

**MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING
ENVIRONMENT AND ECONOMY OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY PANEL**

THURSDAY 19 JANUARY 2017 AT 10.00AM

PRESENT: Councillor Nedved (Chairman), Councillors Betton, Bloxham (as substitute for Councillor Mitchelson), Bowditch, Burns (as substitute for Councillor McNulty) Christian, Mrs Coleman, McDonald.

ALSO

PRESENT: Councillor Glover – The Leader
Councillor Mrs Bradley – Economy, Enterprise and Housing Portfolio Holder
Mr G Hayward – Director, Cumbria Local Enterprise Partnership
Miss L M Ohlsen – Work Experience Student from Flensburg
Councillor J Mallinson (Observer)
Councillor Paton (Observer)

OFFICERS: Deputy Chief Executive
Contracts and Community Services Manager
Tourist Information Centre Manager
Investment and Policy Manager
Economy & Enterprise Officer

EEOSP.01/17 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies for absence were submitted on behalf of Councillor Mitchelson, Councillor McNulty, Councillor Quilter, and the Corporate Director of Economic Development.

EEOSP.02/17 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Councillor Betton declared a disclosable pecuniary interest in item A.4 Progress Update to Business Support Task and Finish Group. The interest related his being a tenant at the Enterprise Centre.

EEOSP.03/17 PUBLIC AND PRESS

RESOLVED – That the Agenda be agreed as circulated.

EEOSP.04/17 AGENDA

RESOLVED – That Items A.1 and B.1 Call – in of Decisions be considered at the end of the meeting.

EEOSP.05/17 MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETINGS

A Member noted that a written response regarding a £91,000 potential new spending pressure relating to Clean Up Carlisle funding had not been received. The Overview and Scrutiny Officer undertook to follow the matter up.

RESOLVED – (1) The Minutes of the meetings held on 27 October 2016 and 1 December 2016 were approved and signed by the Chairman.

(2) That the Overview and Scrutiny Officer follow up the written response to the Panel detailing the £91,000 potential new spending pressure relating to Clean Up Carlisle.

EEOSP.06/17 OVERVIEW REPORT AND WORK PROGRAMME

The Overview and Scrutiny Officer presented report OS.03/17 providing an overview of matters relating to the work of the Environment and Economy Overview and Scrutiny Panel.

The Overview and Scrutiny Officer reported that the most recent Notice of Executive Key Decisions, copies of which had been circulated to all Members, had been published on 20 December 2016. The following items had been referred to the Panel:

KD.21/16 – Budget Process 2017/18

The item had been discussed by the Panel at its 1 December 2016 meeting.

Members raised no questions or comments on the Notice of Executive Key Decisions.

The Panel's current work programme was attached as Appendix 1 to the report. Members were asked to note and/or amend the programme. The following items were to be considered by the Panel at its meeting on 2 March 2017: Performance Monitoring Report; Performance Report Options; Flood Update Report (tentative); Local Development Scheme; Business Plan Development for Carlisle Parks; Economic Strategy; Car Parking (tentative).

A Member asked if the Panel was able to undertake a workshop on future planning for the Work Programme.

The Chairman responded that the Panel had agreed to hold a meeting at the beginning of each Civic Year to agree the issues the Panel would include in the Work Programme for the forthcoming year.

The Overview and Scrutiny Officer added that the Overview and Scrutiny Annual Report would include a format for addressing this issue which it was anticipated would be implemented in the new Civic Year.

RESOLVED – 1) That the Overview Report (OS.03/17) incorporating the Work Programme and Notice of Executive Key Decision items relevant to this Panel be noted.

2) That the following items be included on the agenda for the Panel's meeting scheduled for 2 March 2017:

- Performance Monitoring Report
- Performance Report Options
- Flood Update Report (tentative)
- Local Development Scheme
- Business Plan Development for Carlisle Parks
- Economic Strategy
- Car Parking (tentative)

The Chairman welcomed Mr Haywood, Director, Cumbria Local Enterprise Partnership (LEP) to the meeting.

The Investment and Policy Manager presented report ED.02/17 Cumbria Local Enterprise Partnership which outlined: the background of the LEP's nationally; the membership and governance arrangements locally; and work being undertaken in relation to the Strategic Economic Plan and projects within the District.

