

MINUTES OF A MEETING OF THE
COUNCIL HELD IN THE ONLINE MEETING -
LIVESTREAMED ON THURSDAY 18 MARCH
2021, AT 4.00 PM

PRESENT: Councillor J Kaye (Chairman).
Councillors A Alder, D Andrews, T Beckett,
S Bell, R Buckmaster, P Boylan, M Brady,
E Buckmaster, S Bull, J Burmicz, K Crofton,
B Crystall, A Curtis, G Cutting, B Deering,
I Devonshire, J Dumont, R Fernando,
M Goldspink, J Goodeve, A Hall, L Haysey,
A Huggins, I Kemp, G McAndrew,
M McMullen, S Newton, T Page, M Pope,
C Redfern, S Reed, P Ruffles, S Rutland-
Barsby, D Snowdon, M Stevenson, T Stowe,
N Symonds, A Ward-Booth, G Williamson
and C Wilson.

OFFICERS IN ATTENDANCE:

Richard Cassidy	- Chief Executive
James Ellis	- Head of Legal and Democratic Services and Monitoring Officer
Steven Linnett	- Head of Strategic Finance and Property
Peter Mannings	- Democratic Services Officer
Katie Mogan	- Democratic Services Manager
Helen Standen	- Deputy Chief

Ben Wood

Executive
- Head of
Communications,
Strategy and
Policy

428 CHAIRMAN'S ANNOUNCEMENTS

The Chairman welcomed Members to the Council meeting being held as a virtual meeting on Zoom. He also welcomed those that there were watching the meeting live on the East Herts District YouTube channel.

The Chairman advised that the Local Authorities and Police and Crime Panels (Coronavirus) (Flexibility of Local Authority and Police and Crime Panel Meetings) (England and Wales) Regulations 2020 came into force on Saturday 4 April 2020 to enable councils to hold remote committee meetings during the Covid-19 pandemic period. This was to ensure local authorities could conduct business during this current public health emergency. This Extraordinary Council meeting was being held remotely under these regulations, via the Zoom application and was being recorded and live streamed on YouTube.

The Chairman asked that Members use the raised blue hand function to indicate if they wished to speak. Due to a Zoom update, the raise hand function would now be used to vote on items. The Chairman said he would call out 'for', 'against' and 'abstain' and members would need to raise their virtual hand at the appropriate

moment and the result be declared at the end.

The Chairman read out a statement as follows:

At the meeting of the Council held on 2nd March 2021, during the recorded vote on the East Herts budget, a remark was made by a councillor that was inadvertently broadcast to the wider meeting.

The comment of “you silly girl” made by Councillor Michael McMullen immediately following Councillor Mary Brady’s abstention, whilst not intended to be heard, was nevertheless inappropriate.

Councillor McMullen accepts that he should not have made the comment, irrespective of the circumstances or intention, and wishes to offer an unreserved apology to Councillor Mary Brady, and to any others who were offended by the remark.

Some equalities training is also being arranged for the end of the month, which Councillor McMullan, and any other members wishing to, will attend.

The Chairman announced that Tuesday 23rd March would be a national day of reflection on the first anniversary of the United Kingdom entering its first lockdown. The day would be used for the nation and communities to come together to remember, grieve and celebrate those who have died from Covid-19 and show support for family and friends who were grieving. There would be a minutes silence and 12 noon and people would be invited to stand outside with a light at 8pm.

429 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Bolton, Drake, Frecknall, Hollebon, Ranger, Rowley and Wyllie. Upon taking a roll call of Members, it was established that Councillor Jones was absent.

430 MINUTES - 2 MARCH 2021

Councillor Alder proposed, and Councillor Reed seconded, a motion that the Minutes of the meeting held on 2 March 2021 be confirmed as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.

The motion to approve the Minutes being put to the meeting, and a vote taken, it was declared CARRIED.

RESOLVED – that the Minutes of the meeting held on 2 March 2021 be confirmed as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.

431 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

There were no declarations of interest.

432 SUSPENSION OF COUNCIL PROCEDURE RULES

It was proposed by Councillor Cutting and seconded by Councillor Deering to suspend Council Procedure Rule 4.2 to allow for Members and the public to submit questions to the Extraordinary Council meeting.

RESOLVED – That Council Procedure Rule 4.2 be suspended for this meeting to allow for Members and public questions.

