



City of Westminster Cabinet Member Report

Decision Maker: *Cabinet Member for Finance, Property and Regeneration*

Date: *24 May 2019*

Classification: *For General Release*

Title: *Church Street Sites A, B & C – Preferred Way Forward (PWF)*

Wards Affected: *Church Street*

City for All Summary

The proposed Option will meet three of the Council's City for All objectives. **Civic Leadership and Responsibility** will be demonstrated by a transparent process that has fully engaged with residents as part of a strategy of continuous engagement with the community and residents. A detailed consultation has been held on a range of potential options including do nothing, refurbishment and redevelopment with residents and Secure Tenants whose existing homes might be affected by redevelopment. The designs would be developed, and any future renewal will promote **Opportunity and Fairness** by providing more homes of all types and providing access to potentially sector leading delivery of council and healthcare services; improving resident's lives and creating a vibrant community which is full of opportunity. The design development and potential future renewal of Church Street sites A, B & C is a significant chance to strengthen a **World Class City** through creating high quality homes and a variety of safe and engaging open spaces that better connect Church Street and the surrounding areas.

Key Decision: Yes

Financial Summary: The projected financial position for the preferred way forward is within the current approved budgets. The final mix and design of the scheme will have considerable impact on the financial position and the detail will be set out as part of the Outline Business Case.

1. Executive Summary

- 1.1. The Church Street Masterplan was approved by Cabinet in December 2017 as the Council's framework for informing the future regeneration of the Church Street area. The Cabinet Report recommended further consultation be undertaken on a full range of options including maintenance, refurbishment and development options prior to the selection of the preferred option.
- 1.2. Following this, the Council's Development Team engaged a multidisciplinary consultant team to work up a full range of options for the three largest development sites within the Masterplan, namely Sites A, B & C and Church Street market. The Council and its consultants have developed four options for these sites and the Market, and these are as follows (refer to Appendix B & C for further details)
 - Option 1 – Maintenance
 - Option 2 – Refurbishment
 - Option 3 – Part refurbishment, part redevelopment
 - Option 4 – Full redevelopment
- 1.3. In order to arrive at a recommended preferred option, officers have considered
 - The views of the community on each of the options through an extensive public consultation exercise.
 - The assessment carried out by the Council and its consultants on each of the options. This was assessed against the corporate objectives and the community's priorities.
 - The views of the market through a soft market testing exercise.
- 1.4. Responses received as part of the options consultation exercise indicate the participants are strongly in favour of redevelopment. Option 3 is the most favoured. Option 3 also enjoys significant support from leaders in the community including Ward Councillors, the Neighbourhood Forum and many workshop participants. Option 3 was also most favoured in a poster campaign for the retention of Kennet House.
- 1.5. Option 4 performs better than option 3 in the delivery of new homes. However, given the support from the community and considering the benefit of other factors such as health and wellbeing, market and enterprise and making connections option 4 performs only slightly better than option 3. As discussed below in paragraph 1.9 there are significant challenges in the acquisition of interests outside the Council's freehold. Given the general sense in the community that delivery should be accelerated this makes option 4 less attractive.
- 1.6. Viability of both options 3 and 4 is now significantly better than the Masterplan scheme and the costs for the HRA for option 3 are also within the existing HRA budgets.
- 1.7. Soft market testing indicates that the market is supportive of both option 3 and option 4. Whilst some participants expressed a preference for option 4, most recognised the delivery risks with option 4 and expressed a preference for option 3.
- 1.8. The scope of redevelopment of option 3 currently excludes Kennet House, properties on Edgware Road on Site A (with the exception of Graham Trust land) and Edgware Road on Site C. Consultation responses received indicate that the participants place value on the

Dutch-gabled terraced properties on Edgware Road on Site A but also the Local Planning Authority considers them to be of value. Retention of Kennet House is also widely supported by the participants of the options consultation. With regards to the properties on Edgware Road on Site C, these are considered to detract from the character and appearance of the area and will be detrimental to the appearance, value and benefits of the regeneration scheme. For this reason, officers recommend that properties on Edgware Road on Site C are considered for redevelopment as part of option 3.

1.9. In determining the Preferred Way Forward, matters of risk and deliverability also need to be considered carefully alongside assessment against corporate objectives and community's priorities, market opinion and the options consultation.

