

Runnymede Borough Council

ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE

11 September 2003 at 7.30 p.m.

Members of the Committee present: Councillors J.R. Furey (Chairman), J.E. Haas (Vice-Chairman), A. Alderson, M.J. Brown, A.J. Davis, D.P. Easton J.M. Edwards, R.J. Ray, B.J. Relph and Ms. C.M. Simmons

Members of the Committee absent: None

Councillors Mrs. P.I. Broadhead, R.K. Habgood, P.J. Poole and P.J. Waddell also attended.

291. NOTIFICATION OF CHANGES TO COMMITTEE MEMBERSHIP

The Conservative Group had notified the Chief Executive Officer of its wish that Councillor K.J.T. Walmsley be removed from membership of the Committee and that Councillor J.M. Edwards be appointed in his place for a fixed period ending on the day after the meeting. Thereafter Councillor Walmsley would be re-appointed.

The Chief Executive Officer had given effect to this request in accordance with Section 16(2) of the Local Government and Housing Act 1989.

292. MINUTES

The Minutes of the meeting of the Committee held on 12 June 2003 were confirmed and signed as a correct record.

293. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Councillor J.R. Furey declared a personal and prejudicial interest under the Runnymede Code of Conduct for Members in respect of the items concerning environmental improvements in Station Road, Addlestone and car parking in Addlestone as he operated a retail outlet in Station Road. Councillor Furey therefore withdrew from the room during the discussion of these items, Councillor J.E. Haas taking the Chair in his absence. Councillor Furey also declared a personal interest in the item on the proposed Addlestone traffic calming scheme for the same reason. As this interest was not prejudicial he remained in attendance and participated in the debate thereon.

Councillor J.M. Edwards declared a personal and prejudicial interest under the Runnymede Code of Conduct for Members in respect of the item concerning the proposed Addlestone traffic calming scheme owing to the proximity of his home to the works. Councillor Edwards therefore withdrew from the room during the discussion of the item.

294. STATION ROAD, ADDLESTONE - ENVIRONMENTAL IMPROVEMENTS

The Committee gave consideration to revised proposals for an environmental improvement scheme in the length of Station Road, Addlestone between the Civic Offices and the Tesco roundabout.

Members recalled that the March 2003 meeting of the Committee had authorised the provision of three controlled crossings on raised tables in Station Road as part of the Action Addlestone Initiative to enhance the town centre. These were to be located at the existing crossing point outside Goldings Newsagents, between the Iceland store and the Post Office and between the Health Centre and the Chemist. All other design work except for an associated traffic calming scheme (due to be further considered later in the meeting) had been held in abeyance pending consideration by the Action Addlestone Steering Group.

The Committee now welcomed a recommendation by the Steering Group for the inclusion in the scheme of lay-bys capable of accommodating 25 short-stay parking spaces. Members recognised that there was concern amongst residents as to the adequacy of public car parking provision in

Addlestone once the new Community Centre was constructed on part of the Garfield Road car park. Additional short-stay parking in this form would therefore help address these concerns and substantially offset the loss of spaces in Garfield Road. Addlestone had experienced a significant increase in footfall since the opening of the Tesco store and it was felt that the improvement scheme would help to create a safer and more vibrant town centre environment for traders, shoppers and residents.

The Committee took the opportunity to address Review Board recommendations that elements of the scheme, principally the carriageway width measurements and the extent of lay-by parking spaces, should be reviewed. It was emphasized that efforts would be made in the detailed design process to maximise the number of parking spaces. Dedicated parking bays for disabled people would also be incorporated where possible. While there would be a need to reduce the carriageway width to a minimum of 6.75 metres in order to accommodate the proposals, it was not thought that this would lead to traffic congestion. Although the County Council's Local Committee had previously stipulated a minimum width of 7.3 metres the revised dimensions were within the range recommended by the County Council Local Transportation Director and, indeed, were wider than the current narrowest point of Station Road.

The Committee was also mindful of the concerns of a small number of traders regarding parking and access issues. Discussions would be held with the individuals concerned in order to establish delivery needs and resolve outstanding matters. It was, however, emphasised that most of the commercial properties in the area of the scheme had some form of service facilities at the rear, even if they tended not to be used because of the present lack of enforcement against on-street deliveries and parking.

