

## Minutes of Previous Meeting

### ENVIRONMENT AND ECONOMY OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY PANEL

THURSDAY 14 APRIL 2016 AT 10.00AM

PRESENT: Councillor Nedved (Chairman), Councillors Betton (from 10.15am), Bloxham (as substitute for Councillor Mitchelson), Bowditch, Christian, Dodd, Ms Franklin and Ms Patrick (as substitute for Councillor Caig).

ALSO PRESENT Councillor Glover – Leader  
Councillor Mrs Martlew – Deputy Leader, and Environment and Transport Portfolio Holder  
Councillor Mrs Bradley – Economy, Enterprise and Housing Portfolio Holder  
Councillor Burns (as an observer for part of the meeting)  
Councillor J Mallinson (as an observer for part of the meeting)

OFFICERS: Deputy Chief Executive  
Director of Local Environment  
Director of Economic Development  
Neighbourhood Services Manager  
Investment and Policy Manager  
Tourist Information Centre Manager  
Principal Planning Officer Local Plans  
Overview and Scrutiny Officer

#### **EEOSP.19/16 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**

Apologies for absence were submitted on behalf of Councillors Caig, Mitchelson and Quilter.

The Deputy Leader, and Environment and Transport Portfolio Holder advised the Panel that Councillor Caig had been unable to attend the meeting as he was undergoing surgery.

RESOLVED – That the Panel's best wishes for a speedy recovery be conveyed to Councillor Caig.

#### **EEOSP.20/16 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

Councillor Ms Patrick declared a registrable interest in accordance with the Council's Code of Conduct in respect of Item A.3 December 2015 Flood Update Report. The interest related to the fact that she was the Chairman of Trustees of Botcherby Community Centre.

Councillor Dodd declared a pecuniary interest in accordance with the Council's Code of Conduct in respect of Item A.6 Carlisle City Centre Development Framework. The interest related to his being employed by the company which conducted the feasibility study on the Central Plaza Hotel. Councillor Dodd undertook to remove himself from the room should the Panel's discussions cover the Central Plaza Hotel.

#### **EEOSP.21/16 PUBLIC AND PRESS**

RESOLVED – That the Agenda be agreed as circulated.

## **EEOSP.22/16 MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETINGS**

The Chairman referred to EEOSP.16/16 (3) Rethinking Waste which stated a resume covering the agreed project timescale be circulated to Members following that the next meeting of the Rethinking Waste Project Board, and asked when this was to be provided to Members.

The Deputy Leader, and Environment and Transport Portfolio Holder explained that the Rethinking Waste Project Board had not met, once the meeting had occurred the resume would be circulated to Members.

The Chairman noted that the Deputy Leader, and Environment and Transport Portfolio Holder was stepping down from the Council at the upcoming election, on behalf of the Panel he thanked her for her work and support of the Panel.

The Deputy Leader, and Environment and Transport Portfolio Holder thanked the Chairman for his comments. She felt that Scrutiny was an important function within the Council, and she was pleased to see it operated robustly.

RESOLVED – (1)The minutes of the meeting held on 21 January 2016 be approved and signed by the Chairman.

(2) The minutes of the meeting held on 3 March 2016be noted.

(3) That the Deputy Leader, and Environment and Transport Portfolio Holder be thanked for her work and support of the Panel.

## **EEOSP.23/16 CALL-IN OF DECISIONS**

There were no items which had been the subject of call-in.

## **EEOSP.24/16 OVERVIEW REPORT AND WORK PROGRAMME**

The Overview and Scrutiny Officer presented report OS.09/16 providing an overview of matters related to the work of the Environment and Economy Overview and Scrutiny Panel.

The Overview and Scrutiny Officer reported that the most recent Notice of Key Executive Decisions had been published on 4 March 2016. This was circulated to all Members. No items fell into the remit of the Panel.

There were no references from the Executive's meeting on 7 March 2016. At the 4 April meeting of the Executive report RD.60/15 Discretionary Rate Relief had been submitted under General Exception Rules, the Executive referred the report to the Resources and Environment and Economy Overview and Scrutiny Panels (EX.25/16) for their consideration and comment. The report would be included as an item on the June meeting of the Panel.

The Overview and Scrutiny Officer drew Member's attention to Appendix 1 - Overview and Scrutiny Annual report, which was to be formally approved by the Scrutiny Chairs Group, after which it would be presented to Council on 26 April 2016; she invited Members to comment on the report.