Mr Haywood delivered a presentation to the Panel covering: the work undertaken by the LEP in Carlisle in 2016, for example the Durranhill infrastructure project, Enterprise Zone, Carlisle Station Gateway, Garden Village; work planned for 2017 including the Growth Deal Programme and M6 Strategic Connectivity; skills funding, and emerging government policy.

In considering the report and presentation, Members raised the following comments and questions:

- Had the LEP been advised of the funding it would receive from Growth Deal 3?

Mr Haywood responded that the LEP Board had been advised of the allocation, however, the level of allotment could not be made public until the government's formal announcement had been released. The allocation received was lower than the sum applied for despite the submission of a competitive bid, it was understood that in assessing the bids the government had applied a per capita criteria which had adversely affected the monies awarded to the Partnership. Additionally, the lack of an agreed devolution deal between the local authorities and central government for Cumbria was also felt to have been detrimental to the submitted funding bid. The final factor which was deemed to have hampered the bid was the lack of private sector match funding – the Cumbria LEP had worked to attract private sector funding in a different way..

In response, the Member sought to clarify that the quality of the bid submission had not been a factor in the lower than anticipated funding level.

Mr Haywood replied that government had indicated the submission had been of extremely good quality comprising strong business cases but, for the reasons outlined above the allocation was lower than the submitted bid.

- What was the current status of devolution discussions for Cumbria?

Mr Haywood advised that devolution for Cumbria was not currently being progressed, and that government was not pursuing the matter.

- Had the Growth Deal 3 submission been reviewed and what lessons had been learned?

Mr Haywood advised that a great deal of effort had been put into developing the business cases submitted as part of the funding bid, and that these had been assessed by independent auditors KPMG who had offered advice in terms of prioritisation and presentation. He did not feel it was possible that the LEP could have submitted a better bid.

- What scrutiny arrangements were in operation at the LEP?

Mr Haywood explained that a scrutiny panel was in place at the LEP and the Council was represented by the Economy, Enterprise and Housing Portfolio Holder. He added that the LEP intended to conduct a review of its Board composition and governance arrangements, with proposals being submitted to the LEP Board for consideration.

In response to a question from a Member, Mr Haywood outlined the current composition of the LEP's scrutiny panel

- Had the proposed development of the Citadel considered the development of the Rickergate area?

The Investment and Policy Manager responded that the Carlisle and District Local Plan 2015 – 30 clearly set out the opportunities in both areas of the city, however, due to the Heritage Assets in the Citadel area, development there required a greater degree of sensitivity.

- A Member noted that the Growth Deal 3 funding bid had resulted in an allocation of only 25% of the requested funds, how did the LEP prioritise the monies received to its projects?

Mr Haywood explained that in addition to the Growth Deal funding streams, the LEP was engaging with other public bodies such as the Homes and Communities Agency (HCA) regarding other funding streams. In terms of the re-profiling of monies, the LEP's Investment Panel were to consider a report on the matter in February 2017, before submitting recommendations to the LEP Board for their determination. Partner organisations would be advised of the outcome of the re-profiling exercise and the information would be published on the LEP's website.

- Did the LEP provide support to Small and Medium Sized Enterprises and social enterprises?

Mr Haywood recognised the important work carried out by SME's and social enterprises, however, the majority of government grant funding that was accessible to the LEP was aimed at commercial enterprise, rather than social enterprise.

The Investment and Policy Manager added that a report on the Economic Strategy was due to be scrutinised by the Panel at its 2 March 2017 meeting, he undertook to ensure that issues relating to social enterprise were detailed within the report.

- How secure was the LEP without the availability of funding from the European Union?

Mr Haywood responded that whilst European Union funding had contributed to the LEP's projects other sources of grant monies were available. The government's new Industrial Strategy was currently out for consultation, and it was anticipated this would create new funding streams for the LEPs. Mr Haywood stressed the importance of Cumbria setting out clearly to government its requirements for economic growth, he felt that Cumbria was well placed to respond to future challenges.

- A Member expressed uncertainty that the provision of additional houses and roads would necessarily generate economic growth. He was aware that some professions faced challenges recruiting adequately trained people to work in Cumbria.