Members noted that the estimated cost of the overall enhancement scheme was now £400,000. This figure included a sum of £100,000 for the lowering of telephone cabling along the south side of Station Road and a 20% contingency, which was appropriate at this early stage in the design process. The detailed design work, which was likely to cost £10,000, would be undertaken by the Surrey County Council design team as they offered competitive terms and had been responsible for the original feasibility studies. The expenditure could be accommodated within the established Action Addlestone provision.

The Committee agreed that the revised proposals should be widely publicised locally as well as being the subject of a public exhibition at the Addlestone Community Centre on 15/16 September. If this consultation produced an adverse reaction the design would be brought back to the Committee for reconsideration. If, however, the public was generally supportive of the scheme approval for the project would be sought from the County Council Local Committee. It had originally been hoped that this would be secured in September. However, it was now understood that the Local Committee had decided to postpone its consideration of the scheme to their following meeting in order to clarify a number of issues arising. Members expressed their disappointment at this delay. Subject to prompt approval, it was intended that the improvements be completed prior to the introduction of decriminalised parking enforcement in Runnymede on 1 November 2004.

**RESOLVED that –**

- i) the proposed improvements to Station Road (including the provision of 3 pelican crossings and carriageway narrowing to provide 25 limited waiting parking spaces), be approved for submission to Surrey County Council;**
- ii) the designs be subject to public consultation at a local exhibition in September 2003;**
- iii) subject to public support, the approval of the Surrey County Council Local Committee be sought at its next available meeting; and**
- iv) subject to those permissions being received, the detailed design contract be awarded to the Surrey County Council design team as the previously successful tenderer.**

295. CAR PARKING IN ADDLESTONE – PETITION

The Committee gave consideration to car parking provision in Addlestone in the light of a petition organised by a retailer in Station Road and a series of recommendations by the Review Board.

Members noted that the petition, which had attracted nearly 500 signatures, was headed “Fight to Save Addlestone. Town’s only car park will be closing at the end of July. No place for traders or customers to park.” It was emphasised that the reference to the closure of the Garfield Road car park was inaccurate. While the construction of the new Addlestone Community Centre on part of the car park would reduce the number of spaces, it would not lead to the closure of the facility. Current Government policies and planning standards discouraged both car usage and extensive parking provision. Nevertheless, having regard for the current levels of usage of Garfield Road, the availability to the public at weekends of the Civic Offices car park, proposals for 25 additional short-stay parking spaces in lay-bys and the potential for the former Safeways car park to be re-opened by the new owners of the site, Members considered that the reduction in spaces at Garfield Road would not affect the viability or vitality of Addlestone as a shopping centre. The assumption of on-street parking enforcement powers by Runnymede, scheduled for November 2004, would further improve matters through the introduction of a more vigorous enforcement regime. In the longer term it was possible that land assembly initiatives might present the opportunity for enhanced provision.

The Committee did, however, recognise that the size of the petition reflected the importance to traders, residents and shoppers of adequate town centre public car parking. Mindful of this concern, Members agreed that Officers should investigate a series of options designed to maximise the number of car parking spaces in Addlestone in accordance with recommendations of the Review Board, which had considered the matter at its meeting on 2 September. (The Committee had already addressed one of the Review Board’s recommendations, relating to the width of the Station Road carriageway and number of lay-by parking spaces, in the context of the Station Road enhancement scheme approved earlier in the meeting.) Officers were also asked to examine the potential for a local area travel scheme for Addlestone traders and employees which would reduce the demand for parking spaces. As the largest employer in the area, the Council was well placed to act as a focus for a venture similar in principle to the highly successful yellow bus initiative for school children.

**RESOLVED that –**

- i) Officers be instructed to undertake the following actions in order to identify means of creating additional parking spaces in Addlestone.**
  - a) examine the scope for decked or multi-storey parking at the Civic Offices or elsewhere in Addlestone;**
  - b) investigate the use of private parking areas by the general public at certain times;**
  - c) seek to provide more disabled parking bays;**
  - d) re-examine arrangements for all of the 11 month construction period in Garfield Road car park, including how the builders will be accommodated and ensuring that the spaces which will be available in the Civic Offices car park on Saturdays and Sundays will be clearly signposted;**
  - e) enquire about the Addlestone Post Office Sorting Offices long-term plans for parking and access; and**
  - f) investigate the possibility of instituting a local area travel plan for businesses and traders in Addlestone using the Council as a focus.**
- ii) a report on the findings be presented to the Committee for further consideration.**

