

 <p>WARWICK DISTRICT COUNCIL</p>	<p>Executive – 9th February 2011</p>	<p>Agenda Item No. 11</p>
<p>Title</p>	<p>Feasibility study of various WDC assets in Leamington</p>	
<p>For further information about this report please contact</p>	<p>Bill Hunt Deputy Chief Executive (01926) 456014 bill.hunt@warwickdc.gov.uk</p>	
<p>Service Area</p>	<p>Chief Executive’s Office</p>	
<p>Wards of the District directly affected</p>	<p>Leamington Milverton and Clarendon</p>	
<p>Is the report private and confidential and not for publication by virtue of a paragraph of schedule 12A of the Local Government Act 1972, following the Local Government (Access to Information) (Variation) Order 2006</p>	<p>No</p>	
<p>Date and meeting when issue was last considered and relevant minute number</p>	<p>6/1/11 Executive Minute number 119</p>	
<p>Background Papers</p>	<p>Previous Spencer Yard reports to Executive and Scrutiny Committees</p> <p>Spencer Yard project papers and all background and working papers and correspondence</p> <p>Accommodation Review report to Executive April 2010</p> <p>EC Harris Accommodation Review report, background and working papers</p> <p>Royal Spa Centre report to Executive November 2009</p> <p>Spa Centre Task & Finish Group reports and background papers</p> <p>Customer Access in Leamington reports to Executive June 2010, June and February 2009 and One Stop Shop background working papers</p> <p>Bath Place report to Executive March 2010 and background working papers and correspondence</p> <p>Town Hall Working Group papers and correspondence with CAB</p> <p>Car Park Strategy</p>	

	Asset Management Steering Group and Strategic Asset Group papers and minutes
	Budget Improvement Programme and Fit for the Future reports and background papers

Contrary to the policy framework:	No
Contrary to the budgetary framework:	No
Key Decision?	Yes
Included within the Forward Plan? (If yes include reference number)	No

Officer/Councillor Approval		
With regard to officer approval all reports <i>must</i> be approved by the report authors relevant director, Finance, Legal Services and the relevant Portfolio Holder(s).		
Officer Approval	Date	Name
Relevant Director	Author	Bill Hunt
Chief Executive	23/01/11	Chris Elliott
CMT	23/01/11	Chris Elliott, Andrew Jones
Section 151 Officer	23/01/11	Mike Snow
Legal		Suzanne Burrell
Finance	23/01/11	Jenny Clayton
Portfolio Holder(s)	25/01/11	Cllr. Doody, Cllr. Hammon, Cllr. Caborn, Cllr. Mrs. Gallagher
Consultation Undertaken		
Final Decision?	Yes	
Suggested next steps (if not final decision please set out below)		

1. **SUMMARY**

- 1.1 This report explores the potential to complement the specific Spencer Yard feasibility study, jointly funded by that project's partners, approved at the 6 January Executive, by undertaking a much wider WDC funded feasibility study to examine potential future options for WDC owned assets in both Spencer Yard and elsewhere in Leamington.

2. **RECOMMENDATIONS**

- 2.1 That Executive approve the commissioning of a high level feasibility study to produce options appraisals and an outline masterplan for the Spencer Yard, Bath Place, Station Approach, Pump Rooms, Town Hall, Spa Centre and Riverside House sites.
- 2.2 That Executive agree that a maximum £90,000 allocation for the estimated cost of the work is met from the 2010/12 Contingency Budget, carried forward, if necessary, to 2011/12 by way of an Ear Marked Reserve.
- 2.3 That Executive delegates authority to the Deputy Chief Executive, in consultation with the Leader of the Council and Portfolio Holders for Development, Culture and Customer & Information Services, to finalise the specification for the study prior to its tender.
- 2.4 That Executive note the findings of the high level accommodation review of Riverside House, as set out in Appendix One.
- 2.5 That Executive agree the Principles of Occupancy arising from this review, as set out in Appendix Two, for future application as the basis on which WDC will occupy its headquarters building(s), at either Riverside House or any new location.
- 2.6 That Executive agree to discontinue the current review of the Spa Centre and instruct the Head of Cultural Services and Spa Centre Manager to prepare a 4 year business plan on the basis of an assumed 5% reduction in net costs per annum.
- 2.7 That, subject to the agreement of the Chairs of the Scrutiny Committees, Executive agree a revised remit for the existing Spa Centre Task and Finish Group to monitor the delivery of the Business Plan and nominate the Finance Portfolio Holder to work with the group.
- 2.8 That Executive agree to defer any consideration of future major capital investment in the Town Hall until after the outcome of the study is known.
- 2.9 That Executive continue to pursue discussions with the Warwick District Citizens Advice Bureau but otherwise agree to defer any further consideration of alternative options for the use of the Town Hall until after the outcome of the study is known.
- 2.10 That Executive agree to defer the consideration of a business case for the creation of a One Stop Shop at the Royal Pump Rooms until after the outcome of the study is known