1.10. There are the following additional risk and delivery challenges with option 4:

- As stated above in paragraph 1.5, the acquisition of interests outside the Council's freehold for option 4 may lead to a prolonged delivery programme and add risk and complexity to the CPO process. Option 3 has reduced CPO risks and a quicker delivery timescale. Even if further properties on Edgware Road on Site C are included for redevelopment under option 3, this option will continue to have reduced CPO risks and quicker delivery timescale than option 4.
- Added planning risks as it includes the demolition of Edgware Road properties on Site A which the Local Planning Authority and some parts of the local community consider to be of architectural and historic value. Option 3 has a reduced planning risk as it retains the properties which are considered to be of value.
- Added political risks arise from the community's desire to retain Kennet House, which would be demolished in option 4. Option 3 retains Kennet House.

1.11. For all the reasons stated above, this paper recommends option 3 as the Preferred Way Forward. The key next step is to develop option 3 further with a view to presenting an Outline Business Case to the Cabinet Member in Autumn this year.

2. Recommendations

That the Cabinet Member for Finance, Property and Regeneration:

- 2.1. approves option 3 as the Preferred Way Forward to progress Sites A, B & C and Church Street market and return to Cabinet Member with an Outline Business Case for approval in Autumn 2019;
- 2.2. authorises Officers to consider the inclusion of the properties on Edgware Road on Site C in the scope of redevelopment of option 3;
- 2.3. in connection with progressing option 3, authorises Officers to enter into voluntary negotiations with leaseholders in any or all blocks within Sites A, B & C (with the exception of Kennet House) to apply the acquisition budget to acquire all leasehold interests by agreement at open market value and offer compensation in line with the Council's Policy on Leaseholders in Housing Renewal Areas;
- 2.4. also, in connection with progressing option 3, authorises the implementation by Officers of the Council's Policy for Tenants in Housing Renewal Areas (as updated from time to time) to include all blocks in Sites A, B & C (with the exception of Kennet House).

3. Reasons for Decision

3.1. The decisions requested in this report will:

- enable the proposals of the chosen option to be progressed and developed into an Outline Business Case for consideration by the Cabinet Member in Autumn of 2019;
- enable the achievement of vacant possession of all blocks on Sites A, B & C (except Kennet House) in readiness for redevelopment in accordance with the emerging development programme time - table.

4. Background, including Policy Context

Public Consultation

- 4.1. An Options Consultation was undertaken over an 8-week period from 7 March – 30 April 2019 with residents, businesses and market traders living and working in Sites A, B & C, the Church Street market and the wider Church Street community.
- 4.2. The consultation process was comprehensively publicised with over 6,000 invitation flyers distributed, 160 posters displayed, invitation letters sent to all resident – tenants and leaseholders in Sites A, B & C and invitation e-mails sent to resident's associations, the Neighbourhood Forum, schools, Councillors, the local MP, business forum, Church Street library, community organisations, Central Area Panel and various youth clubs.
- 4.3. During this time, the Council used 35-37 Church Street as a consultation base from which it hosted an exhibition with models and visualisations of the options. It was open every week day from 10am to 4pm, with some weekend and evening openings. Workshops and themed drop-in events for engaged resident groups, business forum, market traders and youth groups were also held.
- 4.4. The consultation team also visited local schools and community organisations. Meetings were held with stakeholders including the committee of the Church Street Ward Neighbourhood Forum, ward Councillors, Church Street library etc.
- 4.5. A website providing consultation information and an opportunity to provide feedback was also available. All residents on the three sites were door-knocked to inform and encourage participation. Targeted door-knocking exercise was also undertaken to engage with the 'harder to reach' sections of the community.
- 4.6. Despite extensive previous consultations and the resulting consultation fatigue within the community the Options Consultation was well attended, and comprehensive feedback was received from the community. A total of 236 people attended the exhibition and 75 people attended the themed drop-ins and workshops. A total of 165 people provided written feedback including 100 respondents living on Sites A, B & C.
- 4.7. In the written feedback, the community were invited to give their overall view on the four options and give their detailed view on each individual option based on the extent to which each option met the identified key priorities.
- 4.8. Responses to both the general and detailed view indicate a clear and strong support for the redevelopment options (3 and 4).
- 4.9. Responses to the questions about their detailed view were provided by a smaller number of respondents. Their responses indicate full development (option 4) being the most favoured with slightly fewer respondents favouring part development (option 3).
- 4.10. Responses to the questions about their general view were provided by a much greater number of respondents. As summarised below, these responses marginally favour option 3.
 - 36% of respondents thought option 1 met or exceeded the needs of the community
 - 38% of respondents thought option 2 met or exceeded the needs of the community

- 63% of respondents thought option 3 met or exceeded the needs of the community
- 62% of respondents thought option 4 met or exceeded the needs of the community

4.11. A notable response was the significant support from the community for the retention of Kennet House. This included ward Councillors, the Neighbourhood Forum, workshop participants, a poster campaign within the building and individual responses from residents of Kennet House.