296. CROCKFORD PARK/CORRIE ROAD/GARFIELD ROAD, ADDLESTONE - TRAFFIC CALMING SCHEME  
(Ref: Minutes of Economic Development Committee March 2003, page 1140, para 703)

The Committee received details of the outcome of a tendering exercise for the construction of the proposed traffic calming scheme in Crockford Park Road, Corrie Road and Garfield Road, Addlestone. The scheme comprised four speed tables in Garfield Road, including two incorporating zebra crossings, five speed tables in Crockford Park Road and two in Corrie Road. T.J. Hunt was the favoured contractor on the basis of lowest tender price (£108,028), construction scheming and the programme for the works. It was noted that the competitive tender process appeared to have secured a lower price than would have been the case had the works been offered to one of the County Council's 'Mammoth' contractors at the agreed rates. Construction works were due to commence on 22 September with completion expected by 1 December.

**RESOLVED that –**

**a capital estimate in the sum of £110,000 be taken from the Action Addlestone provision held in the Capital Programme for the construction of the Crockford Park Road, Corrie Road and Garfield Road traffic calming scheme.**

297. COMPREHENSIVE PERFORMANCE ASSESSMENT – PUBLIC SPACE SELF-ASSESSMENT DIAGNOSTIC

Members approved, with minor modifications, the draft Public Space self-assessment diagnostic insofar as it related to services under the remit of the Committee. It was noted that the diagnostic had been compiled for the purposes of the forthcoming Comprehensive Performance Assessment of the Council and was part of a range of information, indicators and documentation which the Inspectors would take into account. The document, which had been drafted in accordance with Audit Commission guidelines, would be submitted to each of the Committees with relevant service responsibilities in order to ensure widespread ownership of the content.

**RESOLVED that –**

**the Public Space self-assessment diagnostic be approved as a reasonable reflection of services under the remit of this Committee for further report to Corporate Management Committee and Council.**

298. BUSINESS IMPROVEMENT DISTRICTS – DRAFT GUIDANCE

The Committee gave consideration to draft guidance issued by the Government in order to assist with the development of Business Improvement Districts (BIDs).

Members recalled that the Government had set out its initial concept of BIDs, a means of promoting partnership working between local authorities and businesses, in the 2001 White Paper, *Strong Local Leadership – Quality Public Services*. It was envisaged that BIDs would undertake a wide variety of projects including the creation of a safe environment, improvement of transport and accessibility and the development of tourism. The Local Government Bill, which was due to be enacted shortly, contained provisions for a time limited levy to be added to the non-domestic rate which could be retained for local initiatives based either upon a specific geographical area or focused on the needs of a particular business sector. Projects would be identified by the business community following a ballot amongst those companies likely to benefit from the project, but would be implemented in consultation with the Council. Proposals would have to be approved by a majority of those businesses voting both in simple numerical terms and also by rateable value of the hereditaments.

The Committee now noted that draft guidance had been issued to provide practical information for those wishing to set up a BID in their area. The advice covered in detail aspects relating to the establishment, implementation, management and monitoring of partnerships, including ways in which the supplementary levy might be calculated. Additional regulations would be

formulated in respect of matters such as voting procedures, the conduct of the ballots, application of a veto and the revenue account.

While the guidance appeared to be sufficient for the purpose, Members considered that it should be subjected to a review mechanism a year or so after the enactment of the Local Government Bill in order that operating practices could be reconsidered if necessary. In the meantime, details of the Council's Safer Runnymede Initiative and Yellow School Bus project would be forwarded to the Office of the Deputy Prime Minister as examples of close co-operation between a local authority and business community consistent with the objectives of the BID concept.

**RESOLVED that –**

- i) the comments set out in Appendix 'A' be forwarded to the Government as a formal response to the consultation on the Draft Guidance for Business Improvement Districts; and**
- ii) details of the Safer Runnymede and Yellow Bus Initiatives be forwarded to the Government as a good example of schemes that would benefit from BID funding.**

299. RUNNYMEDE TRAVEL INITIATIVE – PROGRESS REPORT

(Ref: Minutes of Economic Development Committee, March 2003, page 1138, para 701)

The Committee received a progress report in respect of the Runnymede Travel Initiative and considered whether to continue the yellow school bus element of the project beyond the pilot scheme.

