

**FALKIRK COUNCIL**

**Minute of meeting of Falkirk Council held in the Municipal Buildings, Falkirk on Wednesday 22 June 2016 at 9.30 a.m.**

<b><u>Councillors:</u></b>	David Alexander	Dennis Goldie	Cecil Meiklejohn
	David Balfour	Gerry Goldie	Rosie Murray
	Stephen Bird	Linda Gow	Malcolm Nicol
	Allyson Black	Gordon Hughes	Alan Nimmo
	Jim Blackwood	Steven Jackson	Martin Oliver
	Baillie William	Charles MacDonald	Baillie Joan Paterson
	Buchanan	Brian McCabe	Depute Provost John Patrick
	Colin Chalmers	John McLuckie	Provost Pat Reid
	Steven Carleschi	Adrian Mahoney	Ann Ritchie
	Tom Coleman	Craig Martin	
	Paul Garner	Dr Craig R Martin	

<b><u>Officers:</u></b>	Karen Algie, Head of Human Resources and Business Transformation
	John Angell, Head of Planning and Transportation
	Julie Cole, Transport Planning Manager
	Rhona Geisler, Director of Development Services
	Rose Mary Glackin, Chief Governance Officer
	Iain Henderson, Legal Services Manager
	Colin Moodie, Depute Chief Governance Officer
	Robert Naylor, Director of Children's Services
	Brian Pirie, Democratic Services Manager
	Mary Pitcaithly, Chief Executive
	Stuart Ritchie, Director of Corporate and Housing Services
	Bryan Smail, Chief Finance Officer
	Alistair Steel, Team Leader, Legal Services

**FC13. Minute's Silence**

Council held a minute's silence in memory of Jo Cox, Member of Parliament for Batley and Spen who had been murdered in the course of her work on 16 June 2016.

**FC14. Sederunt**

The sederunt was taken by way of a roll call. Apologies were intimated on behalf of Councillors Spears and Turner.

## **FC15. Declarations of Interest**

In connection with item FC24 Councillor Chalmers advised that he was a former Director of Dial-a-Journey, having been appointed by the Council, but did not consider that this gave rise to any declarable interest under the Code of Conduct.

## **FC16. Minutes and Information Bulletin**

### **(a) Meeting of Falkirk Council held on 11 May 2016.**

#### **Decision**

**The minute of the meeting held on 11 May 2016 was agreed as a correct record.**

### **(b) Meeting of the special meeting of Falkirk Council held on 8 June 2016.**

**The minute of the special meeting held on 8 June 2016 was agreed as a correct record.**

### **(c) Volume of Minutes – Volume 1 2016/2017.**

#### **Decision**

**The Volume of Minutes – Volume 1 2016/2017 was noted.**

### **(c) Information Bulletin – Volume 1 2016/2017.**

#### **Decision**

**The Information Bulletin – Volume 5 2015/2016 was noted.**

## **FC17. Questions**

In terms of Standing Order 32, written questions may be submitted to the Leader of the Council and/or portfolio holders on any matters relating to business transacted at any meeting of the Executive or Education Executive since the last Volume of Minutes was published or to the Provost on civic and related matters.

The Questions put to the Leader of the Council and his answers are recorded in appendix 1.

#### **FC18. Rolling Action Log**

The 'rolling action log' showing progress on outstanding actions from previous meetings was presented.

##### **Decision**

**The rolling action log was noted.**

#### **FC19. Treasury Management Annual Review 2015/16**

Council considered a report by the Director of Corporate and Housing Services presenting the Treasury Management Annual Review for 2015/16.

The Review had previously been considered by the Executive on 7 June 2016 (ref EX24) and had been referred to Council for consideration.

##### **Decision**

**Council approved the Treasury Management Annual Review for 2015/16.**

#### **FC20. Medium Term Financial Strategy**

Council considered a report by the Director of Corporate and Housing Services presenting the medium term financial strategy.