- 2.11 That Executive note that the catering contract for the Royal Pump Rooms will continue to be let on the previously agreed timetable and that the study will need to reflect the existence and duration of this contract.
- 2.12 That Executive continue the current marketing exercise to identify a potential occupier of surplus space at Riverside House but agree to defer the completion of any potential agreement to lease space until after the outcome of the study is known.
- 2.13 That Executive approve the undertaking of an exercise to determine the potential value of the Riverside House site based on alternative future uses.

3. **REASONS FOR THE RECOMMENDATION**

3.1 Feasibility Study and Outline Masterplan

- 3.1.1 Executive approved the commissioning of a feasibility study to explore potential options to meet the current funding shortfall on the Spencer Yard project, created by the withdrawal of all AWM funding from the project, at its meeting on 6 January 2011. That study, costing £35,000, exclusive of VAT, will be jointly funded by the project partners, WDC, the Loft Theatre and City Spirit Limited, and is predicated on an assumption that the project will continue on the basis of the refurbishment of the former United Reform Church (URC) as a new theatre for the Loft Theatre, with subsequent redevelopment of their current site and the adjoining, WDC owned, former Dole Office. The study will explore options to fund the project by alternative use of other buildings in the Spencer Yard area including the Pump Rooms, associated options for potential parking development at Bath Place and/or Station Approach and consideration of an alternative relocation of the Loft theatre to the Spa Centre site.
- 3.1.2 However, in addition to its holdings at Spencer Yard WDC owns a number of buildings, car parks and other land holdings elsewhere within Leamington Spa, all of which have previously been subject to varying levels of assessment as to their potential for alternative use. These assessments have tended to be conducted on a piecemeal, site by site, basis and the opportunity now exists to undertake a co-ordinated feasibility study of potential future options across all these sites.
- 3.1.3 The sites for inclusion within the proposed wider study are:
- Riverside House site
 - Royal Pump Rooms
 - Royal Spa Centre site
 - Leamington Town Hall
 - former URC, Spencer Street
 - West Wing & North Hall, Spencer Yard
 - Bath Place car park
 - Packington Place car park and the adjoining former Italian Club
 - WDC land holdings at Station Approach
- 3.1.4 Although the Spencer Yard properties are already within the remit of the separate study referred to at 3.1.1 that does not preclude a separate examination of their potential for alternative use as part of this proposed study. This study, if approved, will be run entirely separately and would allow an exploration of any alternative options to the current proposed basis for the

development of a Cultural Quarter and/or any other future commercial opportunities for WDC at Spencer Yard.

- 3.1.5 The wider feasibility study is intended to build on and complement previous or, in the case of the separate Spencer Yard study, existing pieces of work to enable members and officers to understand the 'big picture' options for future use of WDC assets and land. By assessing all of the sites within a relatively small geographic area the study would assess whether any or all could assist the council to address its regeneration and economic development priorities and/or be used differently in order to maximise their contribution towards alleviating the financial challenges faced by the Council.
- 3.1.6 The proposed study will provide an opportunity to reappraise options for sites where previously identified options have yet to be progressed e.g. for the future use of the Town Hall. It will also ensure that where major future investment is required, e.g. Town Hall, development of a Leamington One Stop Shop, informed decisions can safely be made within the context of the 'big picture' minimising the risk that the investment would be subsequently compromised by later decisions on disposal or change of use in relation to those buildings housing the facility.
- 3.1.7 The specification for the proposed study has deliberately not been developed in detail in order to allow members to carefully consider the proposals and, in particular, the impact that the recommendations have on some existing pieces of work, e.g. development of the business cases for a One Stop Shop at the Pump Rooms or capital investment in the Town Hall. Were members to alter the scope of the proposed study, for example by removing or adding sites from/to the list set out at 3.1.3, a revised specification would be required. It is therefore recommended that subject to members agreeing to commission the study the final specification for the brief is developed under delegated powers.