Mr Haywood replied that without a growth agenda business in Cumbria would face further challenges in relation to the recruitment of staff. A significant disadvantage for Cumbrian businesses was that no single body was responsible for promoting and marketing the county. Whilst it was not the LEP's role to deliver such promotion it had actively encouraged the private sector to support the "Choose Cumbria" campaign as a means of encouraging people to live and work in the county, and thereby supporting its economic growth.

The size of households was reducing which required that more units were built in order to meet housing demand, without the Garden Village development, the level of housing provision in the Carlisle and District Local Plan 2015 – 30 (Local Plan) was sufficient to sustain the current level of economic activity, but did not provide for economic growth.

- A Member expressed concern that increasing economic growth required the development of greenbelt sites in the District. He sought reassurance that the new Garden Village and future economic expansion would not occur on greenbelt land.

The Investment and Policy Manager informed Members that the term greenbelt had a very specific designation, whilst Cumbria had greenfield land, it did not have areas of greenbelt. The adopted Local Plan identified sites within the district where future development would take place, it was noted that the LEP was not imposing development on to the city, economic growth was a priority for the Council.

Mr Haywood added that the LEP's aspirations for development had largely gone through the planning process and that it was not considering development outside of the site identified for development in the Local Plan.

RESOLVED – (1) That Mr Haywood be thanked for his presentation.

(2) That report ED.02/17 Cumbria Local Enterprise Partnership be noted.

EEOSP.08/17 PROGRESS UPDATE TO BUSINESS SUPPORT TASK AND FINISH GROUP

The Investment and Policy Manager presented report ED.02/17 Progress Update to Business Support Task and Finish Group which provided Members with an update on the recommendations from the Panel's Business Support Task and Finish Group, October 2015.

The Economy and Enterprise Officer detailed work which had been undertaken in relation to Recommendation 1 – Audit of networks including engagement with local businesses and partners via both formal and informal support networks, and the development of the Council's business website. The networking activity had provided opportunity of establishing links with the partner organisation such as Carlisle Ambassadors, The Chamber of Commerce, Local Enterprise Partnership, and The University of Cumbria.

The Council's business website which sought to provide information to sign-post businesses to relevant organisations had been updated and it was intended that it would

link with relevant partner organisation websites. Partner organisations had expressed an interest in including content on the site and this was being looked at. The Economy and Enterprise Officer invited Members to view the site and invited suggestions to further develop the site.

In respect of Recommendation 4 – Communications and Marketing Strategy for Business Support, the Economy and Enterprise Officer advised that the Council's business website was the focus of communications and marketing activity. During the previous eleven months the site had attracted eleven thousand views, and it was intended to compare the site to those of other local authorities and to use analytics of the site to identify further improvements which could be made to the site.

The Investment and Policy Manager added that Recommendation 1 had been aimed at signposting and the Council's activity in this regard had been re-energised, with users of the website having confidence in the information the site contained. In addition partner organisation websites were also signposting people to the Council's website for information.

In relation to Recommendation 3 (a) (b), the Investment and Policy Manager advised that as devolution was no longer being pursued, radical change to business support was unlikely, however, were the opportunity of devolution to come forward again local scrutiny would be undertaken on any proposed changes. Paragraph 2.12 of the report which summarised the two key strands of business support being offered by the Chamber of Commerce.

The Investment and Policy Manager advised Members that Recommendation 2 – Rebranding of the Enterprise Centre was not being pursued at the present time. Following consultation with tenants at the Enterprise Centre, during which a number of concerns had been expressed, details of which were outlined in the report. The Investment and Policy Manager appreciated the rationale for the recommendation, and it was an area that would be kept under consideration.

In considering the report, Members raised the following comments and questions:

- *A Member requested further detail on the work undertaken with tenants regarding the re-branding of the Enterprise Centre.*

The Investment and Policy Manager explained that Officers had held discussions with individual tenants at the Enterprise Centre about a broad range of issues relating to the Centre, including their views on rebranding. The responses had indicated concerns rebranding the Centre would require a change to the business address, necessitating the making of new stationery, advising suppliers, and authorities such as Her Majesty's Customs and Revenue, and utility suppliers of the change, which was considered unnecessarily burdensome by the tenants. It was noted that a high proportion of the businesses operating from the Centre were very small scale and may not have administrative support.

The Economy, Enterprise and Housing Portfolio Holder added that she appreciated the concerns expressed by the tenants and felt it was acceptable for them not to wish to undertake the recommended re-branding.