433 PUBLIC QUESTIONS

The Chairman invited the public to ask their questions. He said that members of the public who were present at the meeting would read out their questions and other questions that had been submitted were published under the Supplementary agenda. A response would be provided by the relevant Executive Members at the end that would cover all the points raised.

Simon Baker asked the following question:

“If the various companies and individuals that represent the arts in Bishop’s Stortford are saying that the spaces you are creating in the new cinema/arts space are too small for us to use, and therefore as experienced arts professionals we don’t believe it would be viable to use them, how does that change your mind on the design or indeed the concept of your proposal?”

Jill Goldsmith asked the following question:

“The report to Council on the Business Case for the ORL stipulates the deliverables the Council is committing to in the regeneration project but no detail on the contracts the Council has already entered into (with CityHeart, appointed in 2019, Glenn Howells

architect, Theatreplan and Barker Langham) or on future contracting to inform the public on how it will achieve these deliverables.”

“The Council’s Contracts Register discloses none of the existing ORL related contracts, in contravention of the Local Government Transparency Code, which requires local authorities to publish details of any contract, commissioned activity, purchase order, framework agreement and any other legally enforceable agreement with a value that exceeds £5,000. At paragraph 20 of the Code it specifically states that “Local authorities should expect to publish details of contracts newly entered into – commercial confidentiality should not, in itself, be a reason for local authorities to not follow the provisions of this Code.””

“Paragraph 8 in the report to Council mentions the risk of delay from the SPD process, but the effect of such impact is not spelled out. It says nothing about other contractual or financial risks, such as the risk of developer non-delivery after it has bought the land from the Council from operating the site after its development. It does not set out any safeguards the Council may have.”

“Can you detail the impacts and specific financial risks there would be for the Council if the project gets delayed or set back and what mitigations the Council has put in place?”

Stuart Purton asked the following question:

“As there has been widely publicised criticism of the rushed rework of the scheme, what efforts have or can be made to include members of the local creative community in the process? The voices of commercial interests will be amplified by their money how will you ensure those without financial clout are given equal credence?”

Simon Gilliver asked the following question:

“Almost uniquely for a town of its size, Bishop's Stortford has no venues of any description large enough to hold large scale concerts or events. The previous plans for ORL addressed this need, whereas the proposal now merely duplicates facilities that already exist in the town. In responding to the reduced available funds, why has the council not sought to find a solution that still delivers on the needs of the town on a reduced budget?”

Paddy Lennox asked the following question:

“In a report on the future of cinema, which we understand underpins the Council’s business case for the proposed 5 screen cinema, Tamara Jarvis concluded that the key success of smaller locally run venues lies in a flexible offering to “local interest & population groups”, responding to their demands by combining cinema spaces with other spaces to engage “live performance”.”

“That sounds great but, given that none of the local performing arts groups, not the local theatre, not the Symphonia, not the Comedy Club and not the local live music bands, say the proposed new design ORL

will be of use to them, who exactly are these “local interest & population groups?””

“Please name them.”

Gailie Pollock asked the following question:

“If the footprint of the ORL arts centre is the same as the original plan, why can't we build the cinema spaces but leave the space for the larger auditorium (which would benefit the town's arts organisations that can't use the proposed small flexible performance spaces), to be built at a later date, at a time when it might be easier to apply for funding?”

Paul Dean asked the following question:

“Section 8 of the Business Plan Report for the ORL Development says *“the Master-planning and SPD process is a key risk ... [where] it is expected that there will be some turbulence around public opinion”*. Much of this arises from the Council's perceived failure to separate its role as a landowner/developer from its role as the Local Planning Authority and consult with the public.”

“The same paragraph of the Report illustrates the problem by suggesting the risk to the SPD process “will be mitigated through close working and good communication between Cityheart and EHDC's project team and planning officers”.”

“District Plan Policy BISH8(I) makes it clear that an SPD will be prepared by EHDC's planning officers and “used to inform the master-planning of the site” - not that the SPD will be informed by the developer's masterplan and EHDC's project team's Business Case.”