3.2 Riverside House

- 3.2.1 Members will recall that a high level Accommodation Review to examine the future accommodation needs of the Council was commissioned last year in relation to Riverside House, having been approved by Executive in April 2010. That review, undertaken by EC Harris' Built Asset Consultancy team, was designed to examine how the existing HQ building could be used more effectively and determine whether there was a high level business case for potential future relocation if that option would deliver greater efficiencies. The full EC Harris report is attached at Appendix One.
- 3.2.2 The review had a number of key findings:
- The current desk share ratio is 1.1 to 1, i.e. there are more desks than members of staff
 - The overall office areas per workstation and per person are generous compared to elsewhere in the sector
 - There is significant opportunity to reduce the office footprint (either at Riverside House or elsewhere) by rationalising the way we use office space and adopting new ways of working
 - The highest single element of expenditure on Riverside House (45% of total expenditure) is on business rates, 13% higher than the sector average
 - Other elements of expenditure tend to be close to or below the sector average

- Expenditure could be influenced and thereby reduced through relocation but there is limited opportunity for further reductions at the current site.
- A high level business case exists for the exploration of alternative options for our HQ accommodation, with at least 7 potentially viable options

3.2.3 Page 7 of the report (Appendix One) shows that 92% of current (20010/11) expenditure on Riverside House was spent on:

- Business rates
- Repairs and maintenance
- Hired and contract services e.g. cleaning, lift and plant maintenance, security etc
- Electricity

Each of these expenditure headings could be influenced by the type and standard of property that the council occupies as its future HQ accommodation. For example a reduced footprint would minimise business rates expenditure whilst specialist design combined with a reduced footprint would also enable a reduction in energy consumption. Clearly the first scenario could be achieved within Riverside House (reduction in the area of the footprint of the building occupied by the council with the remainder leased out) while the latter would require the exploration of alternative options.

3.2.4 The study used current expenditure, validated against historic trends, along with assumed future capital expenditure requirements to establish a baseline cost of continuing to occupy Riverside House for the next 25 years, as shown at Page 9 of Appendix One. The baseline position also assumes income from leasing the building at current rates.

3.2.5 The review identified and assessed 13 alternative options against this baseline to determine if there was a high level business case for relocation. Of these, 7 returned a positive or marginal benefits case:

- Refurbish the existing building and lease all available office space
- Buy a new fit for purpose HQ building on a new site
- Refurbish the existing building, lease it out and lease a new HQ elsewhere
- Refurbish the existing building, lease it out and buy a new HQ elsewhere
- Refurbish the existing building property, sell it and buy new HQ elsewhere
- Sell the existing building, lease a one stop shop & buy a new HQ elsewhere
- Sell the existing building, buy a one stop shop & buy a HQ elsewhere

3.2.6 The table at page 21 of Appendix One shows the financial benefits appraisal for all the options identified and the following pages explore the benefits case of the 7 potentially viable options. It must be stressed that the purpose of the study was only to establish whether a high level business case for alternative options existed or not. Whilst this has been demonstrated it is important to recognise that even those options currently showing only a marginal financial benefit against the baseline are still worthy of more detailed investigation as these could rapidly move into a positive financial position were the assumptions on the valuation and potential development constraints on the land, set out at page 20, to alter. Indeed, the marginal options are generally of lower risk than those shown as delivering the greatest return against the baseline.

3.2.7 The accommodation review study achieved its objectives, but whilst its findings are valuable, further work on the options identified is required, hence the recommendations to include Riverside House within the remit of the proposed

feasibility study and to seek a detailed valuation of the site based on a range of potential future alternative uses. The details of the accommodation review study will be made available to the consultants undertaking the feasibility study. The new study will also identify and evaluate the merits of differing options for alternative locations for our HQ accommodation. Included in this consideration will be further exploration of what functions could be placed into a One Stop Shop and whether this would allow future consideration of a non-public access HQ building at a separate site.

3.2.8 The feasibility study will also feed into the Local Plan process, allowing consideration of designating the site for purposes other than office accommodation as shown in the current plan.

3.2.9 It is also recommended that the current marketing exercise is continued but that no new leases are entered into until the feasibility study has been completed. The study itself will need to consider the implications of the various options under consideration for our current lessees and examine options for their future accommodation if the council were to consider relocation from Riverside House.