The Deputy Leader and Environment and Transport Portfolio Holder noted a typographical error on page 28 of the agenda document pack which should have read that the "...Council was run *on* a cabinet style..."

A Member asked if the conclusion section, which was blank, was to remain in the report or be removed. The Overview and Scrutiny Officer responded that as the Panels had noted the Annual Report, but given no other feedback, she would remove this section of the report.

The Chairman thanked the members and substitutes of the Panel for their hard work and support during the year in delivering the work of the Panel.

RESOLVED – (1) That the Overview Report (OS.09/16) incorporating the Work Programme and Notice of Executive Key Decision items relevant to this Panel be noted.

(2) That the conclusion section of the Overview and Scrutiny Annual report be removed.

(3) That the amended Overview and Scrutiny Annual Report be noted.

(4) That the members and substitutes of the Panel for their hard work and support during the year in delivering the work of the Panel.

## **EEOSP.25/16      DECEMBER 2015 FLOOD UPDATE REPORT**

The Deputy Chief Executive submitted report SD.07/16 which was part of a series of update reports prepared for Overview and Scrutiny Panels on flood recovery activities and future programmed work.

The reports contained a generic section designed to give all Panels an overview of flood recovery work and a more specific section tailored to the work areas of each Committee, included in the report were specific updates relating to:

- Local Environment - initial clean-up operations The Council had disposed of more than 3,000 tonnes of flood damaged materials from affected residents and businesses and had provided 520 skips throughout the city.
- Flood grants and household payments: 1,536 households within the district had received the Community Support Grant of £500 amounting to £768,000, which equated to 96% of the households eligible to receive the grant.  
The Flood Resilience Grants of up to £5,000 was being administered by the Housing Department, 197 applications had been received, 112 had been approved, with payments made to 10 applicants totalling £44,680.70. The Grant had relatively low take up within the district and nationally, there was concern that residents were not aware of the benefits of claiming the grant.  
Two grants were available to local business; the Flood Resilience Grant and a grant from Cumbria Chamber of Commerce of up to £5,000 was also available.  
Council Tax and NNDR discounts: Up to 31 March 2016 the following discounts had been issued: Council Tax discounts had been awarded to 1,729 householders totalling £735,354.64; NNDR discount had been awarded to 92 businesses amounting to £230,926.45.
- City Council property and asset recovery: All Council assets (with the exception of the Sheepmount) had been stripped of flooded material and dried out. Condition

surveys had been carried by WYG and the Council was aware of the value and costs of the works required to reinstate the assets.

- Financial considerations and activities: The Council had activated the Bellwin scheme which covered local authorities for costs incurred with actions to safeguard life and property or to prevent suffering or severe inconvenience as a result of a disaster or emergency. The scheme did not cover all the Council's expenditure on the disaster and the authority would have to meet £26,000 of costs related to the emergency response. The deadline for submission of the claim was June 2016.
- Car Park recovery: All of the Council's car parks had been affected by the flood and as a result the Council had not been able to charge for their use, however, it was felt that the removal of the charge had been useful for both residents and business that had used the facilities during that period. Recovery work had been completed at the sites and new payment machines had been ordered, the new machines would provide enhanced systems of card and contactless payment methods.
- Liaison with Environment Agency: The Council was working closely with the Environment Agency and Cumbria County Council assessing future prevention and alleviation schemes. The County Council was preparing the Section 19 report, a statutory document, to government on the flood response in the county, along with input from the Environment Agency. The government had announced £25M of funding for flood prevention for the district, and the City Council was well placed to play a strong role in the investment of this funding.
- Resident support via the Carlisle Flood Partnership (led by Cumbria County Council). Cumbria County Council had formed a number of groups from partners including the University of Cumbria, Greystone Community Centre, The Round Table and Carlisle Food Bank, amongst others, and in the initial response to the flood they had taken part in various aspects of the flood response. The City Council had managed donations made for victims at three sites; Fusehill Street Campus, Greystone Community Centre, and a 20,000 sq.ft warehouse at Kingmoor Park. The level of donations received had been remarkable and was an indication of the public support for the victims of the floods.
- Recovery Programme – Future Actions: In terms of the Council's own assets, recovery of the Leisure estate and the ground floor of the Civic Centre, including decisions regarding design and service provision and increasing resilience were areas that the Council was considering as part of the future actions of the recovery programme.