The report set out the 2015/16 budget position together with the provisional budget gap ranges for 2017/18 and 2018/19 of £15-20m and £12-17m respectively.

The report also set out the main sources from which the gaps could be bridged:-

- Council tax;
- strategic reviews;
- terms and conditions;
- reserves;
- service savings;
- Falkirk Community Trust and the Integration Joint Board.

Budget pressures that could flow from the Community Empowerment (Scotland) Act 2015 were highlighted and a high level budget timeline was provided.

## **Decision**

### **Council agreed:-**

- (1) the Revenue Budget Framework set out in the report;**
- (2) the process for developing savings options as detailed in paragraph 3.6.2 of the report; and**
- (3) that the cost of re-instating garden aid is likely to be offset by a higher than anticipated tax yield, as detailed in paragraph 6.1 of the report.**

## **FC21. Annual Accounts 2015/16**

Council considered a report by the Director of Corporate and Housing Services advising that, in accordance with the Local Government (Scotland) Act 1973 and the Local Authority Accounts (Scotland) Regulations 2014, Council was required to submit its unaudited annual accounts for the financial year to 31 March 2016 to the Controller of Audit by 30 June 2016.

The accounts had been considered by the Audit Committee on 20 June 2016 and would be available for public inspection for a three week period starting on 27 June 2016.

Council is required to submit its audited accounts to the Controller of Audit by 30 September 2016. In order to meet that deadline it was proposed that authority be delegated to the Audit Committee to consider and approve the accounts at the meeting scheduled to take place on 26 September 2016.

## **Decision**

### **Council agreed to:-**

- (1) note the arrangements for consideration of the unaudited accounts; and**
- (2) delegate authority to the Audit Committee to consider and approve the audited accounts.**

## **FC22. Contract Standing Orders**

Council considered a report by the Director of Corporate and Housing Services presenting revised Contract Standing Orders for approval.

The current Contract Standing Orders had been adopted by Council in March 2012 (ref FC103). Since then there had been considerable changes

to procurement legislation with the majority of new rules coming into force in April 2016. Additionally the Council had undertaken a number of internal restructures since 2012. Consequently a revised set of Contract Standing Orders had been prepared.

The report summarised the main changes arising from the Procurement Reform (Scotland) Act 2014 and the Public Contracts (Scotland) Regulations 2015 and set out proposed consequential amendments to the Standing Orders. In addition increases to authorisation levels were recommended. It was also proposed that Council adopt new procedures for the appointment of consultants/external advisers. Among other things, this would improve transparency and reduce the need to respond to freedom of information requests by making the information publicly available.

Councillor Nicol, seconded by Baillie Paterson, moved that Council:-

- (1) notes the introduction of the new procurement rules;
- (2) approves the revised Contract Standing Orders; and
- (3) approves the procedures set out in paragraph 5 of the report in relation to external advisers.

As an amendment, Councillor Meiklejohn, seconded by Councillor Jackson, moved, in substitution for the motion, that:-

Council agrees:-

- (1) to note the introduction of new procurement rules;
- (2) that in keeping with recommendations from Audit Scotland, for elected members to be more aware of their responsibilities for financial management, the current reporting arrangements to members of the Executive should be retained including the appointment of external advisors; and
- (3) that as inflation has remained fairly static there is no need to revise the authorisation levels for contract awards, therefore the approval levels of the current contract costs should remain at the current thresholds.

Council adjourned at 10.40 a.m. to allow members to consider the motion and amendment and reconvened at 11.00 a.m. with members present as per the sederunt.

On a division, 17 members voted for the motion and 13 voted for the amendment, with voting as follows:-

For the motion (17) – Provost Reid; Depute Provost Patrick; Baillies Buchanan and Paterson; and Councillors Black, Blackwood, D Goldie, G Goldie, Gow, MacDonald, McLuckie, Mahoney, C Martin, Dr C R Martin, Murray, Nicol and Nimmo.