The Member asked if any other lessons had been learned from the discussions with tenants.

The Investment and Policy Manager responded that Officers were considering how further support could be provided to the tenants by offering them the opportunity to network with others in the building, through the medium of a tenants' forum. It was also intended that the Economy and Enterprise Officer would meet with tenants as part of her support and networking activities.

- A Member understood that the Enterprise Centre catered for start-up businesses, he sought clarification on the matter.

The Investment and Policy Manager advised that the Enterprise Centre had a broad range of businesses operating from it, and the Centre was able to offer premises to businesses at a variety of stages of development. The original purpose of the Centre had been to cater for start-up businesses which it was hoped would expand and progress to bigger premises. Whilst the Centre had not operated at full capacity long term occupation of units by tenants was permitted, in the event that occupation of units reached capacity this approach would require reconsideration.

- A Member suggested that case studies from the Enterprise Centre and Carlisle Ambassadors be included on the Council's business website, she undertook to follow this up with the relevant Officer.

RESOLVED – That report ED.02/17 Progress Update to Business Support Task and Finish Group be noted.

EEOSP.09/17 TOURIST INFORMATION CENTRE UPDATE

The Deputy Chief Executive presented report CS.02/17 Tourist Information Centre Update which outlined the recent capital upgrade works undertaken at the Old Town Hall / Tourist Information Centre and the Business Plan and Marketing Strategy, and assessment of visitor numbers to the Tourist Information Centre (TIC), and budgetary matters.

The developing Business Plan and Marketing Strategy recognised the internet as a tool which was increasingly used by tourists as a source of advice, the developing Business Plan placed greater focus on the use of web based services, retail and commercial activities. Some redevelopment activity had already commenced including altering the products on offer at the Old Town Hall and the creation of a website for the Old Town Hall which sought to market the facility and the Assembly Rooms. The Assembly Rooms had been granted a wedding license and was available for small ceremonies, with the first wedding being held in October 2017.

The Deputy Chief Executive explained the importance of performance management measures going forward and advised Members of work being undertaken in respect of this including a visitor survey the result of which had been summarised in the report, and the setting of income targets, and appropriate staff training.

In considering the report, Members raised the following comments and questions:

- The Chairman commented that he considered appropriate signage within the city directing visitors to the TIC was crucial, and this issue had been identified by those responding to the TIC Visitor Survey. He asked when new improved signage would be provided in the city.

The Economy, Enterprise and Housing Portfolio Holder responded that plans to install improved signage in the city were well underway, and obelisks containing maps, signage and historical information had been prepared, and would be placed at strategic sites, for example in the vicinity of the bus and railway stations. She understood that discussions were being held with businesses and residents in the areas where the obelisks were to be sited.

The Economy, Enterprise and Housing Portfolio Holder agreed that signage was an important factor in directing visitors to the TIC, and she hoped that installation would occur in the near future.

- The Chairman asked when the fully developed Business Plan and Marketing Plan would be complete and available for the Panel to scrutinise.

The Deputy Chief Executive expected the Business Plan and Marketing Plan to be complete and available for scrutiny in the new financial year.

- How had Officers determined the closure of the Settle to Carlisle Railway line at Appleby had caused the decline in visitor numbers?

The Deputy Chief Executive replied that a significant proportion of those visiting the TIC travelled to the city by train, the closure of the railway line had caused a decrease in the number of people able to access the city in this way, additionally, the Appleby TIC had reported a significant increase in visitor numbers.

In response to a further comment from the Member who noted that the visitor figures contained within the report showed a downward trend prior to the railway line closure, the Deputy Chief Executive acknowledged that the closure and re-siting of the TIC during the capital upgrade works undertaken in 2015 had also had a negative impact on visitor numbers.

- How had the visitor survey been conducted?

The TIC Manager explained that participants were asked questions outside the TIC following a visit to the Centre, to ensure that respondents did not feel fettered by being in the Centre. The person conducting the survey identified whether the responder was visiting the city or was a resident before posing the relevant set of questions, contact details were also requested so that marketing information could be sent in the future.

Another Member noted that the report illustrated that 46.5% TIC users had used the TIC had used the Centre as a place to get information on Carlisle, he suggested that future surveys may require refinement to provide information which would be useful for future business planning.

- Did the budget variances detailed in the report indicate that the base budget was incorrect?