Members recalled that the Travel Initiative had been developed in conjunction with the Runnymede Business Partnership in order to reduce the number of school and business journeys made by car, particularly at peak times of the day. The initiative had to date focused mainly on school based projects, including the installation of cycle shelters at six secondary schools and the Royal Holloway University of London and the introduction of four American style yellow buses operating initially from Magna Carta and Fullbrook schools and, more recently, Jubilee High School.

The Committee welcomed independent research from consultants appointed to study the scheme by the Government which revealed that the projects at Magna Carta and Fullbrook school had reduced the number of school journeys made by car from 40% to 33% over two years. This represented a significant modal shift in a short period of time away from car use and towards the yellow school bus, cycling and, to a lesser extent, walking. Some 6.5% of school journeys were now made by bicycle against a national average of 2%. The Government was unlikely to sustain its funding for the cycle shelters beyond 2004, although it was encouraging Surrey County Council to continue to make Local Transport Plan money available to further the development of the project. Officers were to hold discussions with the County Council to this end and give consideration to other external funding opportunities. Meanwhile, funding for the remainder of the year would be focused on the provision of cycle shelters at local businesses, with matched funding, and railway stations to encourage alternatives to the car.

The Committee noted that the contract with First Group Ltd for the pilot yellow bus scheme was due to expire in February 2004. The four buses, which could collectively accommodate 240 pupils, had built up a steady customer base of over 300 since their introduction at Fullbrook and Magna Carta schools in February 2002 and Jubilee High School in March 2003. This necessitated the buses running more than one morning and afternoon route. Interest was continuing to grow and, without any advertising, approximately 380 pupils had registered to use the buses for the new school year. An additional, conventional, bus had therefore been leased as an interim solution. The cost of the project was met by a combination of fares of £1 a day, sponsorship of £25,000 per annum and section 106 developer contributions. The Council had yet to draw upon the £70,000 reserve provision it had originally put in place to assist with the project.

Given the success of the Yellow Bus Initiative in achieving modal shift, its environmental, economic, social and educational benefits and the regard in which it was held both locally and nationally, Members were of the view that the scheme should be continued beyond its pilot period for a further three years. While there was a desire to expand the project it was emphasised that this must be undertaken on an incremental basis in order to maintain its financial sustainability. Members were mindful that the competitive leasing arrangements currently offered by First Group were not guaranteed in the longer term and grant funding was generally only available for capital rather than revenue expenditure. As the buses were specially constructed there would not be flexibility to scale down the commitment if demand for the service fell. No other local schools had, in any event, asked for an extension of the service.

Nevertheless, projections based on current fare levels, committed section 106 monies and assumed sponsorship income of £30,000 per annum suggested that there was scope within existing resources to expand the service to six buses for between 2½ - 4½ years. This would be sufficient to meet both current and latent demand at the three participating schools. The longer term potential for the roll out of the scheme elsewhere could be explored if other schools expressed an interest. Other sources of funding might be available if the Council wished to further extend the scheme in the longer term. Experience suggested that further new developments would emerge to sustain the funding stream from developers. Provisions in the emerging Local Government Bill provided the potential for a Business Improvement District to be utilised to secure funding, while Officers were investigating the possibility of establishing a charity to operate the buses in order to draw in charitable contributions and take advantage of taxation relief. A bid was also being submitted to the Department of Transport for revenue funding of sustainable transport projects. The Council's original financial commitment to the scheme also remained available for use if necessary. In the meantime, the day use of the bus for purposes such as school trips would henceforth be negotiated directly between the schools and bus company. The financial advantages of this usage were marginal because of the need to hire staff to drive the vehicles rather than use parents, as with the morning and afternoon school runs.