For the amendment (13) – Councillors Alexander, Balfour, Bird, Carleschi, Chalmers, Coleman, Garner, Hughes, Jackson, McCabe, Meiklejohn, Oliver and Ritchie.

### **Decision**

**Council agreed the motion.**

### **FC23. Local Government Boundary Commission for Scotland: Fifth Review of Electoral Arrangements**

Council considered a report by the Chief Executive presenting the Local Government Boundary Commission for Scotland's recommendations following its Fifth Statutory Review of Electoral Arrangements.

Council had considered and rejected the Commission's proposals in regard to the Falkirk Council area on 27 May 2015 (ref FC14) advising the Commission of its position that the status quo should remain (with one minor exception to address a boundary anomaly which affected a handful of voters in wards 4 and 5).

The Commission had considered the Council's response on 7 July 2015 but had made no change to its published proposals, namely that the number of Councillors should reduce from 32 to 30 with the corresponding amendments to ward boundaries. Public consultation on the proposals took place between June and October 2015 with the Commission's final recommendations being made to the Scottish Ministers in May 2016.

COSLA was due to consider the Commission's recommendations at a Convention meeting on 24 June 2016 and, in the meantime, had sought clarification of the Ministers' plans to respond to the recommendations. In addition the Chief Executive advised that Councils had been invited to support a letter from East Renfrewshire Council to the Minister for Parliamentary Business in regard to the recommendations.

Councillor C Martin, seconded by Councillor Meiklejohn, moved that:-

Council agrees:-

- (1) to oppose the Boundary Commission's recommendations and adhere to the Council's position to maintain 32 elected members; and
- (2) to endorse and sign the letter from East Renfrewshire Council to the Minister for Parliamentary Business.

As an amendment, Councillor Nicol, seconded by Depute Provost Patrick, moved in substitution for the motion, that:-

Council supports the recommendations of the Boundary Commission for Scotland's Fifth Review of Electoral Arrangements as detailed in sections 2.3 to 2.6 of the report

On a division, 28 members voted for the motion and 2 voted for the amendment, with voting as follows:-

For the motion (28) – Provost Reid; Baillies Buchanan and Paterson; Councillors Alexander, Balfour, Bird, Black, Blackwood, Carleschi, Chalmers, Coleman, Garner, D Goldie, G Goldie, Gow, Hughes, Jackson, MacDonald, McCabe, McLuckie, Mahoney, C Martin, Dr C R Martin, Meiklejohn, Murray, Nimmo, Oliver and Ritchie.

For the amendment (2) – Depute Provost Patrick and Councillor Nicol.

### **Decision**

**Council agreed the motion.**

## **FC24. Accessible Transport**

The Provost advised that a deputation request had been made by Order of Malta Dial-a-Journey to be heard in regard to this item. The Provost confirmed that the request had been made in accordance with Standing Orders. Council agreed to hear the deputation.

Herbert Coutts (Chair) addressed the Council, following which members asked questions of him and Duncan Hearsum (Chief Executive) and Lawson Eadie (Service User). The Provost thanked the deputation for addressing Council.

Council then considered a report by the Director of Development Services outlining the consultation activity undergone since the budget meeting in February and proposing an interim contractual position.

As part of its budget considerations, Council had agreed to reduce the accessible transport budget to £69,190 and had asked officers to consult further on proposals for the contract with Order of Malta Dial-a-Journey, with particular regard to the public sector equality duty.

The report summarised the consultation process and the results of this exercise. An assessment of the available data had concluded that the service was not cost effective. However, further analysis was required on the equalities dimension and on alternative sources of provision with a view to bringing forward options for the future of the service from April 2017. In the meantime it was recommended that a new contract with a reduced specification is awarded for the period from 1 August 2016 to 31 March

2017. The service, for 2 vehicles 5 days a week (8.30 to 17.00 hours) in the Falkirk Council area only would cost £105,225.