The Deputy Leader and Environment and Transport Portfolio Holder thanked the staff for their invaluable and tremendous efforts during the difficult period following the flood. The city had been affected by the flood on 5 December 2015, and the Council had been open for business again on the 7 December 2015.

The report had clearly highlighted the extent of the problems caused by the flood and the damage which had been caused to the infrastructure of Carlisle. Referring to paragraph 4.1 of the report, she considered that staff communication with residents affected by the flood had been very professional and warmly appreciated.

In addition to the support provided by public authorities to flood victims, a group of Young Farmers from the district had provided assistance to victims using their own tractors and machinery to remove flood materials from affected streets. The individuals involved had been nominated, by a flood victim, for a Community Award and an article on the group had been screened recently on the BBC's Countryfile programme.

The Chairman reiterated the Deputy Leader and Environment and Transport Portfolio Holder's comments praising the efforts of the Council's staff in responding to the flood. The Informal Briefing for Members on the flood had also been a useful session for Members, giving them the opportunity to ask questions and access information from other agencies involved in the flood recovery work.

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

- *How had the Council disposed of the flood damaged materials which had been collected?*

The Neighbourhood Services Manager explained that because the material was deemed to be contaminated it had not been possible for it to be recycled therefore it had been deposited in landfill.

The Deputy Chief Executive added that the recycling industry's focus was on the processing of clean materials, therefore it was not readily able to process flood damaged materials. He hoped that this was an area of flood recovery that the government and industry would look at in the future with a view to making the recycling of flood damaged materials possible.

- *A Member noted the replacement payment machines for the Council's car parks, were described in the report as card and cashless payment facilities, he asked if cash payments would remain an option for those using the Council's car parks.*

The Deputy Chief Executive confirmed the replacement machines would still process cash payments, but would also allow users to pay for car park use via card and contactless payment methods. The replacement machines had been ordered, but each of the Council's car parks currently had at least one operational fee collection machine.

- *Why had twenty-three households not been eligible to receive the Community Support Grant?*

The Deputy Chief Executive advised that those households had been deemed not eligible for the Community Support Grant as flood waters had not actually breached the property.

The Member responded that a number of flood victims felt the grant application form was complex which made completing the form challenging and added to the stress of the victims. She was aware that some insurance companies were assisting claimants with their forms, as well as providing guidance on resilience measure to be implemented.

The Deputy Leader and Environment and Transport Portfolio Holder commented that the recovery of properties operated on varying timescales with drying works commencing at different times. Residents would find it awkward to add extra resilience after reinstatement works had been completed, she felt that the Flood Resilience Grants were not dovetailed to the process of property reconstruction.

The Director of Economic Development added that the Council was trying to increase awareness of the Grant by promoting it through a range of methods, including social media. The Council had received more than 400 enquiries about the grant which had been addressed by the Housing Team. The deadline for grant application was 31 December 2016, it was hoped the timeframe would allow residents time to consider any resilience measures they wished to include in their properties. Some insurance

companies were working with groups of residents to deliver resilience measure aimed at protecting a number of properties.

- *What steps did the Council plan to take next in the recovery of its assets?*

The Deputy Chief Executive explained that the Council was bound by European Union rules regarding procurement, and therefore had a responsibility to act responsibly when procuring goods and services. A procurement framework had been developed and officers were working on identifying the most appropriate groups of assets to commission works to get good value for money. The immediate priorities were the reinstatement of the affected Community Centres and the Civic Centre.

Discussions would need to be held with Members in relation to the future use of the flood affected areas of the Civic Centre and the leisure estate, particularly the Sheepmount which had suffered flood damage on a number of occasions. The Council's insurance claim was awaiting final settlement and negotiations were ongoing.

- *Had the Council provided information to the Flood Minister on the impact of the flood?*

The Deputy Chief Executive advised that the Council did not have the capacity to provide an additional tranche of data to the Flood Minister regarding the impact of the flood, however, the grant applications received by the authority did contain relevant information. Gathering information on the effect of the flood on businesses in the city was difficult as only a small number had applied for grants.

The Deputy Leader and Environment and Transport Portfolio Holder considered that a scheme for businesses similar to the FloodRe which was now in operation for residential properties was needed. An arrangement to provide flooded business properties with access to affordable insurance was essential as Small and Medium Size Enterprises (SMEs) profit margins would be affected by increasing premium levels. If a scheme was not put forward there was potential for areas previously impacted by flooding to be devoid of commercial activity.

