive.

He went on to advise that both the Army Museum Ogilby Trust and the National Army Museum had planned to attend but given the high incidence of COVID-19 in County Durham they reluctantly decided earlier this week not to travel. The Chair of the Board had agreed that due to the circumstances, their joint submission should be included in the papers to be discussed. The submission was circulated to Members the previous day and was read out during the course of the meeting.

The Corporate Director of Regeneration, Economy and Growth alongside the Head of Culture, Sport and Tourism and Durham History Centre Programme Lead provided a detailed presentation which highlighted the two questions which the review would aim to answer through careful assessment:

**Question 1: Can the former DLI building be brought back into use to house the DLI collection?**

**Question 2: What are the options to repurpose the former DLI building/site for an alternative use?**

The presentation further provided an overview of the timeline and history of the previous decisions regarding the DLI museum, collection and archive and the development of the Durham History Centre project, including public consultation.

In summary the Corporate Director of Regeneration, Economy and Growth explained that the review would seek to:

- Explore options for displaying and storing and care of DLI collection in the existing DLI building.
- To undertake an impact assessment on the plans for the new History Centre

- To assess the impact on the storage, display, and care of other DCC collections and archive
- Provide a high-level options assessment, which would include any suitable alternatives uses for the former DLI building and with regard to the grounds and environment around the site.

Mrs D Inglis, Faithful Durhams was then invited to put forward her representation.

“Thank you Chair for giving us this opportunity to speak. My name is Diane English and I am secretary of Facebook group the Faithful Durhams, a group including other County Durham groups.

Our group was born out of the original group Save the DLI Museum which came about when it was decided to close the museum without public consultation in 2015, finally closing its doors in March 2016. We hold the DLI Regimental history close to our hearts and visited the museum regularly.

We have campaigned in and around Durham asking for public views on the closure and giving out information we had, such as why we were told the museum was closing, which range from financial problems, the museum being too far away from the city centre and that no one visited. We also let them know of some of the tricks along the way played by DCC. One example is the Labour councillor who spoke about vegetables in order to talk out time so that the DLI museum could not be discussed.

The people we spoke to were disgusted, and like us could not understand why the people had not been told about any difficulties or problems that had arisen. They felt let down and that the Trustees of the Collection and DCC should be ashamed of what had gone on and how the closure was conducted, after all almost all of us in County Durham, including some of us in this room had family members who served in the DLI - some even have loved one's ashes laid to rest in the grounds.

On that note ex councillor Neil Foster who was a cabinet member for Arts and Culture stated that a few sods of grass could be pulled up and taken to the Palace Green... how thoughtful of him.

The year leading up to the Museum closure there were 38,000 visitors this does not signify a poor attendance; the Green Howards Museum survives on around 17,000 visitors.

Our views on the move of the collection to the new history centre was that we realised council would not reopen the museum, the collection was split up. We felt we should support the new centre in order to get the collection back together.

Council did say that closing the museum would save £250,000 these figures have been proven to be incorrect, Sevenhills costs £588,000 per year (this building also houses more than DLI collection) as well as expenses paid to the University, including a one off payment of £90,000 plus £50,000 per annum (which is almost £1000 a week) as well as £175,000 on new cabinets, which the museum already had, the removal of the Collection and not forgetting the removal and relocation of the Inkermann stone (which is now beside the public toilets and litter bins) how appropriate.

The closure appears to have cost considerably more than the £250,000. DCC carried out a survey of the Museum in 2015 which found that in order to keep it up to scratch £250,000 was needed to be spent over a five-year period. Via FOI requests we found that 68 people had viewed the medals over a 5-year period. This was probably due to the number of hoops you had to jump through to get to see them.

Also, by FOI request we found that there was still no complete inventory of the Collection, considering this collection is worth millions of pounds we found a cause of concern. Colonel Ramsbotham, Chair of the Trustees at the time of closure did say that this new approach was making the collection a lot more accessible to the public, we found the complete opposite. Colonel Ramsbotham is no longer Chair of the Trustees.