Councillor Gow, seconded by Councillor C R Martin, moved that:-

Council agrees:-

- (1) that, in order to give notice of a reduced service, the existing contract with Order of Malta Dial-a-Journey (OMDAJ) is extended to 31 July 2016; and
- (2) to award a new contact to OMDAJ from 1 August 2016 until 31 March 2017, for a 2 vehicle, 5 days a week, 8.30 to 17.30 hours Falkirk Council area only service at a cost of £105,225 (an annual rate of £157,838) to allow officers to prepare a further report to the Council on options for the future; the additional costs being met from a combination of existing Transport Planning budgets and the balance (estimated at £66,000) from the bus contracts budget.

As an amendment, Councillor Meiklejohn, seconded by Councillor Jackson, moved, in substitution for the motion, that:-

Council agrees:-

- (1) that by significantly reducing the service level and area of operation with OMDAJ there will be a number of people marginalised and isolated as there would be no alternative; and
- (2) therefore to fund OMDAJ from 1 August 2016 to 31 March 2018 to provide a 7 day a week service with journeys not restricted to only Falkirk Council area at a cost of £164,494.

Council adjourned at 1.00 p.m. for lunch and reconvened at 1.45 p.m. with all members present as per the sederunt, with the exception of Councillor McCabe.

On a division, 16 members voted for the motion, 12 voted for the amendment and one member abstained, with voting as follows:-

For the motion (16) – Provost Reid; Depute Provost Patrick; Baillies Buchanan and Paterson; and Councillors Black, Blackwood, D Goldie, G Goldie, Gow, MacDonald, McLuckie, Mahoney, C Martin, Dr C R Martin, Nicol and Nimmo.

For the amendment (12) – Councillors Alexander, Balfour, Bird, Carleschi, Chalmers, Coleman, Garner, Hughes, Jackson, Meiklejohn, Oliver and Ritchie.

Abstention (1) – Councillor Murray.



## **Decision**

**Council agreed the motion.**

### **FC25. Delegation of Powers to Determine Urgent Issues During the Summer Recess**

Council considered a report by the Director of Corporate and Housing Services on the delegation of powers to determine urgent issues during the summer recess.

## **Decision**

**Council agreed that Chief Officers be given delegated powers, in consultation with the Leader of the Council and/or the relevant portfolio holder or, as appropriate, the relevant Committee Convener and/or Deputy Convener, to determine urgent items of business during the summer recess (from 22 June 2016 to 16 August 2016) and to report the decisions thereon to the first meeting of the Executive thereafter, provided that any such decision:-**

- (1) is required to secure the proper delivery of Council Services and to comply with the Council's statutory duties;**
- (2) does not involve expenditure of Council monies outwith the approved Revenue Budget and Capital Programme;**
- (3) does not involve an increase in the permanent establishment of the particular Service, and**
- (4) involves no dispute as to legality, propriety or the proper interpretation of Council policy as affecting the decision.**

### **FC26. Execution of Deeds**

Council considered a report by the Director of Corporate and Housing Services detailing those deeds that had been signed and sealed on behalf of the Council since the last meeting.

## **Decision**

**Council agreed to note the signing of the deeds listed in the appendix to the report.**

## **FC27. Motion**

### **Bandeath Animal Shelter**

Councillor Garner, seconded by Councillor Balfour, moved that:-

Council agrees that where a financial decision is to be made under delegated powers, and has the potential to be of significant public interest all elected members will receive a briefing paper prior to any decision being implemented.

Council acknowledges the significant public concern at a recent decision to withdraw funding from Bandeath Animal Shelter without recourse to elected members. It now therefore agrees to reinstate the funding for the Shelter and to work with partners and the wider community on the sustainability of the facility for the foreseeable future.