- *A Member felt that the Council's response to the flood had been faultless; he recognised the importance of the support to residents who had received Council Tax and NNDR discounts. He asked if Officers were aware that residents who rented allotments from the Council which had been flooded were still charged full rent for the allotment?*

The Deputy Chief Executive replied that he had not been aware of this issue and agreed to look into the matter.

- *How did the Council plan to address the issue of riverbank erosion?*

The Deputy Chief Executive explained that prior to the floods erosion of riverbanks was an ongoing issue. Following the floods the Environment Agency intended to develop plans in three areas; riverbank erosion, repair and maintenance of flood defences. The City Council would contribute to this work as it owned a proportion of the land which made up the riverbanks in the district.

The Member replied that willow planting had been used in the past to help maintain riverbanks, and this method had also helped to prevent flooding by reducing the flow rate of the river water.

The Deputy Leader and Environment and Transport Portfolio Holder commented that the Environment Agency had a statutory duty to publish a report on the flood along with a consultation relating to new plans for flood defence, she advised the Member that responding to the consultation with suggestions to minimise riverbank erosion would be a useful way to have the proposal considered.

The Director of Local Environment added that a number of agencies were involved in developing new methods to minimise flood risk, including the Environment Agency and the Natural England. The process would involve the instatement of improved flood defence measures and consultation with the public.

The Chairman commented that the format of the Flood Update report had been workable and requested that the Panel received future updates on that basis.

RESOLVED –(1) That report SD.07/16 be noted.

(2) That a further report be included on the agenda for the next meeting of the Panel.

(3) That the Panel's thanks be conveyed to the staff for their work in response to the flood.

#### **EEOSP.26/16 UPDATE ON CLEAN CARLISLE**

The Director of Local Environment submitted report LE.07/16 which considered the educational, enforcement and operational work carried out by the Neighbourhood Services Team.

The Neighbourhood Services Manager delivered a presentation on the work of the Neat Street initiative which was a pilot clean up initiative for the city. The presentation covered the aim of the initiative which was to tackle flytipping, litter and dog fouling; the action taken by the Council as part of the initiative, which sought to improve areas with clean-up activities involving residents; the monitoring of areas and where necessary undertaking legal action against those who created problems relating to litter, fouling, and flytipping.

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

- *How did the initiative address the issue of landownership?*

The Neighbourhood Services Manager advised that the pilot initiative had been carried out in back lanes and letters had been sent to the properties adjacent to the lane advising them that a clean-up of the lane was to take place. Ownership of the lanes was not always clear, which made taking enforcement action more difficult, it was hoped by engaging all the residents adjacent to the lane that they would buy into keeping the area clean.

The Neighbourhood Services Manager felt that Members would be aware of areas in their Wards that had problems with litter, flytipping, and dog fouling and encouraged them to report the issues to his team.

The Director of Local Environment added that landownership in the rural area was often more readily identifiable which made enforcement action easier to take. The Council was

happy to work with landowners to develop solutions to flytipping, but the responsibility for the removal of flytipping from private land remained with the landowner.

The Council was restricted in the methods it could use to monitor areas with, for example, CCTV. When litter or flytipping were reported to the Council, Officers searched the detritus to see if any documents identifying the perpetrator had been included. Any information found in the rubbish allowed the Officers to take enforcement action against those identified.

In response to a Member's request the Director of Local Environment agreed to distribute "We Are Watching You" posters in the rural area.

A Member felt that the project had been very well received by residents in the pilot areas, not only in the streets which had been cleaned up but also the surrounding ones, it had increased the residents' sense of enjoyment of the area. The Council planned to create Community Champions in areas which took part in the initiative to monitor and enable enforcement action.

- *Had there been requests for clean-up actions outside the pilot area?*

The Neighbourhood Services Manager advised that there were some areas which were regularly identified by residents as having problems, and that the Council would seek to address these first, he reiterated his invitation for Members to report areas in their wards where problems were experienced.

- *What was the cost of prosecution action, and did it take funds away from the Neat Streets initiative?*

The Director of Local Environment responded that prosecution action was a culmination of a process of attempting to address issues in an area that was experiencing litter, flytipping, and fouling, recurrently. The Council engaged in education activities with the aim of reducing incidences of litter, flytipping, and dog fouling in the city, it also issued warnings and Fixed Penalty Notices. Prosecution was costly but important, if the Council repeatedly cleaned areas without taking enforcement actions the number of incidences would increase and a culture of dependency would be created, prosecution was a very important deterrent action for the Council.