3.3 Principles of Occupancy

3.3.1 The accommodation review also established that we have more desks than staff in Riverside House resulting in a 1.1 (desks) to 1 (staff) ratio. This factor, coupled with a generous allocation of space per person, demonstrates significant potential to reduce the footprint of the accommodation the council occupies. Of course, this finding is not new and is entirely consistent with our own thinking that led to the establishment of the Agile Working project and the decision to market space for additional leasing within Riverside House.

3.3.2 However, what the study did do was to identify potential future 'space standards' that WDC could deploy in future. Based on a reduction in office area occupied per workstation from the current 12.3 sq m to 6 sq m and a renewed and concerted focus on the promotion of agile and home working it calculated that a 7 to 10 desk space ratio could be achieved, i.e. 7 desks to every 10 staff with agile and home workers utilising 'hot-desks' on their visits to the HQ accommodation.

3.3.3 The study used data from our HR team that grouped our existing staff cohort into a number of 'archetypes' based on the nature of the work that they do. An assessment was then made as to the extent to which new, flexible, methods of working could be deployed across each archetype thereby reducing the need for occupation of fixed workstations within a HQ building. Whilst, this is consistent with the principles of the Agile Working project, the ability to achieve the 'step-change' from current working practices and traditional levels of occupancy of space is likely to be greater if coupled with a relocation to a new building rather than continued rationalisation of the space occupied within Riverside House.

3.3.4 Nonetheless, if the council were able to achieve deployment of the principles of occupancy shown at page 13 of Appendix One a 41% reduction in the office footprint that would need to be occupied could be achieved. This is clearly significant in financial terms, creating significant space for leasing within Riverside House and therefore an increased income stream, or allowing the expenditure issues considered in section 3.2 above to be addressed through relocation to a smaller HQ.

3.3.5 Another output of the accommodation review was the production of a draft Principle of Occupancy statement that the council can consider adopting. These are generic principles applicable to any HQ accommodation occupied in the future and are equally applicable for deployment to continued occupation of Riverside House. The recommended Principles of Occupation are attached as Appendix Two.

3.4 Spa Centre

3.4.1 Since late 2009 the operation of the Spa Centre has been subject to scrutiny by a cross-party Task and Finish Group who concluded that the level of subsidy required to sustain its operation did not give a suitable return to the Council. Their report led to the Executive agreeing that:

- Investigations should be made into development of the Spa Centre site
- Investigations should be made into potential relocation of those community organisations currently using the Spa Centre
- In the interim, improvements should be sought in the current Spa Centre operations and direction to minimise the subsidy requirement.

It was agreed that the Spa Centre would be subject to a further review in 2011.

3.4.2 With the previous Spa Centre Manager having left the post in mid 2009 a new manager was recruited and commenced in post in January 2010. Since then the Spa Centre has undergone a major transition in a very short space of time with upgrades made to its facilities, operational savings and efficiencies identified and captured and a completely new programme implemented.

3.4.3 The impact has been apparent with significant increases in the use of the Spa Centre from residents in all areas of the district outside Leamington, demonstrating that it can operate as a district resource not just a Leamington one. Sales trends for the last quarter of 2010, when the impact of the revised programme were fully realised, are particularly encouraging and bode well for the future.

3.4.4 Given the positive improvements in its operation it is recommended that a 4 year business plan is developed for the Spa Centre as a replacement to a further formal review later this year. This will enable the Spa Centre manager to further refine the revised programme to extend the range of the customer offer without the constraints imposed by working to a set review period. Experience to date is that potential development opportunities are unavailable without the ability to offer potential partners and performers the certainty that the programme will be available for a number of years. Removing the set timescale will also benefit our ability to retain key staff.

3.4.5 However, the Spa Centre subsidy has not been eliminated, nor is it likely that it will be in the foreseeable future. It is therefore recommended that the business plan is predicated on the delivery of a 5% per annum reduction in the cost of operating the Spa Centre and that the delivery of this target is carefully monitored by members. This will provide the opportunity for a further review to be instigated at any point within the 4 year period should the encouraging improvements not be sustained, without imposing a set time limit for the review which in itself could be detrimental to delivering that improvement.

3.4.6 Subject to the approval of the two Scrutiny Chairs, it is recommended that the remit of the Task and Finish Group is altered to ensure it retains oversight of the development and delivery of the business plan and that the Finance Portfolio Holder works directly with the group to scrutinise the delivery of the 5% cost reduction target.