4.12. Overall consultation responses indicate strong support for redevelopment of Church Street Sites A, B & C. On balance, when taking in to account the responses to both the general and detailed views on the options, alongside written support from stakeholders, and the poster campaign, the community displays a slightly higher preference for option 3.

Consultation with ward Councillors

4.13. The three Church Street Ward Councillors, Aicha Less, Matt Noble and Aziz Toki submitted a detailed written response.

4.14. The ward councillors made the following key points

- They commented that “the library should retain its own discrete site on Church Street itself. Church Street should not just be for retail/hospitality”.
- They raised concerns about the future location of Westminster Adult Education Services, stating that this must remain in Church Street Ward.
- They requested, if either Option 3 or 4 is selected, current Church Street residents must be given priority over the social and intermediate homes that are built. Leaseholders who wish to remain must also be supported to do so.
- They favour a modified version of Option 3. However, they raised concerns about the increased density and note that it is ‘disappointing that the Council is not being more ambitious in its allocation of social and genuinely affordable housing’.
- They questioned the calculations put forward in the consultation in relation to social housing. They state that the ‘figures should represent how many affordable homes are delivered on the uplift in numbers.

Assessment against community’s priorities and corporate objectives

4.15. Each of the four options has been evaluated against criteria and weighting based on the corporate objectives of the Council and priorities identified as important to the residents. The criteria include Viability, Homes, Health and Wellbeing, Market and Enterprise and Movement – these have been drawn from the Church Street Masterplan and confirmed as the community’s priorities in the recent consultation in October and November last year.

4.16. Viability is calculated by taking all agreed costs and all agreed income and profiling these against a 30-year timeline. The net position of these costs, year on year, are discounted by 5.25% to reflect the cost of money over time. The combined sum of the discounted year on year net positions is the indicator for viability for each option, which is as follows.

- Option 1 - £7,200,000
- Option 2 - £5,600,000
- Option 3 - negative £19,000,000
- Option 4 - £2,000,000

4.17. The viability of the Masterplan scheme is -£47m. The basis of calculation of viability and inputs differ between options 3 and 4 and the previous masterplan scheme, however it still provides a useful indicator.

4.18. Below is a table summarising the assessment of the two development options and how they perform against the community’s and Council’s priorities.

Theme / Weighting	Question	Option 3 – Summary of assessment	Option 4 – Summary of assessment
Viability (20%)	Question 1: How viable is the option	Viability is negative £19m.	Viability is £2m.
Homes (40%)	Question 2: Does it provide more dwellings	Provides 768 new homes of which 264 new homes are affordable.	Provides 1089 new homes of which 388 new homes are affordable.
	Question 3: Does it provide more affordable homes		
	Question 4: Does it provide better homes	Design of homes in both options will be in accordance with the Nationally Prescribed Space Standards which promote dual aspect flats, good natural surveillance, adaptable for changing needs and provision of private amenity space. It's estimated that the new homes will require less energy to heat thereby expected to reduce heating bills.	
Market and enterprise (14%)	Question 5: Does it improve the commercial and retail offer	<p>Along Church Street both options will provide significantly improved fit for purpose retail premises for both new and existing retail providers including a new supermarket. Both options will provide enterprise and commercial spaces, opportunity for more retail jobs and an improved range and diversity of retail offer which better meets the needs of the shoppers and the community.</p> <p>Along Edgware Road change and improvements described above will be achieved in option 4, in option 3 however they will be extremely limited.</p> <p>Both options will provide comprehensive improvements to the Market in terms of its design, layout, appearance, storage, parking, provision of water, electricity and trader welfare facilities including toilets.</p>	
	Question 6: Does it improve the market		
	Question 7: Does it improve business opportunities		
Health and wellbeing (16%)	Question 8: Does it improve open space and the environment	<p>Both options will provide comprehensively better quality and range of public and communal open space with planting, street furniture and play equipment to facilitate play, leisure and visual amenity. Option 3 is estimated to have slightly lesser quantum of open space than option 4 however there will be little noticeable difference in the quality of the environment and the public realm experience along Church Street and other side streets within the development.</p> <p>The environment of Edgware Road along Site A and C however will experience very limited improvements in option 3.</p>	
	Question 9: Does it improve community services		
	Question 10: What level of disruption does it cause		
	Question 11: Does it create safer neighbourhoods		