We attended meetings with council officer Steven Howell as well as Trustees and Association members. The first meeting we were told that we could not relay any information to our group, which we could not agree to as we were there as our group's representatives. We were told that the History Centre would be the new home of the Collection and we were glad to hear this, but the next meeting the Collection was down to a couple of cabinets on a rotary basis. This meeting a Colonel swore at me and we were lied to about Museums being out of fashion and that my husband's regimental museum was closing, this was not true.

We supported the idea of the History Centre placing adverts in the local paper asking the public to get behind council consultations, both consultations the DLI came tops, however we were taken on board to keep us quiet. We were banned from the councils Facebook page as we asked too many questions about the Museum. Some strange things have gone on and I feel sure some people in this room will know more about them than us, such as the coincidence of a Trustee Major Lawton being made a Deputy Lord Lieutenant of the County the day after the museum closed. Colonel Ramsbotham said it was an unfortunate timing.

Major Lawton is not the only Deputy Lieutenant of the county to be a Trustee, also we cannot understand why the DLI Association have never supported

our campaign, we were fighting for their Regimental Museum, again we were told by several of them that they were informed from higher authority to avoid our group... why?

The council have been playing with words about the new History Centre, stating it will be the first time in years that the Collection and Archives are housed together... they may be housed together but there certainly will not be a permanent DLI display. It appears the new history centre will have a lot of virtual or digital displays which is not a museum.

Our groups aim has always been to have the DLI Collection housed and displayed as a whole collection, of course understanding that most museums do not put every item on display. We were told the collection would not be split up and it was. The public told us they wanted to be able to see the collection, wanted their children to be able to view closeup, Wakenshaw's gun, take a seat in the Jeep, be able to walk around looking at uniforms, medals - weapons that grandad had or worn. The main aim, which was pointed out to us very clearly when speaking to people, was that a dedicated DLI museum was wanted, the DLI deserve that. If the archives and the collection were housed together this will be a great asset for historians, family researchers etc, having access to the written history of the DLI, however, keeping the new History Centre as the home for the archives could be an asset to the two buildings as each one could promote the other. We are very proud of our county history be it mining, railways or military but mining has Killhope, railways have Shildon, what does the DLI have?

Should council decide after reviewing all the information to reopen the Art Gallery and Museum we know this would be a massive step to putting things right. This would show the public that what went on regarding the closure was amongst other things a farce, and that perhaps this decision could be looked at a little closer at a later date. We've always been very conscious that the museum is surrounded by Veterans and other ashes which sadly did not seem to mean that much at the time of the closure. This leads us on to the outstanding grounds in the area, where wildlife is in abundance, walking areas are used and pure peace is promoted there. An ideal base to begin a day out and don't forget just over the road is the multi-million Wharton Park. Consider too the fact of ample car parking at museum. A cafe once again could be looked at, as people have said they Sevenhills.

Advertising is a must, as the museum had not been advertised effectively for years prior to its closure, which could have been deliberate. Durham is making its bid for City of Culture in 2023 what is more cultural than a museum and art gallery, especially as at the moment Durham City has no Art Gallery. Finance should also be considered in the reopening of the museum, as stated earlier the expenditure due to the Museum closure is ridiculous, we do appreciate that money cannot be plucked out of thin air to fund this

reopening, however millions of pounds were, by the previous council set aside for cricket clubs, Auckland project and the new council HQ, but hopefully, via grants, careful planning and simply doing the right thing this can be overcome.

Consider the public's opinion which has already been proven to count for a lot, after the historical defeat of Labour in County Durham in May this year. The people made their voices heard via their vote. During both wars and campaigns before and after thousands of DLI men fought and died they deserve to be honoured. What we must ensure is that this is never allowed to happen again, with both the collection or the grounds, and that the collection is put into the hands of people who will listen and who will generally have the DLI Regimental History at heart, the way it was years ago.