**RESOLVED that –**

- i) the Director of Technical Services be requested to examine further external funding opportunities to extend the cycle shelter provision in educational establishments and businesses generally;**
- ii) the yellow school bus service be extended for a further three years to the end of the appropriate school year, using six buses and drawing upon funding from fares, section 106 monies and local business contributions; and**
- iii) a further report be submitted on the opportunities that a Charity and/or Business Improvement District status would provide for longer term funding of the yellow school bus project.**

300. CROWN LANE TO LYNE ROAD FOOTPATH, VIRGINIA WATER – PETITION  
(Ref: Minutes of Council, July 2003, page 297, para 199)

Members received details of a 127 signature petition referred to the Committee by Council, advocating the closure of the footpath across the railway line linking Crown Lane to Lyne Road, Virginia Water because of disturbance caused to neighbouring residents by the sounding of train horns. It was noted that the footpath, which was designated as such by Network Rail rather than being a public right of way managed by the Highway Authority, incorporated an uncontrolled pedestrian crossing over the railway line. Trains were currently obliged to sound their horns on the approach to such crossings for safety reasons but levels of noise nuisance had risen with the recent introduction of new models of trains with louder horns. Ward Members had previously reported the concerns of residents in Virginia Water and Egham about the level of noise of such horns and the unsociable hours at which they were sounded. At its meeting in June 2003 the Council had resolved that strong representations should be made to the railway authorities in an effort to reduce and eliminate the noise.

The Committee noted that the rail industry and H.M. Inspector of Railways were actively looking to close uncontrolled crossings because of concerns over their safety record. Network Rail was

therefore keen to meet the petitioner's request. Before doing so, however, it had agreed to undertake a public consultation exercise in order to determine whether there was wider public support for the closure of the path and crossing. The results of this consultation would be made available to the Committee at its next meeting and no final decision would be taken by Network Rail until the Council had been given the opportunity to comment. In the meantime, Officers were continuing to liaise with the railway authorities and Surrey County Council on train noise across the borough. Progress would be reported to Members in due course.

301. REFERRAL FROM HOUSING AND COMMUNITY SERVICES COMMITTEE

Affordable Housing Programme – Land at Pooley Green Road, Egham

Members concurred with a recommendation of the Housing and Community Services Committee that an unpopular and heavily vandalised garage compound at Pooley Green Road be sold to the Thames Valley Housing Association for the construction of an affordable housing scheme comprising 7 three bedroom houses. It was noted that the Leisure and Environment Committee, which was responsible for the management of part of the land in question, was also to be asked to comment on the proposal. Terms for the disposal had yet to be settled but the eventual receipt would be utilised for the development of the town park on the Pooley Green Allotment site.

**RESOLVED that –**

**subject to the views of the Leisure and Environment Committee and the agreement of terms, the disposal of the garage compound at Pooley Green Road, Egham (indicated at Appendix 'B') to the Thames Valley Housing Association be approved.**

302. SERVICE PLAN 2003/2004

Members approved the format and initial content of the Committee's Service Plan for 2003/04.

A variety of objectives and targets had been drawn together into a single document for each Committee in order to provide a more coherent reporting and monitoring process, both at political and management levels. The format had been modified from the "Aims and Targets" approach to include more detail of timescales, potential barriers and additional resource requirements. The draft Service Plan drew together objectives from the Leader's Position Statement, Community Strategy, the Best Value Performance Plan, Best Value Continuous Improvement Plans, Best Value Performance Indicators and other plans and strategies. It was noted that substantially similar aims often appeared in two or more different documents, and a degree of rationalisation might be worthwhile in the future. This initial draft of the Service Plan would need further sharpening and refinement as time progressed.

**RESOLVED that –**

**the format and content of the draft Economic Development Committee Service Plan be approved, with minor modification, as a basis for the monitoring and review of the Committee's objectives.**

303. URGENT ACTION - STANDING ORDER 42

Members noted details of the following action which had been taken after consultation with the Chairman of the Committee under Standing Order 42:

<u>Officer</u>	<u>Action Taken</u>	<u>Central Index No.</u>
Director of Technical Services	Selection of four tenderers to bid for the construction of the new Addlestone Community Centre.	532

304. CHERTSEY MEADS – TRANSFER OF LAND  
(Ref: Minutes of Executive Committee, August 2000, page 360, para 208)

By resolution of the Committee, the press and public were excluded from the meeting during the consideration of this matter under Section 100A(4) of the Local Government Act 1972 on the grounds that the discussion would be likely to involve the disclosure of exempt information of the description specified in paragraphs 7 and 12 of Schedule 12A and Part 1 of the Act.

The Committee received details of an anomaly in the Council's title to Chertsey Meads and considered formalising the rights of access across the Meads enjoyed by owners of neighbouring properties.