“In view of this will the Council confirm that in mitigating the public opinion risks on the SPD and master-planning processes for ORL it will:

1. comply with Regulation 12 of the Planning (Local Planning) Regulations 2012 to carry out public participation on the preparation and recommendations of the SPD before it is adopted and used to inform master-planning?)
2. follow the NPPF’s SPD requirements for planning officers to provide further guidance for development on specific sites and, in this particular case, (para 23) “provide a clear strategy ... (and) ... address objectively assessed needs” for the facilities to be provided in accordance with Policy BISH III (a)?
3. during the Pre-application Engagement Process, comply with District Plan Policy DES1 (II) that: “The Masterplan will be collaboratively prepared with all stakeholders, including the public?
4. include transport, environmental conservation area and social impact assessments within the scope of the SPD?”

“Finally, will the Council’s Chief Legal Officer recommend that all DMC members and their substitutes be excluded from today’s meeting so they can take an unbiased decision when the resulting planning application comes before them for

determination.”

Daniel Badcock asked the following question:

“On the substantially reduced arts centre plan, is there any option delay the start of building of the new arts facility and to "save" the planned subsidy for some time to allow a scheme closer to the original proposal to be built? In my opinion to build a new facility without adding a larger stage to the town facilities is a huge missed opportunity and additional cinema screens are not an exciting alternative proposition.”

Simon Anderson asked the following question:

“Please tell me the reasons why the decision on the amended ORL development cannot be postponed”

Jill Jones asked the following question:

“The business plan does not show any financial comparisons between the proposed cinema and any other alternatives. Will EHDC provide any comparisons to show residents of Bishops Stortford how the cinema proposal outweighs other concepts in terms of cost-benefit and social impact? In particular, comparison with an educational establishment such as a Digital skills training centre in terms of potential economic boost and long term sustainable income - as education is counter-cyclic, and BS is ideally placed between Cambridge and London to be such an educational ‘hub’.”

Councillor Haysey, Leader of the Council, responded as

follows:

“Many thanks for the questions submitted. A number of these questions have requested specific information which we are not able to share at this time. We are still at an early stage in the design process and there is further work to be done on the design development. As there is some overlap in the questions that have been asked Councillors will deliver a combined response to provide all of the information that we are able to at this time.”

Councillor Williamson, Deputy Leader and Executive Member for Financial Sustainability, responded as follows:

“Significant consultation took place in the designing of the original scheme. It is with disappointment that this scheme has had to be reduced in response to the extraordinary circumstances that we have all found ourselves in as a result of the COVID 19 pandemic and the subsequent impact that this has had on public finances, alongside the impact of national government policy changes in relation to public sector borrowing. We have worked hard to keep as much of that original scheme as possible. The reduced scheme still offers a large part of the scheme that was based on that early consultation process and there will be plenty of opportunity for the public and the local creative community to engage with the revised proposals as we undertake further, extensive consultation as part of the planning process.”

“The business plan is currently predicated on a limited

live performance programme of a single performance per week in the 80 seat space and income and hire assumptions are based on local benchmarking, interpreted by expert business planners in the arts and culture industry. The inclusion of other live performances, in shared spaces or outdoor space, has not been factored in as required income in the business plan but is of course something that we are looking to maximise in the delivery programme.”

“Delay of the proposals has been considered but taking into account inflation, costs associated with maintaining the existing design and developer teams and other associated expenses, it is estimated that a 12 month delay would come at a minimum cost of £1.2mn. This would of course only make the scheme harder to deliver later down the line and whilst we all hope that the economy will recover from the Covid-19 pandemic, there is less reassurance about the future of local government finances. Longer periods of delay would pose a significant risk of having to re procure a development team at a later date, which would again add further risk and cost to the project. It is not possible to leave an area for the auditorium to be added at a later date, this space has been reallocated as part of the development of the overall scheme, which now includes the 90 senior living apartments, which have contributed to the increase in capital receipt by £700k. In response to the specific question on Northgate End, it is not possible to redesign the MSCP as the construction works are already well underway.”

“To confirm the Council hasn’t yet entered into a legally

binding contract with the Developer, Cityheart. The Development Agreement (for the wider ORL scheme) and the Development Management Agreement (for the arts centre) are not yet agreed. Once these have been completed, details will be published in accordance with the Local Government Transparency Code.”

Councillor Goodeve, Executive Member for Planning and Growth, responded as follows:

“Taking the first 3 points together from the question asked by Paul Dean; the Council has prepared a number of SPDs which are compliant with relevant regulations and we will continue to ensure compliance with regulations, policy and guidance during the production of the SPD for ORL.”