Our group, The Faithful Durhams, would like to once again Chair thank you and the new council for finally listening to the people we've spoken to whilst out on the streets. It's been a long time coming for a lot of us, but we would do it again in a heartbeat. Some of the things that I've mentioned may not sit well with some people, however this is the truth as we see it. I will finish now with this story. James Holland a prominent historian who also backed us, told us he was at Pegasus Bridge one Remembrance Day, all the dignitaries, officers etc, were standing around chatting after the service and at the back of the room stood an old DLI soldier, so he went up to this old man introduced himself and asked, "so Sir where did you go during the war", the old man simply smiled and said "son, we were all over".

After reading online the Chair of Trustees' statement, once again we are disgusted. He states that there is little other than fond memories that is of regimental interest at the museum. Well, what about the ashes of the DLI lads. Yes, these lads were probably miners before soldiers, but they put their lives on the line so that we could have a future. As for coming back, living in the community thousands never came back.

On a personal note, can I offer our group sincere condolences to Audrey Willis or should I say Audrey Court whose husband Richie passed away last night. Ritchie was Chair of the Faithful Durhams and ex DLI"

The Chair thanked Mrs Inglis for her statement and asked the Head of Strategy and Transformation to summarise the statements provided in advance by the stakeholders and to read for the benefit of the Board and others present, a late joint statement received from The Army Museums Ogilby Trust.

"The Army Museums Ogilby Trust (AMOT) has been involved with the collection of the Durham Light Infantry since our foundation over 70 years ago. Robert Ogilby our founder endowed the original DLI museum and our

Trust has supported it with regular grants and acquisition funds. In the last few years leading up to the closure of the Aykley Heads site grants exceeded £20k. We have also supported directly the DLI Trustees in their work including funding their governance reforms to a further £10k.

The National Army Museum (NAM) has given advice, training, and a whole range of professional support at no cost to the Local Authority since the early 1970's. It has regularly placed exhibitions from the National Army collection in the former DLI museum site and did so especially over the period of Great War centenaries and Waterloo bicentenary.

Since the closure of the museum at Aykley Heads in 2015/16 we have offered support and partnerships both with Durham County Council and the DLI Trustees. We encouraged both the appropriate conservation and care of the collection and pressed repeatedly for continued public access. We developed and deepened our relationship with Durham County Archives and its DLI holdings. We jointly supported the arrangements on Palace Green and the move to Sevenhills though always insisting these were interim moves.

At every juncture we have worked with Council officers, a committed and experienced curatorial and archive team, and the political leadership of the Council, with no regard to political stripe. This led in time to a Memorandum of Understanding agreed in 2017 which allowed AMOT funding and NAM advice for a superb programme of travelling exhibitions. It also opened the way for funded additional curatorial capacity from AMOT.

Over the last 5 years the DLI collection and archives have received over £100k in direct grants and matched funding. In addition, we provided over £13k of funding to the Durham Hymns project working with the archives and Northern Bands Trust. We raised the profile of the collection and the opportunities arising from having no permanent home. This included a NAM facilitated and AMOT funded study day in London, held at the NAM, for local authorities. Significant keynote contributions were given at this event by Durham CC and West Sussex CC who have a similar issue with a Regimental collection.

The costs of regular travel to Durham from our bases in Salisbury and London respectively and the hidden administrative costs and staff resourcing also need to be noted. I estimate overall with grants and support costs committed to the DLI collection AMOT is committed to the tune of over £170k. The NAM costs at this stage must also be significant.

Public funders have already noted the discussions in Durham and not in a positive light. Certainty is needed or a perception of unreliability will grow.

AMOT still has resources committed to Durham especially in regard to archives. Like other stakeholders we will be patient for the democratic

processes involved but it is safe to say that major changes will take our focus elsewhere. AMOT and NAM work with a network of 144 Regimental and Corps collections and currently are involved in 8 major military museum building projects apart from Durham. This includes major projects in each of the devolved parts of the UK. If our funding is not needed in Durham it will be welcome elsewhere. We will also look to recover our original spend.