As an amendment, Councillor Blackwood, seconded by Councillor Dr C R Martin, moved in substitution for the motion, that:-

Council agrees:-

- (1) that where a financial decision is to be made under delegated powers and has the potential to be of significant public interest all elected members will receive a briefing paper prior to any decision being implemented;
- (2) to acknowledge the great work of Bandeath dog shelter and the high regard it is thought of throughout the district and the work and passion being shown by the Save Bandeath group;
- (3) to acknowledge that all the local authority partners are committed to funding a dog shelter and have made public their desires that this facility continues to be of the highest quality, such as Bandeath. However Council are aware that Police Scotland is still insisting that they will withdraw their funding. If this is the case we reaffirm that Falkirk Council will not take over the responsibility for the duties and powers placed upon Police Scotland in relation to stray dogs should they withdraw from the Partnership;
- (4) to continue to work with our partners and the wider community on the sustainability of the Bandeath dog shelter; and
- (5) to write to the Chief Constable, Phillip Gormley and Justice Minister, Michael Matheson, asking them to intervene on the decision by Police Scotland of its intention to withdraw funding.

On a division, 12 members voted for the motion, 17 voted for the amendment, with voting as follows:-

For the motion (12) – Councillors Alexander, Balfour, Bird, Carleschi, Chalmers, Coleman, Garner, Hughes, Jackson, Meiklejohn, Oliver and Ritchie.

For the amendment (17) – Provost Reid; Depute Provost Patrick; Baillies Buchanan and Paterson and Councillors Black, Blackwood, D Goldie, G Goldie, Gow, MacDonald, McLuckie, Mahoney, C Martin, Dr C R Martin, Murray, Nicol and Nimmo.

### **Decision**

#### **Council agreed the amendment.**

Councillor D Goldie left the meeting following consideration of the previous item.

### **FC28. Exclusion of Public**

**Council agreed, in terms of s.50A(4) of the Local Government (Scotland) Act 1973 to exclude the press and public from the meeting for the following item of business on the ground that it would involve the likely disclosure of exempt information as defined in paragraphs 11 and 12 of Part 1 of Schedule 7A to the said Act.**

At this point, Councillor Garner declared a non-financial interest in the following item of business as a family member was a claimant and stated that he would take no part in the discussion or decision making on the item. In accordance with his declaration, Councillor Garner left the meeting.

### **FC29. Equal Pay**

Council considered a report by the Director of Corporate and Housing Services setting out the latest position in regard to equal pay claims and setting out options to progress claims made by Trade Union members.

Councillor C Martin, seconded by Baillie Paterson, moved that:-

Council authorise the Director of Corporate and Housing Services to continue negotiations with the Trade Unions with the aim of reaching a settlement. This should be done in line with option 2 contained within paragraph 4.1 of the report.

Councillor Alexander proposed that the motion be adjusted to:-

- (1) to note with concern the flawed two tier settlement proposals following negotiations on equal pay resulting in a divisive and unsustainable situation;

- (2) call for a report back to each full Council meeting on equal pay, and
- (3) that all future negotiations should adopt the previous practice where elected members across party lines are involved in the negotiation process.

After discussion on the terms of the motion Councillor Martin, with the consent of the Provost, and Baillie Paterson as his seconder, agreed to adjust the text as follows:-

Council agrees to:-

- (1) note with concern the flawed two tier settlement proposals following negotiations on equal pay resulting in a divisive and unsustainable situation, recognising that employees are entitled to pursue their claim as they see fit;
- (2) authorise the Director of Corporate and Housing Services to continue negotiations with the Trades Unions with the aim of reaching a settlement. This should be done in line with option 2 contained within paragraph 4.1 of the report;
- (3) receive reports where there has been progress made in the negotiation process and to note that the item will stand as part of the Rolling Action Log which is submitted to each meeting; and
- (4) member involvement in the negotiation process by means to be determined by the Leader of the Council, the Leader of the Opposition and the Provost.

## **Decision**

**Council agreed the motion.**

## FALKIRK COUNCIL

## QUESTIONS UNDER STANDING ORDER 32

Standing Order 32 enables Councillors to put questions to the Leader of the Council or the relevant portfolio holder on matters transacted at a meeting of the Executive or the Education Executive, or to the Provost on civic matters, during the preceding cycle. The table below details the questions asked and answered at the meeting.