- *What impact would the requirement for dogs to be microchipped have on the service?*

The Director of Local Environment advised Members that staff in the Enforcement and Education Team would assess how this technology could assist Officers in their efforts to minimise dog fouling in the District. She added that the Enforcement and Education Team was merging with the Neighbourhood Services Team and it was hoped that this would strengthen the work of the two teams.

- *Dog fouling was a recurring problem, it was suggested that an Officer team needed to look at the reasons why the problem repeatedly occurred in the same areas.*

The Director of Local Environment responded that Officers already assessed the reasons why dog fouling recurred in particular areas and aimed to address this. The Council's approach to the problem was a mixture of education and enforcement action.



The Chairman welcomed the Neat Streets initiative and thanked the Officers for their report and presentation.

RESOLVED (1) That report LE.07/16 be welcomed.

(2) That a further update report on Clean Carlisle be considered by the Panel in six months.

## **EEOSP.27/16 TOURIST INFORMATION CENTRE**

The Investment and Policy Manager submitted report ED.19/16 which provided an update on the progress of the operation of the Tourist Information Centre (TIC) and the Assembly Rooms.

The recent completion of significant works at the Old Town Hall had enabled the Council to give the TIC and Assembly Rooms a more commercial focus, whilst retaining the information service. The retail offer in the TIC was now centred on local, seasonal products which it was hoped would help it to meet ambitious income targets.

The Assembly Rooms had been extensively restored, and additional facilities such as IT had been included. Officers were considering how best to make the rooms accessible and increase usage of the space. The Assembly Rooms had been granted a wedding licence and work was underway to market the site as a wedding venue. Consideration was being given as to how to best use social media as a tool to market the both the TIC and the Assembly Rooms.

The Investment and Policy Manager concluded by stating the new business model for the TIC was to be monitored to identify which areas of the products and services offered contributed to the meeting of income targets.

In considering the report Members raised the following question and comments:

- *What feedback had staff at the TIC received following the refurbishment works?*

The Tourist Information Centre Manager advised that the feedback had been very positive; customers felt that the space was open and welcoming, but that it retained the character that it had previously exhibited.

- *How had the new income targets been set?*

The Investment and Policy Manager explained that the income targets were set through the Council's Medium Term Financial Plan and were ambitious, and understandably challenging. He expected that some revision of the targets may be required following ongoing monitoring and review. The relevance of the past year's performance was limited given the disruption during the previous three years as the physical refurbishment occurred. The broader focus of the new service was not comparable in a like for like sense to the service which had existed previously.

The Tourist Information Centre Manager added that the emphasis of the Centre had changed in recent years, for example, the internet meant that fewer customers used the TIC for accommodation bookings.

- *A Member noted that The Carlisle Tourist Information Centre Task and Finish Group 2012/13 had wanted to increase the sales area in the TIC, but the new layout had actually decreased it. It had been agreed that the Task and Finish Group would continue to allow the TIC to raise issues, why had it not been reconvened?*

The Economy, Enterprise, and Housing Portfolio Holder reminded Members that Task and Finish Groups were in the remit of the Overview and Scrutiny Panels, therefore the onus was on the relevant panel to reconvene a Task and Finish Group.

The Chairman stated that he had been a Member of the Task and Finish Group, which had worked during the planning stages of the TIC redevelopment. He felt reconvening the Task and Finish Group was an item the Panel could consider in the new civic year.

The Tourist Information Centre Manager explained that the loss of retail space had resulted from the installation of the "Discovery Wall", which was a useful tool in signposting visitors to activities, but it needed to be balanced against the retail provision. The new retail display units were moveable so the space in the TIC could be reconfigured to keep it fresh and responsive to the needs of customers.

Monitoring the performance of the retail area was an important piece of work going forward, the centre was coming into its busy summer period which would highlight what aspects were working well in the new centre, if required the retail area could be expanded.

- *Why did the Old Town Hall have its own website, as well as being hosted on the Discover Carlisle website?*

The Tourist Information Centre Manager advised that a separate site for the TIC and Assembly Rooms had been created to enable the facilities to be marketed, it was planned to set up an online shop on the website, which would not have been possible on the Discover Carlisle website. The separate site gave the TIC and the Assembly Rooms increased flexibility and control, and it was intended to link the site to Facebook and Twitter to increase its online presence.