AMOT and NAM were delighted when in early 2019 members of Durham CC gave the agreement to the Durham History Centre project. The project has grown and become a well thought through and integrated plan in which stakeholders were regularly consulted, including AMOT and NAM. It has from the outset been a joint effort. In Gillian Kirkbride and her team, the collection has imaginative and creative talents. The project will undoubtedly lead to greater and wider public access built on the inspiring links with the local community that have existed for so long. It also takes into account the trajectory of travel in museums across the world who have raised expectations including more technology, as part of the offer to any prospective audience.

The recently opened National Army Museum of America relies almost exclusively on virtual technology. The marriage of archives and collection on one site is certainly the way ahead and Durham CC and the people of Durham should be very proud of this project.

It is clearly the case some have felt uneasy with the plans and have been loud and persistent in their views though not always constructively. It is also the case that the communications of the Council have left external organisations like ourselves frequently bemused and frustrated at every stage of this story. It has appeared at time that our contributions have not been fully recognised which is sad considering our only interest is the preservation and promotion of the extraordinary stories and history of the DLI and the community from which it was hewn.

We strongly feel the Council should take into account in its review our financial commitment both to date and in the future. It should consider the damage to the profile of Durham if it binned another museum plan. How would this be received by external funders? It should reflect on the duty to care for the collection in the long term as its current home is not suitable for this purpose. It should also consider the museum and archive team gathered around this project. Once a skill set is diffused or even dispersed the loss is often irreparable.

The open sore of the Aykley Heads site is clearly an issue the Council feels it should address but this is for another conversation and with greater thought. AMOT and NAM would offer our thoughts on the possibilities but any suggestion that this should return as a museum we roundly reject. The



present Director of the Imperial War Museum and a former AMOT Trustee is frequently quoted as stating that a museum is not a memorial.

The honour due to the DLI lives on in the community and the desire to tell its story afresh and anew to future generations. Durham History Centre project is close to making that commitment a reality and so we warmly commend it to the review process. It is worthy of the DLI and the people of this part of England.

Thank you for allowing our submission and our earlier conversations with the Council leadership. We wish you well in your deliberations, the people of Durham in these difficult times and look forward to our future visits and projects together”.

The Chair then invited questions from the Board and members.

Councillor McKenna added that he had intended to ask for a moment of remembrance at the beginning of the meeting, however noting that this had now passed asked what the future plans were for the grounds at the DLI museum and whether, given the number of ashes of former light infantrymen scattered, if they would be consecrated and blessed.

Councillor Elmer noted that although the statement read out acknowledged that the site was a museum not a memorial, however it actually was, and it was therefore extremely important that the status remained as a place for remembrance and reflection and agreed that dedication of a memorial garden would be incredibly important.

The Corporate Director Regeneration, Economy and Growth in response stated this would be considered as part of the review, noting potential legal implications, however acknowledging that ensuring the honour of County Durham’s military history was important.

Councillor Brown noted it would be extremely important to ensure a bus service was provided to the museum and she hoped the council could explore options for a visual arts space in Durham. She went on to add she hoped the existing DLI building was viable for future use. For instance, Durham has no visual arts exhibition space.

Councillor Moist thanked Mrs Inglis for her representation which he noted was in contrast to that submitted by the Ogilby Trust. He asked whether the Faithful Durhams group would be satisfied with the set up of the History Centre if the DLI collection was on permanent display. He furthermore commented that the impact of a second location for the housing of the collection could have a positive impact.

Councillor Marshall asked for clarification as to whether it was in the council's gift to be able to say where the DLI collection was placed. In response the Durham History Centre Programme Lead advised that the collection belonged to the Trust and DCC looked after this on their behalf. Any decision taken on its relocation would be done in collaboration with the Trustees. Councillor Marshall further asked what course of action would be taken in the event that the council and the Trustees disagreed. It was explained that this would be a legal issue and dealt with in accordance with the Memorandum of Agreement.