“As set out in Policy BISH8 the Bishop’s Stortford Town Centre Planning Framework will form the basis of the SPD, which will inform the masterplanning of the site. The preparation of the site specific SPD will include early stakeholder engagement and follow a similar process to that of the Council’s agreed Masterplanning process as well as meeting the statutory requirements for preparing SPDs. The Masterplanning process contained in Policy DES1 not only allows the Council to involve key stakeholders earlier in the planning process, but in this case allows the Council to expand the level of public participation prior to, and during the production of the SPD.”

“On point 4; generally speaking an SPD is often constrained by the relevant policies with which it must comply, in this case however the Masterplanning

approach allows us to broaden the scope to discuss and examine these wider points.”

“Finally, to address the request that DMC members be excluded from the meeting; Members of the DMC are, by definition, Members of the Council and have a right to attend and vote on all matters before the Council so long as they do not have an interest in that matter. Being a member of the DMC is not an “interest” in this context and so DMC members need not be excluded from the Council meeting this evening. In any event, the consideration of a business plan is not akin to determining a planning application, the two are separate.”

Councillor E Buckmaster, Executive Member for Wellbeing, responded as follows:

“The new facilities will still provide something new for the town, yes there will be a cinema – a high end, boutique offer which differs from the current local cinema provisions by providing a different experience with the potential to enjoy a film in luxurious surroundings, whilst enjoying food and drink, but there will also be a number of spaces where a live programme can be delivered. These spaces include gallery and foyer space for live music, a flexible cinema space in the 80 seat auditorium for a range of spoken word events such as one man / woman shows, author meet and greets, director / cast talks and small community led events as well as live streaming and other digital and immersive experiences. The outdoor space will provide the opportunity for larger performances, be it music, comedy, theatre or live

screening of theatre / sports events. We will also explore the demand for and possibility of using the 150 seat cinema space as flexible performance space as part of the ongoing design development. We have worked closely with other local venues and understand that there is an existing demand for audiences of 80 – 100 people. As we move ahead with the design work we will continue to engage with the local community to better understand and respond to the local demand at this level.”

“The design of all of these spaces is at a very early stage and will be developed alongside our expert team and with much public and statutory consultation. I would like to provide reassurance that public safety and sustainability will be built into all elements of the design process for the entire scheme. The Arts Centre is aiming to achieve BREEAM excellent accreditation. Further information will be available as the design development progresses.”

“Questions have been raised about other potential uses of the space, the scheme has not considered alternative options, such as a further education or digital skills college. The business case is based on proposals that are as close to the original brief for the site as possible, taking into account the financial constraints and need for commercial viability. Questions have also been raised in relation to the United Reform Church, which the Council now owns. This site has always been earmarked for demolition to enable the delivery of the scheme as a whole. The current plans for the Arts Centre do not include community space for hire but the Council is currently

considering options for the provision of additional community space for hire elsewhere in Bishop's Stortford."

434 MEMBERS' QUESTIONS

Councillor Mione Goldspink asked Cllr Linda Haysey, Leader of the Council:

"Would the Leader of the Council please clarify some points about the proposals for the Old River Lane development –

- 1) What are the plans for the United Reformed Church Hall (now owned by the Council)?
- 2) Has the size of the proposed Arts Centre been reduced from the original proposals?
- 3) What is the justification for adding a Care Home block of 90 units/beds?"

Councillor Haysey responded as follows:

"Under the existing plans the URC will be demolished and the space will be used to provide parking spaces which are required for the main scheme."

"Yes, the Arts Centre has reduced in size quite considerably."

"There are no plans to build a care home at the Old River Lane development. The proposal is to provide a form of supported living for older people who are no longer able to live independently, but don't necessarily require 24 hour care in a residential care home or

nursing home. This type of housing enables individuals or even couples to live with a degree of independence. Facilities such as those proposed make a significant impact on the lives of older people and can delay the need for people to go into care home facilities. The Developer will work with District and County Council colleagues to ensure that the final proposal meets local needs.”

Supplementary question from Councillor Goldspink

“There seems to be some confusion about the size of the Arts Centre as you say it will be smaller but on page 12 of the report at paragraph 4.4, it states the redesign will mean it will be over a larger footprint. Could you please clarify what is correct?”