		<p>Both options will be designed in line with “Secure by Design” principles including appropriate levels of lighting, controlled and managed access to buildings and communal areas, appropriate use of CCTV etc.</p> <p>Both options will provide an appropriate provision of community services complimenting the provision within the Health and Wellbeing Hub at Lilestone Street.</p> <p>Both options will cause significant disruption to residents, businesses and traders during the construction period, although both will seek to minimise this by facilitating single move for residents and continuity of trade for market traders and businesses. Disruption will affect proportionately lesser number of residents and businesses in the option 3 as buildings are being retained in this option.</p>
Making connections (10%)	Question 13: Does it improve the experience of pedestrians	<p>Both options will provide comprehensive improvements to the pedestrian experience by introducing new routes and improving existing routes and spaces in terms of better-quality road and pavement surfaces, wider and clearly defined footways, less clutter, better lighting and signage, street furniture and clear priority given to pedestrian in the design of the new development.</p> <p>Parking both residential and Market will be better managed.</p> <p>The improved environment, lighting, signage and permeability will encourage walking, access to secure bike storage will encourage cycling and access to car clubs will discourage car ownership. Both options will have the opportunity to improve virtual connectivity.</p>
	Question 14: Does it encourage more sustainable modes of transport	
	Question 15: Does it create a more connected neighbourhood	
	Question 16: Does it improve virtual connectivity	

4.19. The above assessment table demonstrates that option 4 performs better in terms of viability and homes as compared to option 3. With regards to the other assessment criteria the two options perform much closer together with option 4 performing marginally better against all three assessment criteria including Market and Enterprise, Health and Wellbeing and Making Connections.

4.20. The assessment of the two options however should take into account wider factors including those articulated in paragraph 1.5 and 1.9. Option 3 is less risky and more deliverable than option 4 and this is discussed in more detail later in the report.

Soft Market Testing

4.21. The Council undertook an informal soft market testing in April this year to gauge market interest from potential partners. The market acknowledged the potential of the scheme and its location in an area undergoing change and growth and expressed a strong interest in partnering in a capacity suitable to Council’s requirements. They were broadly supportive of both redevelopment options 3 and 4. However, some participants expressed a preference for comprehensive redevelopment as set out within option 4. Most participants felt that the proposals, in terms of its height and density, should be more ambitious, although recognised

the height restrictions within the emerging City Plan. Further details of soft market testing exercise are set out in Appendix D.

Programme and phasing

- 4.22. The Church Street Masterplan, 2017 provides the framework for the future regeneration of the Church Street area. It indicates the development sequence to follow Site A, Site B and Site C. It further indicates the redevelopment of Blackwater House as the first block within Site A.
- 4.23. The intention to redevelop Site A with Blackwater House as the first block within that was confirmed in the recent Options consultation exercise.
- 4.24. As part of design development of the options, officers have considered programming and phasing matters and estimate 'start on site' on Site A for both options 3 and 4 to be in 2022.
- 4.25. There are currently 229 tenants in Sites A, B & C (excluding Kennet House) who will need to decant to achieve vacant possession of the blocks. The decant will take place at different stages according to an emerging decanting strategy.
- 4.26. Officers are undertaking detailed assessment of both on-site and off-site, temporary and permanent decant opportunities for these tenants. Full details of the decant strategy will be presented as part of the Outline Business Case in Autumn this year.
- 4.27. In the meantime, to commence the decant process to achieve vacant possession in readiness for start on site in 2022, decant status is requested for all blocks (with the exception of Kennet House) in Sites A, B & C.

5. Financial Implications

- 5.1. FIs have been assessed in relation to option 3, as the preferred option to be taken forward.
- 5.2. The Council has existing Capital budgets in place within the HRA based on a developer delivery approach. These are set out in the table below.