Councillor Freeman in noting his personal attachment to the DLI, expressed his disappointment that the museum had not stayed open until a decision had been made on the History Centre. Whilst he saw logic in centralising services at the centre, he commented on the importance of retaining a large permanent DLI display. Furthermore, he suggested that a programme of temporary displays at the DLI museum would ensure that an element of the history of the building remained whilst being used for an alternative purpose for example an arts venue which may help to support the council's UK City of Culture Bid.

Councillor Crute asked whether there would be any potential risks to clawback of funding should the move not go ahead. In response the Head of Culture, Sport and Tourism advised that the funding was subject to a commitment to display 5 five collections at the History Centre and should the transfer of the DLI collection not go ahead, then it would be subject to discussions with the funder. So, there would be some risk in this course of action.

Councillor Hood commented that the DLI site meant so much to family and friends of DLI veterans and ex and current Armed Forces personnel. Many had chosen this location to scatter ashes of their loved ones and as a place of remembrance should be preserved.

Councillor Jopling commented that in her opinion £250,000 was not a huge amount of money to put the existing DLI building right, given the sums of money wasted since its closure on contracts with Durham University to hold the collection. All in all, she felt that it had been an extremely expensive and avoidable exercise.

Councillor Adam added his thanks to all who had taken part in the discussions noting the emotional importance of the museum to many. He added however that in his opinion the physical artefacts connected to the DLI needed to be brought back to life in a building which was accessible and provided modern facilities for visitors. He suspected the feasibility study of the DLI museum would find it to be too expensive and unsustainable in terms of its future maintenance and its impact upon the environment. He queried

whether it would be realistic to get a full feasibility report completed by September.

In response the Corporate Director of Regeneration, Economy and Growth advised that the September Cabinet report would answer the two main questions outlined during her presentation, with preferred options. There will be a high level assessment and condition survey available and further work would take place once a preferred option was agreed. In terms of the timeframe for members to have detailed scrutiny of the report she advised that this would depend upon the preferred option although she expected it to be a matter of months.

Councillor McKenna remarked that the Regiment is the people and their sacrifice and is not a building. He added the building was not a war memorial.

Councillor Molloy commented that as a veteran himself coming from outside of County Durham he knew of the DLI and its importance to the people of County Durham. He therefore asked whether it would be possible to place a covenant on the land at the DLI museum to preserve it as a memorial area for the future.

In response the Corporate Director Regeneration, Economy and Growth acknowledged the clear importance of the grounds as an area of memoriam and advised that this would clearly need to be answered in the review.

Councillor Surtees commented that in her opinion Question 1 could not be answered without real consultation.

Councillor Howey suggested the grounds of the museum could be a memorial or peace garden for more than just the DLI. She asked whether the new History Centre would allow for a full family experience. In response, the Head of Culture, Sport and Tourism advised that the centre would be very family orientated.

Councillor Marshall added at this point that he wanted to thank staff for all their work over many years in relation to this issue. He did however recognise the importance of maintaining a place of commemoration for families and suggested that further work be done in this regard. He went on to refer to government funding cuts which started in 2010 and the impact this had upon council decisions over several years. However, noting that there were issues with the current DLI museum, including building maintenance, the transfer of waste for the building and reduced footfall, all of which highlighted the requirement for arrangements to be reviewed. He added that he still felt that the decision taken by the previous administration to exhibit

the important collection in a different way was the right one and welcomed the plans for a modern and engaging history centre.

Mrs D Inglis, Faithful Durhams stated the people of Durham wanted the museum open and her group represented the public.

Councillor Jackson noted that there was always hesitation when change was planned and further acknowledged the importance of retaining a place of remembrance for families who had scattered loved one's ashes on the site. He asked what percentage of the collection would be on display at the History Centre as he felt that this was key. In response the Durham History Centre Programme Lead advised that the history centre exhibition was still in development and it is not possible at this stage to confirm how many objects and archive will be displayed however, around 65% of the stories currently identified for the exhibition include DLI objects and archive.. For comparison around 550 out of 15000 items had been on permanent display at the DLI museum.