The Contracts and Community Services Manager advised Members that the changing context within which the TIC operated required a re-alignment of budget and income targets to reflect the decline of commissions related to accommodation bookings and to include the increase in room hire bookings. Work to re-align the TIC budget to provide

targets that the relevant to the current operation of the facility was being undertaken as part of the Business Plan development.

- How did the TIC's retail offer compare to other outlets in the city, and was the TIC able to offer unique products?

The TIC Manager explained that where possible, the TIC tried to source tailored, bespoke, and locally relevant products, the TIC stocked a range of products including furnishings and bags illustrated with the outline of the Carlisle skyline. It was hard to find local companies making products that were relevant to the customer base of the TIC visitors and consequently, the TIC had to source products from larger companies who also supplied other outlets.

- A Member noted that the Tourist Information Centre Task and Finish had recommended that group continue to have input into the direction of the TIC, he felt that Member input needed to be strengthened and proposed that a Working Group be set up to meet on an annual basis to address issues facing the TIC.

The Deputy Chief Executive responded that the proposal was a matter for the Panel, he cautioned that it was important to retain a clear distinction between Officers' responsibility for managing the TIC and insight given by Members.

Another Member expressed concerns regarding the proposed Working Group and what role it would perform, he did not consider it was appropriate for Members to become involved with the day-to-day operation of the TIC.

The Chairman felt that Members should determine how best to scrutinise the TIC through Work Programme planning, this was agreed by the Panel.

RESOLVED – (1) That the Deputy Chief Executive provide written details of the work being undertaken to provide new signage in the city advertising the Tourist Information Centre.

(2) That a report be presented to a future meeting of the Panel on the complete Tourist Information Centre Business Plan and Marketing Strategy.

(3) That a Tourist Information Centre Working Group be considered as item for inclusion in the Panel's Work Programme in the new civic year.

EEOSP.10/17 CALL-IN PORTFOLIO HOLDER DECISION PF.016/16 – HADRIAN'S CAVALRY PROGRAMME WITH ROMAN TURMA EVENT 1 – 2 JULY 2017

The Chairman explained that he had Called – In for scrutiny Portfolio Holder Decision PF.016/16 Hadrian's Wall Cavalry Programme with Roman Turma Event 1 - 2 July 2017, taken by the Leader on 5 December 2016.

The Decision recorded that the Cavalry Programme was an exhibition and events programme developed by a partnership of museums, including Tullie House, and would comprise ten attractions taking place along Hadrian's Wall to celebrate the elite Roman Cavalry which had guarded Hadrian's Wall 2,000 years ago.

The programme of events for Carlisle would comprise a series of live re-enactments of Roman Cavalry exercises over two days on Bitts Park and an on-going Roman Cavalry

themed exhibition at Tullie House. It was anticipated that the exhibition and events would provide a significant boost to visitor numbers in 2017.

The Leader had made the decision to support the 2017 Hadrian's Cavalry Programme with £45,000 of funding for the Turma, marketing and the exhibition at Tullie House, which would be provided from the Council's existing events budget with £38,000 from the 2016/17 and £7,000 from the 2017/18 budget.

The reasons given for the Call-in were:

- Lack of Business Case
- Uncertainty of the financial liability and risk to the Council
- Whether the project provided value for money

The Chairman then outlined the Panel's options for dealing with the Call-in.

The Chairman explained that he fully supported tourist activity and was aware of the Roman connotations of the city, he noted that Portfolio Holder Decision PF.016/16 had been published on 5 December 2016, however, the Council had been in discussion with the event organisers from February 2016, he asked why the matter had not been referred to the Panel during that time.

The Chairman posed the following questions:

- Was £45,000 the optimum level of contribution;
- Why had the Council allocated funding to Tullie House which was an independent Trust;
- What financial risk was the Council expected to carry;
- How was the success of the event to be measured?

The Leader explained that the purpose of the event was to commemorate the 1,900 year anniversary of Roman cavalry in Carlisle, which he felt, was an important event for the city to celebrate. Regarding the Business Case he advised that funding contribution was to be provided from the Council's Events Budget which had been approved by Council in February 2016. The Council had advised the project organisers that the amount of funding it was able to provide was capped at £45,000.