5.3. Table 1: Existing Capital Budget

Item	£'000
Leaseholder acquisitions	178,674
Fees and contingency	15,040
Social buy backs	105,250
Total Expenditure	298,964
Affordable Housing Fund	(105,250)
Capital Receipts	(134,102)
Total Income	(239,352)
Net position	59,612

- 5.4. In addition to these there are Capital budgets included within the General Fund for the next three years. This is for the acquisition of properties to be used as TA which will then be purchased back by the HRA. The HRA leaseholder acquisitions budget is therefore profiled to start in 2022/23. The overall position for the GF is net nil but the gross capital expenditure is £58.471m.
- 5.5. The costs for the HRA of preferred option 3, if delivered by a developer, are within the existing budgets shown in table 1 above. The main reasons for this are that the leaseholder acquisitions are forecast to be lower than budgeted as the Edgware Road properties are no longer required to be purchased in option 3. There are also additional units as part of the scheme from the original masterplan which help to produce and increased land value.
- 5.6. As part of the Outline Business Case (OBC) in autumn this year, further refinement will be made to the scheme such as tenure mix, delivery routes etc. This will impact on the final financial position which will be presented as part of the OBC. However, at this stage we are not able to make detailed projections around these variables.
- 5.7. The current assumptions are that £105m of Affordable Housing Fund (AHF) is used to acquire the social units back from a developer. The level and use of AHF within this scheme will be reviewed as part of the OBC.
- 5.8. Key risks that may impact on the financial position of the scheme include the market appetite of developers. Recent experience with the Ebury scheme suggests market sale properties may not be popular in the present market.
- 5.9. Assumptions included within the financial modelling around build costs and anticipated income may require updating for the OBC which will impact on the financial position. The scope of any additional public realm works will need to be considered as these are unable to produce a commercial return in the way a rental or commercial unit.

6. Legal Implications

- 6.1. The decisions in this report are being undertaken under Section (1) of the Localism Act 2011, the power to do anything that individuals may generally do (the general power of competence). The Council also has the power under Section 111 of the Local Government Act 1972 to do anything, which is calculated to facilitate or is conducive or incidental to the discharge of any of its functions.
- 6.2. Under Section 105 of the Housing Act 1985, the Council has a legal obligation to consult its secure tenants on matters of housing management such as changes to the management, maintenance, improvement or demolition of dwelling-houses let by the Council under secure tenancies or changes in the provision of services or amenities in relation to such dwelling-

houses. The Council should consider the outcomes of such consultation prior to making any decisions that relate to such housing management matters.

- 6.3. In deciding whether to approve the proposals for consultation, Members must comply with the public sector equality duty under section 149 of the Equality Act 2010, and the assessment commissioned by the Council in this regard is discussed at paragraph 8 of Appendix A of this report.
- 6.4. Section 17 of the Housing Act 1985 authorises the Council to acquire: (a) land as a site for the erection of houses, (b) houses, or buildings which may be made suitable as houses, together with any land occupied with the houses or buildings, (c) land proposed to be used for any facilities provided in connection with housing accommodation, (d) land in order to carry out on it works for the purpose of, or connected with, the alteration, enlarging, repair or improvement of an adjoining house.
- 6.5. If the Council is not able to acquire property rights and interests or tenancies by agreement then as a local authority, the Council has the power to compulsorily purchase land (or rights over land) by way of making a CPO. The procedure for making and confirming CPOs is governed by the Acquisition of Land Act 1981, as amended by the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004. If the Council needs to consider making a decision in principle to proceed with a CPO, the Council would at that time, need to rely on legal advice in terms of choosing the most appropriate power and other relevant considerations.
- 6.6. In implementing a decant policy through to demolition of a building, the Council should be aware of the provisions of the Housing Act 1985 (as amended) enabling the suspension of right to buy claims. There is a procedure for the service of initial and final demolition notices for local authorities. The effect of the service of initial demolition notices on secure tenants is to suspend the requirement for the Council to complete right to buy applications for as long as the notice remains in force. If the Council serves a final demolition notice, the right to buy application will lapse and no further application can then be made whilst the final demolition notice is in effect. It is too soon to factor in service of such notices at the same time these powers are noted as a potential implication of a decant status.