Councillor Haysey responded as follows:

“The original design had an Arts Centre with residential units on the side. Due to discussions with the architect, we have been able to reduce and take away the residential aspect away from the development as we no longer need the income from these sales to make the site work. The Arts Centre itself has been reduced in size”

435 OLD RIVER LANE BUSINESS PLAN

Councillor Williamson, Deputy Leader and Executive Member for Financial Sustainability, presented a report on the Old River Lane Business Plan. He ran through the history of the project from when the Council bought the site five and a half years ago and the

council have shaped and refined its ambition and vision for the site to be a complete regeneration of the Old River Lane area to drive footfall into the area and revitalise the local economy by welcoming people into the town. The plans have progressed and have been presented to Council at various key stages however, at the Council meeting in January, members were asked to look again as several factors have emerged over the last 12 months which have impacted the plans. One change is in the financing of the main site as the plans did allow for residential and commercial units with an agreed buy back model for the Council to retain full ownership as the landlord and receive rental income. However, the government changed the rules on borrowing so that local authorities could no longer get lending for projects primarily for yield and this had made this option unavailable. The Council recognised that the only option was to sell the leasehold to Cityhold and would receive the leasehold receipts. This outcome has the merit of reducing the council's overall borrowing requirement for the project. Council approved the revised scope for the project in January which removed the auditorium as an increase in costs and the reduced ability for subsidising the project was no longer viable and the future financial burden was unaffordable.

Councillor Williamson said that removing some of the residential and community elements made significant savings on the build costs. The capital requirements had fallen from £23.5 million to £15.5 million with a return on investment increased from £4.1 million to £6.9 million. The redesign of the scheme has included extra care housing on the scheme which would add

£700k to the capital receipts.

Councillor Williamson said there had been a lot of comment around further consultation with stakeholders and the community therefore he amended the wording of recommendation 1 to:

“That Council approve that Officers proceed with the delivery of the Old River Lane Arts Centre development and the Old River Lane Main Scheme development, as set out in this report and on the basis of the financial viability demonstrated in the business case and that through the detailed design and planning stages public engagement and statutory consultation will be undertaken.”

Councillor Williamson proposed the two recommendations with the amendment to recommendation one. Councillor E Buckmaster seconded the recommendations and reserved his right to speak.

Councillor Goldspink felt the amended recommendation did not go far enough and therefore proposed an amendment to recommendation one and was seconded by Councillor Wilson and reserved his right to speak. The amendment was as follows:

“That Council approve that Officers proceed with the delivery of the Old River Lane Arts Centre development and the Old River Lane Main Scheme development as set out in this report and on the basis of the financial viability demonstrated in the business case, but only on condition that the final layout, sizes and function of

the internal spaces within the Arts Centre will not be decided until full consultation has been held with local interest groups and with the residents of Bishop's Stortford. This consultation would help to determine the potential usage and viability of the Centre."

Councillor Goldspink thanked everyone who had been involved in the Old River Lane project for their hard work. She referred to the large number of public questions that had been submitted to the Council and said this displayed a large level of interest from residents who were willing to share ideas and contribute. She said what had become clear was that the public felt they had been kept in the dark over the years regarding the plans. She referred to page 15, paragraph 5 which mentioned the next steps in relation to consultation with residents and stakeholders and she welcomed this statement however, the report did not give any time frame for these consultations. Councillor Goldspink was concerned that it seemed the council would work up designs and then consult afterwards. She thought this was a serious mistake and it was important that the consultation should take place before design proposals are decided. She commended the amended to Council and asked members for their support.

Councillor E Buckmaster said he was not happy with the proposed amendment from Councillor Goldspink as it suggested that any consultation would only be held with residents of Bishop's Stortford and any facilities in the District would be open to all residents. The recommendation proposed by Councillor Williamson proposes a much wider engagement.

Councillor Redfern said she did not feel the amendment proposed by Councillor Goldspink was limiting to just Bishop's Stortford residents and the word 'local' could relate to the whole District.

Councillor Wilson addressed this point and said he did not think that if there was to be a consultation, that it would exclude people outside Bishop's Stortford. He felt that the 2016 consultation was inadequate and many residents had expressed that they were not aware one took place. He said this amendment was not calling for a pause or a radical change in thinking with the project, but the Old River Lane project has to attract business and people to the town centre and many residents and community groups do not believe it would in its current form. He referred to the proposed reduction in the facility and losing the Church Hall and not replacing it with a performance space, all local groups have said that it would not meet their needs. Councillor Wilson said the number of questions submitted demonstrated local democracy in action and he said there was no point consulting after the event. He supported the amendment.