The Turma event and Tullie House exhibitions were part of the larger Hadrian's Cavalry Programme which encompassed a number of events and activities taking place at a variety of locations along the length of Hadrian's Wall. Delivery of the entire programme had been costed at £835,000 and the Arts Council were the single largest funder of the event, contributing £690,000. The Leader stated that the Arts Council's level of support for the programme was a source of confidence, and in addition other national bodies such as English Heritage and the National Trust were also supporting the programme.

The Turma event and the Tullie House exhibitions were expected to attract a significant number of tourists into the city contributing to economic growth and promoting the city. The Turma, which consisted of Roman cavalry re-enactments, was considered to be the high profile aspect of the whole programme and number of areas had competed to host the two day event, therefore it was a great honour for the city to host the event. The exhibitions at Tullie House would display items from the National Museum, the Museum of Scotland, international museums and private collections that it had not previously been

possible to be viewed together, and were therefore expected to attract a high number of visitors.

The Deputy Chief Executive added that a number of Officers had been involved in discussions with Tullie House regarding how best to maximise the opportunities created by the exhibitions. Risk and Health and Safety and Accessibility Assessments had been carried out at Bitts Park, however, the Deputy Chief Executive stressed that the Council was hosting the event, but was not responsible for delivering it, that aspect would be undertaken by the programme providers.

The Chairman asked if there was a mechanism for the Panel to be involved in discussion of events of a similar nature in the future.

The Leader responded that the decision to provide funding to the Hadrian's Cavalry Programme with Roman Turma event had followed due process, he suggested that the Panel would derive most benefit from considering the economic vitality of the events budget funding as a whole, rather than through the consideration of individual items.

A Member commented that he supported the project and felt it afforded the city a number of opportunities, however, he considered that the Call-in had been useful as it had brought into the public domain more information than had previously been available on the project.

In response to a question from a Member regarding the marketing of the Programme, and the Carlisle based events, the Leader advised that marketing of the entire programme was being arranged centrally. The Council would also undertake promotional activity through the Customer Contact Centre, and its website, it was noted that the Turma event had already been included in national press publications.

A Member asked if the entire programme's exhibitions would be displayed at Tullie House or across a number of sites.

The Contracts and Community Service Manager informed Member that the exhibition was part of a curated programme encompassing all the museums involved in the programme, with each having its own pieces to display. It was understood that participating museums would also promote the exhibitions of the other museums taking part in the Programme.

The meeting then moved into private session.

EEOSP.11/16 PUBLIC AND PRESS

RESOLVED - That in accordance with Section 100A(4) of the Local Government Act 1972, the Public and Press were excluded from the meeting during consideration of the following item of business on the grounds that it involved the likely disclosure of exempt information, as defined in Paragraph Number 3 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A of the 1972 Local Government Act.

EEOSP.12/17 CALL-IN PORTFOLIO HOLDER DECISION PF.016/16 – HADRIAN'S CAVALRY PROGRAMME WITH ROMAN TURMA EVENT 1 – 2 JULY 2017

Consideration was given to private report Hadrian's Cavalry – Programme Costings for Carlisle City Council funding request which had been submitted as part of the Call – in of Portfolio Holder decision PF.016/16 – Hadrian's Cavalry Programme with a Roman Turma Event: 1 – 2 July 2017.

The Panel held a discussion regarding the financial underwriting responsibilities agreed for the Programme and factors affecting the level of the Council's contribution to the Programme.

In response to a request from a Member for details of projected visit numbers to the Turma event and exhibitions, the Contracts and Community Services Manager undertook to provide a written response.

A Member asked if the Hadrian's Wall bus service would be reinstated for the duration of the Programme.

The Leader responded that the service was not in the Council's remit, however, the Council would raise the matter with the operator.

A Member requested that the Leader circulate a briefing note to all Members detailing the information of the Turma Event and Tullie House exhibition provided to the Panel, to which the Leader agreed.

RESOLVED – (1) That Portfolio Holder Decision PF.016/16 (Hadrian's Cavalry Programme with Roman Turma event: 1 – 2 July 2017) not be referred back to the decision making body.

(2) That the Leader circulate a briefing note to all Members setting out details of the Hadrian's Cavalry Programme with Roman Turma event: 1 – 2 July 2017.

(3) That the Contracts and Community Services Manager provide a written response regarding the projected visitor numbers to the city for the Hadrian's Cavalry Programme.

(The meeting ended at 1:36pm)