7. Recommendation of the Preferred Way Forward

- 7.1. Evaluation of the four options against the criteria and weighting based on the corporate objectives of the Council and priorities identified as important to the residents demonstrates that option 4 delivers significantly more homes, is significantly more viable and delivers greater place - making benefits.
- 7.2. Option 3 which excludes the redevelopment of Edgware Road properties which is the main frontage of the development site, in particular properties along Site C which are of poor architectural quality and appearance (Site A Edgware Road frontage properties are considered to have historic and architectural merit) limits the transformational impact of regeneration and has been noted as 'missed opportunity' by respondents to the community consultation and soft market testing. It has been argued that these sites do not need to be acquired by the Council for it to be developed in line with the Masterplan objectives at some point in the future. However, it should be noted that majority of the properties on the site are owned by individuals, so the likelihood of the market bringing forward these sites as a comprehensive development is questionable. To maximise the transformational impact, Officers recommend that the properties on Edgware Road on Site C which are of poor quality and appearance are included within the scope of option 3.
- 7.3. Responses received as part of the options consultation exercise indicates that the community are strongly in favour of redevelopment and change and whilst they acknowledge the comprehensive benefits of the full redevelopment option as indicated in their detailed response to each option, albeit a smaller number of people provided these comments they strongly support the retention of Kennet House and in the final analysis favour option 3 the most.

- 7.4. In determining the Preferred Way Forward, matters of development risk and deliverability also need to be taken into account alongside assessment against community's priorities and corporate objectives, market opinion and options consultation.
- 7.5. There are the following additional risk and delivery challenges with option 4:
- As stated above in paragraph 1.5, the acquisition of interests outside the Council's freehold for option 4 may lead to a prolonged delivery programme and add risk and complexity to the CPO process. Option 3 has reduced CPO risks and a quicker delivery timescale. Even if further properties on Edgware Road frontage on Site C are included for redevelopment under option 3, this option will still have reduced CPO risks and quicker delivery timescale than option 4.
 - Added planning risks as it includes the demolition of Edgware Road properties on Site A which the Local Planning Authority and some parts of the local community consider to be of architectural and historic value. Option 3 has a reduced planning risk as it retains the properties which are considered to be of value.
 - Added political risks arise from the community's desire to retain Kennet House, which would be demolished in option 4. Option 3 retains Kennet House.
- 7.6. On balance taking into account the outcome of the public consultation, evaluation against the community's priorities and corporate objectives, market opinion and options consultation option 3 is the recommended Preferred Way Forward.

Next Steps

- 7.7. If the Cabinet Member approves the recommendations in this report, officers will progress the design of option 3 and return to the Cabinet Member with an Outline Business Case in Autumn 2019. Further approval in Autumn 2019 will also include:
- A delivery route and grant authority to procure and negotiate with delivery partner(s) if applicable.
 - A planning application strategy.
 - A revised budget for option 3 if applicable.
 - A CPO strategy, but only to be implemented after negotiations have been exhausted and as a method of last resort.
 - A phasing and decanting strategy

APPENDICES

Appendix A - Other Implications

Appendix B - The four consultation options

Appendix C - Consultation brochure

Appendix D - Options consultation report

Appendix E - Summary of Soft Market Testing findings

For completion by the **Cabinet Member for Finance, Property and Regeneration**

Declaration of Interest

I have <no interest to declare / to declare an interest> in respect of this report

Signed: _____ Date: _____

NAME: **Councillor Rachael Robathan, Cabinet Member for Finance, Property and Regeneration**

State nature of interest if any

.....
(N.B: If you have an interest you should seek advice as to whether it is appropriate to make a decision in relation to this matter)

For the reasons set out above, I agree the recommendations in the report entitled **Church Street Sites A, B & C – Preferred Way Forward (PWF)** and reject any alternative options which are referred to but not recommended.

Signed

Councillor Rachael Robathan, Cabinet Member for Finance, Property and Regeneration

Date

If you have any additional comment which you would want actioned in connection with your decision you should discuss this with the report author and then set out your comment below before the report and this pro-forma is returned to the Secretariat for processing.

Additional comment:
.....
.....

If you do not wish to approve the recommendations, or wish to make an alternative decision, it is important that you consult the report author, the Director of Law the Executive Director of Finance and Resources and, if there are resources implications, the Director of People Services (or their representatives) so that (1) you can be made aware of any further relevant considerations that you should take into account before making the decision and (2) your reasons for the decision can be properly identified and recorded, as required by law.

Note to Cabinet Member: Your decision will now be published and copied to the Members of the relevant Policy & Scrutiny Committee. If the decision falls within the criteria for call-in, it will not be implemented until five working days have elapsed from publication to allow the Policy and Scrutiny Committee to decide whether it wishes to call the matter in.