3.4.7 It is further recommended that the necessary work to investigate potential future development of the site is included within the remit of the proposed study. The study will enable the following options to be explored:

- Retention of the site and continued operation of the Spa Centre as per the business plan
- Retention of the existing site with ancillary adjoining development
- Demolition of the Spa Centre and redevelopment of the site with cessation of future provision by the council
- Demolition and redevelopment with relocation of some or all of the existing Spa Centre provision to new facilities.

3.5 Town Hall

3.5.1 Members will recall that several studies have examined the potential future use of the Town Hall and that an approach has been made to the Warwick District Citizens Advice Bureau (CAB) to explore their relocation to the building from their current leased premises at nearby Hamilton Terrace.

3.5.2 These studies have considered the Town Hall in isolation and it is proposed that the new study would revisit these in the context of the bigger picture examination of the full range of sites set out at 3.1.3 to determine if this makes previously considered options viable or demonstrates alternative options.

3.5.3 In the meantime it is recommended that the on-going discussions with the CAB are pursued to their conclusion and that, dependant on the course of these discussions, the outcome is factored into the study. In the meantime it is recommended that no major capital investment is made to the Town Hall.

3.6 Pump Rooms and Spencer Yard

3.6.1 Members will recall that Executive has previously approved the development of a business case for a One Stop Shop (OSS) to serve Leamington located at the Pump Rooms, and that this work has been on-going.

3.6.2 It is recommended that consideration of a site-specific business case is deferred pending the outcome of the proposed review. This will allow the review to consider whether the Pump Rooms site remains the optimum location for the OSS in the context of consideration as to the optimum location of the council's HQ accommodation and the future relationship between the HQ and the OSS.

3.6.3 It is recognised that any review of future use of the Pump Rooms will be subject to constraints relating to the duration of the soon to be let catering contract and the County Council's plans in relation to the Leamington Library.

3.6.4 In the context of the other sites recommended for inclusion within the review it is proposed that the review should consider the potential to link the Pump

Rooms by footbridge to Spencer Yard and the opportunities that this might create for differing uses to be introduced into both the Pump Rooms complex and the Spencer Yard properties. This will include examination of whether the Pump Rooms remain the optimum location for a Leamington Visitor Information Centre.

3.6.5 In relation to the Spencer Yard properties the proposed review provides the opportunity to examine alternative options to the original project which will be the subject of the separate, more narrowly focused, review. This will allow the council to explore both alternative options for the creation of the Cultural Quarter and other more commercially focussed options. It will also allow consideration as to whether redevelopment of the current Loft Theatre site might be suitable as a new location for a HQ building for the council and if so, what synergies might be possible with a OSS located in the Pump Rooms or elsewhere in the town centre.

3.7 Other sites

3.7.1 The council currently provides surface car parks at Bath Place and Packington Place. The former site is adjoined by the WCC owned, partially fire damaged buildings that formerly housed the Bath Place Community Venture and continue to house the Afro-Caribbean Project. Members will recall that the council has been in detailed dialogue with the County Council as to its holdings at the site and has been exploring the development potential of the whole site. It is recommended that this work is re-examined as part of the proposed study.

3.7.2 The Packington Place car park is adjoined by the empty and derelict WDC owned former Italian Club. This building has been subject to various examinations of potential alternative use in the past, none of which have demonstrated financial viability. Again, it is recommended that the proposed study considers the whole site not just the car park.

3.7.3 In addition the council holds land at Station Approach to the north of the railway station. These holdings alone do not present significant development potential but are important within the context of a much wider development across the whole of the site to the north of the railway station, encompassing the former Quicks Garage site, the Stagecoach depot and the land to its west bordering the railway triangle.

3.7.4 Planning permission has recently been granted for a temporary, privately operated, surface car park at the eastern end of this site closest to the subway approach to the railway station. Officers have been exploring the potential for the construction of a multi-storey car park on this area of the site as partnership between the council and developers. Such a development would potentially act as the catalyst for a mixed use development of the remainder of the site and for the development of an integrated transport hub at the railway station on the site of the current, inadequate, station car park to the south of the station. In such a scenario the car parking provision currently situated at Packington Place and Bath Place could be removed allowing development of these small sites.