- *A Member felt it was clear that the TIC was responding to changing customer needs, how did the service receive feedback from customers?*

The Tourist Information Centre Manager informed Members that the TIC conducted visitor surveys, the last of which had taken place prior to the Old Town Hall refurbishment. A further survey was planned for later this year, when feedback on the new centre would be sought. Work on the survey design had already commenced

The Investment and Policy Manager explained that at a strategic level, Cumbria Tourism produced an annual report which was considered by Officers and included information such as trends in duration of stay and factors that would make visitors extend their stay. The city was also being advertised in two separate campaigns by Visit England.

A Member suggested that feedback from visitors on what factors would encourage them to extend their stay in the city could be fed back to Officers working on the Local Plan for their consideration, he asked if this information could also be included in the next Tourist Information Centre report to the Panel.

The Tourist Information Centre Manager felt that it would be more useful for Members to compare the two surveys of the TIC, and this would enable them to have input in the newly developing service.

RESOLVED – (1) That report ED.19/16 be noted.

(2) That the Panel considered reinstating the Carlisle Tourist Information Centre in the new Civic Year.

(3) That a further report on the Tourist Information Centre, with an emphasis on the developing Business Plan, be considered by the Panel in six months.

## **EEOSP.28/16      CARLISLE CITY CENTRE DEVELOPMENT FRAMEWORK – UPDATE**

The Investment and Policy Manager submitted report ED.18/16 which updated the Panel on the progress of the implementation of the City Centre Development Framework (CCDF). The CCDF was a long term plan and vision for the city which would be completed in 2030, and formed key evidence upon which the Local Plan was founded.

The Investment and Policy Manager reminded Members that the Council's retail study had indicated that there was a need for an additional 200,000 sq.ft of retail space. The report updated Members on the number of key character areas in the city which were categorised by their potential for future change.

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

- *What action did the Council plan to take following the removal of the public toilets in The Lanes?*

The Economy, Economy and Housing Portfolio Holder explained that the provision of public toilets in The Lanes was not within the Council's remit although she understood that replacement toilets would be provided on the first floor of The Lanes.

- *What involvement would the City Council have in plans for the redevelopment of the Citadel area?*

The Investment and Policy Manager advised Members that the City Council would have a significant say in the redevelopment of the Citadel area as any proposal would need to meet the requirements of the Council's Local Plan. The Local Enterprise Partnership was very interested in the development of the area which was an important transport gateway not only to the city, but the county as a whole.

- *The Chairman noted that Cumbria County Council's Local Committee was meeting that day, had Officers from the City Council been involved in joint working with County Council Officers in relation to the Citadel?*

The Economy, Enterprise and Housing Portfolio Holder advised that appropriate Officers were talking to County Council Officers but the Citadel area was very complicated and discussions were at a very early stage.

- *Had the recent flood affected Rickergate's status as the preferred retail site in the city?*

The Investment and Policy Manager explained that the Local Plan sought to be flexible, and had to demonstrate that the extra retail floor space required could be provided in the city. The flood had likely given rise to a confidence issue part of the area, however, the Rickergate / Lowther Street area was much broader than those parts of it which had flooded and therefore remained appropriate.

- *A Member commented that the city needed to be better at exposing its historical offer to visitors, for example the country's first postbox was situated in the city, but this was not well publicised.*
- *The Botchergate Masterplan was not referred to in the report, Members had been involved and this work had contributed to the Local Plan, what plans did officers have for involving Members in the CCDF in the future?*

The Investment and Policy Manager agreed that interpretation of history and the city's historical artefacts were important to the city, he was confident the Local Plan would reverse the trend of not making the most of its heritage including archaeological remains.

In response to a Member's question regarding funding to develop the railway station, the Investment and Policy Manager explained that around £14M of funding had been given to the railway station for repairs to the roof and resurfacing of the platforms and courseway, but these were like for like repairs.

- *Did the City Centre Development Framework have any initiatives for bringing money into the city?*

The Investment and Policy Manager responded that the Council had a broad strategy to bring money into the city including the Arts Centre, Tourist Information Centre, and a programme of events for both visitors and residents. It was hoped the new Primark store in The Lanes would increase footfall into the city, although he recognised that the retail offer needed to be a mixture of both independent and large chain stores.

RESOLVED –(1) That report ED.18/16 be noted.

(2) That a further report providing an update on the implementation of the Framework be considered in the new civic year.

(The meeting ended at 13:00)