The amended recommendation, as proposed by Councillor Goldspink and seconded by Councillor Wilson, was put to the meeting and a vote taken. The motion was declared LOST.

Councillor Crystall asked for more information on what the statutory consultation would involve.

Councillor Wilson queried how much room there

would be to change the size of the performance space if local groups said they required more seats.

Councillor Redfern said the Council were looking for a third time at this project because of a lack of money. She asked how the figures in the business plan were arrived at and felt the information in the confidential appendices should be made public as this was public money that was being spent. Councillor Redfern said that the council should release as much information as possible and felt that currently, as little as possible was being released.

Councillor Goldspink referred to the United Reform Church Hall and questioned whether the new arts centres would have no community space that could be hired.

Councillor Snowdon said he was disappointed that the Council could not push ahead with the original plans. He said he was excited by the scheme and was proud of the hard work that had been put into the vision. He said he had spent a lot of time with the Leader, Councillor Wyllie and Bishop's Stortford Town Council to see, as a ward member, what could be done and the plan presented to the meeting achieves this. He felt that the Council needed to push on with the project for the best of the town and district and asked Councillor Haysey if she agreed that this was the best scheme the Council could get.

Councillor McAndrew said he was sympathetic to the concerns raised this evening by members of the public. He agreed with Councillor Williamson about being

disappointed that the scheme had been reduced due to extraordinary circumstances. He highlighted Councillor E Buckmaster's response to the public questions and said the facilities would provide something new for the town and looked forward to the consultation. Councillor McAndrew drew attention to the sustainability element of the project and said the Council was seeking maximum carbon efficiency and achieve carbon neutrality if possible. Green sustainability would be built into all aspects of the design and delivery with electric vehicle charging points in the car park and solar panels would be considered.

Councillor Bell said she was pleased with the discussion around the environmental sustainability of the building. She expressed disappointment about the situation the council was in now. She said that Bishop's Stortford Amateur Dramatics group had been promised a 500 seat theatre which had now been taken away and the community space being utilised at the United Reform Church Hall that was not being replaced would be damaging for these groups. She urged the Council to look at alternative options such as developing community spaces on the top floor of the car park or reduce the cinema to three screens and have a studio theatre. She said the point of the development was to make money and the Church Hall currently makes £80k a year profit.

Councillor Haysey replied yes to Councillor Snowdon's earlier question.

Councillor E Buckmaster said there is an opportunity

for a cultural centre in Old River Lane and there was nothing else like it currently on offer in East Herts. This would offer an entirely different experience and create an ethos based on community need so programming events would have a greater reach as possible. The business case outlines the way forward that is achievable and affordable and he did not believe that people would want to stay home and watch streaming services after restrictions have eased. This project represents great value to residents of Bishop's Stortford and it will draw people in to enhance the local economy. There was no merit in delay and the risk in not proceeding was greater than delaying. Councillor E Buckmaster supported the recommendations.

Councillor Williamson responded to Councillor Crystall's question about the consultation and said it would be in line with any masterplanning process. In response to Councillor Wilson's question on changing the design, he said after the results of the consultation they would work with architects to create the best facilities possible. Responding to Councillor Redfern's question, he explained that the financial details in the confidential appendices were sensitive and could affect any future procurement process. Councillor Williamson concluded that if the council agreed the recommendations, it would be the final endorsement for the scheme and allow the Council to move ahead with masterplanning and for the project team to work closely with contractors in the design stages and start the consultation process.

The recommendations, as proposed by Councillor

Williamson and seconded by Councillor E Buckmaster, were put to the meeting and a vote taken. The motion was declared CARRIED.

RESOLVED - that (A) Council approve that Officers proceed with the delivery of the Old River Lane Arts Centre development and the Old River Lane Main Scheme development, as set out in this report and on the basis of the financial viability demonstrated in the business case and that through the detailed design and planning stages public engagement and statutory consultation will be undertaken; and

(B) That Council delegates to the Head of Strategic Property and Finance, in consultation with the Old River Lane Delivery Board operating in line with its Terms of Reference as contained at Appendix 1, the authority to make decisions relating to the delivery of the Old River Lane project.

The meeting closed at 5.25 pm

Chairman
Date