3.7.5 Whilst the separate Spencer Yard study intends to quantify the need for new car parking provision to support the URC base for the Loft Theatre and the new development on their current site and explore potential options for its delivery it is recommended that a more detailed examination is conducted within the

proposed study that looks at all the sites and assesses the range of development options if they were treated as a single package rather than each being assessed in isolation from the others.

4. ALTERNATIVE OPTION CONSIDERED

- 4.1 Executive could decide not to proceed with the proposed study and only conduct the more limited Spencer Yard feasibility study as approved in January. This option would remove the need to defer work on the OSS, capital investment at the Town Hall, letting of Riverside House or the range of options for the Spa Centre. However, this option was discounted as it would mean the council misses the opportunity to examine options relating to a number of linked sites which might together present greater opportunities to assist the council to deliver its vision than if the sites were examined individually.
- 4.2 Executive could decide to proceed with the proposed study but not defer the other work referred to in recommendations 2.8, 2.9, 2.20 and 2.11. This option has been discounted on the basis that it would place significant constraints on the proposed study and potentially undermine its ability to deliver an integrated outline masterplan for all the sites included within its remit.
- 4.3 Executive could decide to proceed with the proposed study but discontinue the previously approved, separate, Spencer Yard feasibility study. This option has been discounted as the two pieces of work have differing objectives and, rather than duplicating, are designed to be complementary studies. Together, the outcomes of the two studies will inform the council of the full range of options that exist in relation to Spencer Yard allowing an informed decision to be made. Closing down the other study will send a particular message to the partners and could result in the Loft Theatre site becoming unavailable for future development. Such a scenario would significantly limit our potential ability to deliver an integrated outline masterplan across all the sites proposed in this study and limit our ability to develop a Cultural Quarter or bring forward alternative regeneration proposals for the Spencer Yard area.
- 4.4 Executive could proceed with the study but reduce the list of sites for inclusion. This has also been discounted as the list of sites set out at 3.1.3 are seen as having good inter-connectivity and are necessary to ensure that an integrated outline masterplan can be developed, with specific proposals for each site, even if the latter is for a 'stay as current' option.
- 4.5 Equally, the scope of the study could be widened and other sites added to the list set out at 3.1.3. This has been discounted on the grounds of cost and complexity.

5. BUDGETARY FRAMEWORK

- 5.1 Soundings taken indicate that the cost of the proposed study will not exceed £90,000 and, subject to the finalisation of the specification it is hoped that the price for the work would be significantly less than that figure.
- 5.2 The study will need to be tendered but advice indicates that this can be done relatively quickly utilising existing framework agreements within the public sector.

- 5.3 It is therefore proposed that provision of a maximum £90,000 commitment is approved from the 2010/11 Contingency Budget. This currently has an unspent balance of £156,000 and, if members approve the recommendation, this will leave £66,000 for the remainder of this financial year. As it is highly unlikely that the report will be completed by 31st March, it is also recommended that this budget be carried forward into 2011/12 as an Ear Marked Reserve.
- 5.4 The Medium Term Financial Strategy includes an assumption for an increase of £88,300 (General Fund net benefit) in income received from renting an area of Riverside House from 2012/13 onwards. The proposed study is likely to require a maximum 6 months from approval to completion. Should the outcome of the study impact upon this intention the strategy will be updated accordingly.
- 5.5 The Fit for the Future Programme assumptions, set out at Appendix 13 of the Budget 2011/12 report elsewhere on the agenda, currently show revenue savings of £120,960 - £172,800 per annum, deliverable before 2015/16, from the Riverside House accommodation review, which would need to be offset against the £88,300 already factored into the Strategy. That assumption will need to be reviewed when the outcomes of the proposed study are known.

6. **POLICY FRAMEWORK**

- 6.1 The Council's Vision, the guides all its actions, is: Warwick District – a great place to live, work and visit.
- 6.2 To achieve this Vision the Council needs to ensure that it delivers quality services of its own and that it is working in partnership with existing and new communities and across the private, public and voluntary sectors so that residents of the district receive both the services they need and value and the opportunities to which they aspire.
- 6.3 This study will directly contribute to progress towards the delivery of that Vision by ensuring that the Council is achieving value for money through effective use of its assets. This will, in turn, assist the delivery of the Medium Term Financial Strategy on which continued provision of improving services rests.
- 6.4 It will also assess the opportunities for future alternative use of assets as a means of stimulating opportunities for job creation and retention, environmental regeneration, increasing the range of cultural opportunities for local people, transport and parking improvements and partnership working across the sectors.