A recording of the meeting, including the questions asked and full responses can be found at

<http://www.falkirk.gov.uk/services/council-democracy/councillors-decision-making/committees/falkirk-council-audio/22-june-2016.aspx>

<b>ORDER QUESTION TAKEN: 1</b>	<b>COMMITTEE AND MINUTE REFERENCE: EXECUTIVE - 17 May 2016 (EX17)</b>
<b>REPORT TITLE: TRAFFIC MANAGEMENT ARRANGEMENTS – REQUEST FOR SUPPORT</b>	
<p><b>QUESTION</b></p> <p>The Administration's Executive members took a decision on 17 May 2016, to grant £1,145 to the Loyal Orange Institution of Scotland Falkirk Branch 36.</p> <p>Cllr C Martin, Leader of the Council or Cllr Blackwood, the Public Protection portfolio holder, is asked to explain in detail why this decision was taken and where the corresponding funds will come from?</p> <p>Any public statement should answer the following two points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Contravention, or not, of Council policy – the Community Grant Scheme - attached as an appendix to the Director's report.</li> </ul>	

The Director of Development Services report, 3.3 Policy, directly refers to: “*The scheme generally requires that applications are made well in advance but given recent developments as described in the earlier report **this is not possible in this case**.*”

- Identification of the specific “*roads budget*” now alluded to.

The Director of Development Services report, 3.2 Financial, directly states: “*There are no financial implications other than those contained within the report.*” This is clearly not the case.

**Councillor Brian McCabe**

#### **ANSWER**

The Leader of the Council made the following statement - The Administration took the decision for very clear reasons to minimise the impact on road users and pedestrians throughout Falkirk Town Centre. This decision was entirely about Road Safety to protect the public and the road user. It was not about who the organisations were but about road safety. As Police Scotland had decided late in the day that they were not going to provide traffic management, we had to ensure the March like all marches and parades was undertaken in as safe a manner as possible. Public safety is our number one priority. There was no policy contravention as it was not funded from a community grant scheme but I understand from the Director of Development Services from one of the Network Maintenance fees and charges budget which last year was around £186,000 income. That budget is mainly income (including fees from TTROs) so I believe that the reason there are no financial implications is that this relatively small sum can be met from existing budgets.

#### **SUPPLEMENTARY QUESTION**

On what basis was the figure reached and was there any suggestion it would be met from the Community Grants Scheme originally.

#### **ANSWER**

The Leader of the Council advised that the figure for the costs came from a meeting between officers of the Council including Roads and the management company appointed by the organisers. He further advised that at no time during the discussion was it mentioned that the funding would come from the Community Grants Scheme as this situation was entirely different.

<b>ORDER QUESTION TAKEN: 2</b>	<b>COMMITTEE AND MINUTE REFERENCE: EXECUTIVE - 17 May 2016 (EX17)</b>
<b>REPORT TITLE: DENNY TOWN CENTRE REGENERATION: PHASE TWO DEVELOPMENT</b>	
<p><b>QUESTION</b></p> <p>Can the portfolio holder advise Council whether, following the Executive's decision regarding Denny Town Centre Regeneration Phase Two Development, that Phase 2 “... <i>remarketing is delayed until the Phase 1 building is fully tenanted, the town square is in place and car park is fully utilized</i>”, is the position of this Administration?</p> <p>Are we proposing that we don't remarket Phase 2 until Phase 1 is “fully tenanted”?</p> <p><b>Councillor Brian McCabe</b></p>	
<p><b>ANSWER</b></p> <p>Councillor Dennis Goldie, portfolio holder for Economic Development answered that on 7 June 2016, the Council's Executive agreed to Option 2 as outlined in paragraph 3.3 of the relevant report that the phase 2 site would be remarketed on completion of phase 1. The intention is to give the best impression to prospective investors. The site had been marketed without success. The aim was to get the site cleared, complete Phase 1 and get some tenants in. This would be a better time to market the site and give the best impression to prospective investors. However, the situation will be reviewed regularly and, should earlier marketing be considered appropriate, this can be reported back to Members for reconsideration. Any interest expressed outwith the formal marketing process will be pursued.</p> <p>The marketing brief is currently being finalised and is expected to be ready by end of this week. Our commercial agents will issue with a deadline for interest of 26 August. Following assessment of offers, they will provide their recommendation which is expected to be presented to the Council's Executive in September.</p> <p>With regard to the public art proposals 36 notes of interests were received for artist briefs to be issued. We had 15 submissions received by the deadline date. Short-letting and interviews to be carried out in July/August by a community panel.</p>	
<p><b>SUPPLEMENTARY QUESTION</b></p> <p>Quote from the Falkirk Herald 9 June - the Director recommended that on balance the best way forward was to put the remarketing</p>	