Councillor Jopling commented that scrutiny should not be political but responded to the comments made earlier about the period of austerity and said it was as a direct result of the previous administration's failings.

Councillor Gunn added that the suitability of the new History Centre for children and families was a key consideration of the previous administration. She added whilst it was known that there were very few educational visits from schools to the DLI museum the plans for the new history centre would hopefully engage more young people, she therefore felt that this was a great opportunity.

Further discussion ensued regarding advertising and promotion of the DLI museum and Durham Art Gallery and Councillor Howey noted that the reduction in footfall could have been partly to do with lack of active promotion. In response the Corporate Director of Regeneration, Economy and Growth agreed that promotion of school and family accessibility was key to the future success of the history centre. The Head of Culture, Sport and Tourism also agreed that good communications were vital and plans were in place for engagement with key audiences furthermore, the History Centre will also be home to the registrar office for Durham and those who chose to marry there would hold the place in their hearts and would likely return to visit the centre time after time. In addition, there were plans for the History Centre to form part of the Durham Tourist Trail.

Councillor Brown suggested an exhibition at the DLI museum could be complementary to one at the History Centre. The Head of Culture, Sport and Tourism confirmed at the time of the museum's closure the History Centre

had not been planned. Although the collection was dispersed it was always imagined that this may change.

Councillor Coult commented that she hoped the review would address future feasibility of the DLI museum and look to bring it back into use as a potential arts / café / storage / multi-purpose area.

The Chair then welcomed members of the public who had submitted questions in advance of the meeting and asked the Head of Strategy and Transformation to read those to the Board. The Chair then provided the response from the service.

**Mr John Armstrong:**

**Question 1:**

As there is a review into the new County Hall why do they not now use the building as the History Centre including the full DLI collection, bus parking and other things that would bring tourists back into the city centre?

**Response:**

The History Centre is a bespoke design and very specialist in its nature. Due to this it would not be suitable to use the new County Hall for the History Centre.

Current plans for the history centre will also include consideration on how it can support the visitor economy, including working closely with university colleagues to develop itineraries that include attractions such as the botanic gardens and the oriental museum which would support our aims for a stronger tourism offer in and around the city. This is particularly important as we develop our plans for City of Culture 2025.

The History Centre is planned to also house our registrars service and so be an appropriate setting to host weddings and other life events. The visual amenity afforded by the St Oswald setting will help ensure that this element of the centres' operations is successful.

**Question 2:**

Referring to a survey held prior to the decision on closing the DLI museum in 2015, why was there not a question included asking if people wanted the collection to be kept together? He further asked at this point why the question as to what the public like would to see here was not asked as he felt this was misleading.

**Response:**

There have been four separate public consultations over three years and one consultation did ask if they supported five collections being brought together.

## **Mr Peter Jackson**

### **Question 1:**

Will the Management Board ask their Cabinet Colleagues to consider the potential for creating a much-needed Durham County Arts and Crafts and Cultural "exhibition gallery and visual arts activities centre"; which would also act as a first-class visitor attraction? (question amended to include 'arts and crafts')

### **Question 2:**

Will the Management Board also instruct the appropriate officers to explore the potential for such a venture to be run as a "Not for Profit Community Enterprise"?

### **Response:**

Durham Art Gallery housed in the DLI museum was a popular facility and accounted for the majority of visitors to the museum building. Cabinet will include consideration of the resulting reduction in the visual arts infrastructure as part of the review of the DLI collection and former DLI museum building. In addition, we will consider our overall arts infrastructure as we develop plans in anticipation of successful shortlisting for City of Culture 2025. Management arrangements would be an integral part of this consideration, and the council would assess a number of operating models to ascertain optimum value for any cultural facility.

In conclusion the Chair advised that he would at this point close the meeting however noted that comments made by the Board would be collated to form part of the report which would be considered by Cabinet in September. He thanked everyone that had contributed to the debate on the review of the DLI collection and archive.

Councillor Crute requested that the Board consider the Cabinet decision in due course and it was agreed that the Board would receive a further report in this regard.