Members noted that it had become apparent that a strip of land within the curtilage of a property known as Riveredge was incorporated within the Council's title to Chertsey Meads. It was unclear whether this was as a result of a change in the physical boundary many years previously or an inaccuracy in the original title plans. On the basis of the available evidence, however, it would be difficult for the Council to assert a claim to the land, which was, in any case, unlikely to be of substantial benefit to the public. It was therefore felt that the most practicable solution would be to transfer the land to the owners of Riveredge for a nominal consideration. At the same time, Members agreed that the owners of properties adjoining the Meads which required access across it should have their rights formally acknowledged. This would have the advantage of allowing the Council to impose controls relating to usage.

**RESOLVED that –**

- i) the land shown on the plan attached at Appendix 'C' be transferred to the owners of Riveredge for a nominal consideration and upon such other terms as the Director of Administration and Leisure shall agree; and**
- ii) the Council enter into Deeds granting rights to the owners of those properties listed at Appendix 'D' to use the access across the Meads, for a nominal consideration and upon such other terms as the Director of Administration and Leisure shall agree.**

305. CIVIC OFFICES/ADDLESTONE COMMUNITY CENTRE REPROVISION - OUTCOME OF TENDERING EXERCISE FOR CONSTRUCTION WORKS  
(Ref: Minutes of Economic Development Committee March 2003, page 1143, para. 708)

By resolution of the Committee, the press and public were excluded from the meeting during the consideration of this matter under Section 100A(4) of the Local Government Act 1972 on the grounds that the discussion would be likely to involve the disclosure of exempt information of the description specified in paragraphs 8, 9 and 10 of Schedule 12A to Part 1 of the Act.

The Committee received details of an initial appraisal of tenders submitted for the construction of the new Addlestone Community Centre on part of the Garfield Road car park. Members noted that although the two lowest tenders both came within the anticipated construction cost of £2.316m (a sum which included £325,000 of additional facilities to be funded by the Addlestone Community Association), significant elements within them had been identified as provisional sums which, once adjusted, were likely to increase the price. Both contractors had also omitted a roofing item valued at approximately £160,000. The most competitive tenders were therefore likely to be in excess of the original estimate.

Officers were, however, confident that there was scope within the costings to either eliminate or significantly close any potential funding gap. Discussions would be held with the retained professionals and the Community Association in the coming days to this end. The Committee therefore agreed to authorise Officers to settle the specification and contract documentation in consultation with the Civic Offices Reprovision Member Working Group. If it did not prove possible to bring the projected outturn figure within budget further authority would be sought through means appropriate to meet the outstanding shortfall.

At the same time the Committee noted that it would be necessary to increase the existing capital estimate provision by £325,000 in order to allow for the enhanced facilities sought by the Community

Association. As the next meeting of the Council was not scheduled until after the 46 week contract period was due to commence later in the month, the Chairman agreed that this could be approved as a delegated function on the grounds of urgency in accordance with paragraph 1.3 of Part 3 of the Council's Constitution. These items had been included in the specification for reasons of cost effectiveness but would be funded by the Community Association through the application of their reserves together with lottery, grant and sponsorship monies. The Association currently anticipated securing approximately £280,000 by these means although some of the funding had yet to be confirmed. The extra facilities were, however, primarily fixtures and associated enhancements that could be put in place in the final weeks of the contract. It was therefore intended to draft the building contract in such a way as to provide for variation orders to be issued to change or delete various elements of the extra facilities should the necessary funding not come forward. The lease agreement would be settled with the Community Association prior to the letting of a construction contract. This would include arrangements for the reimbursement to the Council of the additional items. It was noted that the precise mechanism for payment and reimbursement for the Community Association's "extras" was subject to further consideration including the VAT implications.

**RESOLVED that -**

- i) the Director of Administration and Leisure, in consultation with Members of the Civic Offices Reprovision Working Group and the Director of Technical Services, settle the specification and associated contract documentation for the letting of the construction contract at a sum not exceeding the Council's contribution of £1.991m, together with the ACA's contribution of up to £325,000;**
- ii) revised capital programme provision be made in the sum of £1,991,000 (agreed building reprovision), £250,000 (fees) and £325,000 (ACA funded requests) giving a total of £2,566,000 and a capital estimate be approved accordingly; and**
- iii) the final tender position be reported to the next meeting of the Economic Development Committee.**

Chairman

(The meeting ended at 10.30 p.m.)