of Phase 2 on hold until Phase 1 is completed and occupied by November. Was she wrong in saying that or did the Falkirk Herald get it wrong?.

**ANSWER**

Councillor D Goldie replied that neither was wrong. He considered the quote that was perfectly reasonable as phase 1 would have tenants in it between September and October.

**ORDER QUESTION TAKEN: 3**

**COMMITTEE AND MINUTE REFERENCE: EXECUTIVE - 7 June 2016 (EX29)**

**REPORT TITLE: DENNY TOWN CENTRE REGENERATION: PHASE TWO DEVELOPMENT**

**QUESTION**

The marketing brief is currently being finalised and is expected to be ready by end of this week. Our commercial agents will issue with a deadline for interest of 26 August. Following assessment of offers, they will provide their recommendation which is expected to be presented to the Council's Executive in September.

With regard to the public art proposals 36 notes of interests were received for artist briefs to be issued. We had 15 submissions received by the deadline date. Short-letting and interviews will be carried out in July/August by a community panel.

**ANSWER**

Councillor D Goldie replied that the marketing brief had slipped by a month from May to June. It is currently being finalised and is expected to be ready by end of the week. Our commercial agents will issue it with a deadline for interest of 26 August. Following assessment of offers, they will provide their recommendation which is expected to be presented to the Council's Executive in September.

With regard to the public art proposals 36 notes of interests were received for artist briefs to be issued. We had 15 submissions received by the deadline date. Short-letting and interviews to be carried out in July/August by a community panel.

**SUPPLEMENTARY QUESTION**

What changes were made to the brief taking on board the local members' concern regarding item 5 of your public art proposals.



This is the public art strategy that identifies an area 5 which is right by Denny Cross and within the marketing brief or within the document called “a place to play – the lazy corner”.

I and the other local members had a meeting with Councillor Goldie where we identified this was not a good place for “a place to play a lazy corner” (right by Denny Cross).

Councillor Goldie was going to take that on board. Was anything done about it?

### **ANSWER**

Informed by the period of community engagement, Icecream architecture consolidated feedback and proposed five broad themes that would direct the development of the public art during the regeneration period. These themes were – Activity; Trade; Networks; Heritage; Environment. The themes are expanded upon fully in the Denny Public Art Plan 2015/17 together with strategic objectives for each as well as suggested opportunities that help illustrate the range of potential approaches for public art development within each theme, respectively.

The 5 Artists' Briefs have been developed in line with the Public Art Presentation that was made to the public. The five commissions are:-

- The Picture House (way-finding and light projection)
- The Treasure Trail (small sculptural interventions across the site)
- The Railings (sculptural and interactive)
- The Staircase (a visual feature)
- The Lazy Corner (a place to play)

The Lazy Corner idea grew out of discussions with the community as an area that people could gather and chat. It is not a play facility but an opportunity to house a playful element within the landscaping/stone work at the floor level of this feature which explores imaginative responses generated by local children and young people for features they would like to see in the town centre. We would envisage the commission as an opportunity to reflect and bring alive some of these elements. I met with Denny Members and Officers who decided that it will be moved from that particular corner and that there will be a reconstruction of that corner basically because of Members.

