

15 JUNE 2010

CONSULTATIONS**REPORT BY STRATEGY MANAGER**

This report seeks the Partnership's endorsement of officer objections to the Loch Lomond and The Trossachs National Park Finalised Draft Local Plan; officer responses to Angus Council's consultation on their Public Transport Policy Statement; an initial call for contributions to the Independent Budget Review; and a Scottish Government consultation on Decriminalised Parking Enforcement – Variation of Level of Penalty Charge Notice.

1 RECOMMENDATIONS

1.1 That the Partnership endorses :-

- (i) officer objections to the Loch Lomond and The Trossachs National Park Finalised Draft Local Plan, as detailed in Appendix A;
- (ii) the officer response to Angus Council's Public Transport Policy Statement consultation, as detailed in Appendix B;
- (iii) the officer response to an initial call for contributions to the Independent Budget Review, as detailed in Appendix C; and
- (iv) the officer response to the Scottish Government's consultation on Decriminalised Parking Enforcement – Variation of Level of Penalty Charge Notice, as detailed in Appendix D.

2 BACKGROUND

- 2.1 At its meeting on 16 March 2010 the Partnership agreed to delegate authority to the Director to respond to consultations on Loch Lomond and The Trossachs National Park's Finalised Draft Local Plan and Angus Council's Public Transport Policy Statement (Report RTP/10/08 refers). Consultation comments were sought by 6th April and 19th March 2010. The consultation documents are available for reference in the Members' area of the Tactran website (Angus Council's Public Transport Policy Statement) and at:
<http://www.lochlomond-trossachs.org/planning/local-plan/menu-id-176.html>
- 2.2 Shortly before the last Partnership meeting on 16 March the Independent Budget Review body invited comments to inform their analysis of issues and options for public spending in the forthcoming Public Spending Review period from 2011/12 – 2013/14.
- 2.3 The Scottish Government has published a consultation on the Variation of Level of Penalty Charge Notices issued under Decriminalised Parking Enforcement. Consultation responses are to be submitted by 10 June 2010. This consultation is available for inspection at:
<http://www.scotland.gov.uk/Publications/2010/03/parking-enforcement>

3 DISCUSSION

Loch Lomond and The Trossachs National Park Finalised Draft Local Plan

- 3.1 On 19th February 2010 Loch Lomond and The Trossachs National Park Authority published for consultation a Finalised Draft Local Plan, along with the Strategic Environmental Assessment: Environmental Report and Appropriate Assessment.
- 3.2 The National Park Authority consulted on their Consultative Draft Local Plan in February 2009. A response was made at the time indicating broad support for the Draft Local Plan, as reported to the Partnership on 10 March 2009 (Report RTP/09/19 refers). It was suggested that additional emphasis was needed for improved public transport accessibility to key services and facilities; the role of sustainable modes for movement of both passengers and freight, including timber transport, within various policy statements; and recognition of the status of RTSs as relevant statutory Plans.
- 3.3 Few of the above suggestions have been incorporated into the Finalised Draft Local Plan. Consequently a response to the recently closed consultation, which takes the form of an objection to the Finalised Draft Local Plan, reiterates these points, together with suggesting a proposed change to the SEA Objectives.
- 3.4 It is understood Stirling Council has also objected in similar terms to transport elements, and other aspects, of the Finalised Draft Local Plan.
- 3.5 A copy of the submitted officer objections is included at Appendix A, which the Partnership is asked to endorse.

Angus Council Public Transport Policy Statement

- 3.6 Angus Council submitted a Draft Public Transport Policy Statement for consultation with responses sought by 19 March 2010. This was received too late to prepare a response to report to the Partnership on 10 March 2009. The Partnership delegated authority for the Director to respond. The response is shown in Appendix B.
- 3.7 As a result of Tactran's comments a number of amendments were made to the Policy Statement. These included making reference to the Partnership and the Regional Transport Strategy, as well as adding bus priority measures and Park & Ride to the section on Infrastructure.

Independent Budget Review : Initial Call for Submissions

- 3.8 In early March the Independent Budget Review group which has been established by Scottish Government to inform the forthcoming 3-year Spending review for 2011/12 – 2013/14 invited initial comments to inform an analysis of public spending. A copy of the consultation paper is available for inspection at: <http://www.scotland.gov.uk/About/IndependentBudgetReview>.

3.9 Responses were sought within a relatively short 4-week consultation period ending 12 April 2010. A response was compiled in consultation with the Chair and Deputy Chair, and with other RTPs, as set out in Appendix C. This makes the following key points:-

- the anticipated constraints on Revenue, and particularly Capital, funding over the next 3 years are likely to present greater challenges to RTPs in securing Revenue and Capital funding to support delivery of Regional Transport Strategies;
- there is a general concern that funding for the transport sector may suffer disproportionately as a result of the overall squeeze on public funding and pressures in other areas;
- in prioritising funding Scottish Government needs to recognise the crucial role that maintaining and enhancing transport systems, infrastructure and connectivity plays in supporting the economy;
- RTPs are a “ready made” opportunity to explore and effect Shared Services efficiency savings, working in partnership with Councils, Health Boards, SAS, the wider public sector and 3rd Sector Agencies.

3.10 The Partnership is asked to endorse the response at Appendix C. It is understood that there will be further consultation on the outcomes of the Independent Budget Review in late summer and any further developments on this will be reported to the Partnership’s next meeting.

Decriminalised Parking Enforcement – Variation of Level of Penalty Charge Notice

3.11 The Scottish Government published a consultation on 10 March 2010 on proposals to issue revised guidance to local authorities on a variation to the level of Penalty Charge Notices (PCN) applicable when enforcing Decriminalised Parking Enforcement (DPE). This would affect two of the region’s authorities, Dundee City Council and Perth & Kinross Council having adopted DPE powers.

3.12 Scottish Ministers last issued guidance on the level of Penalties in 2001. The Government considers it appropriate to revise this guidance to improve compliance. In urban areas where parking spaces are at a premium, parking costs can be such that a motorist may consider the option of not paying for parking and the risk of getting a PCN outweighs the parking charge set by the local authority for a day’s parking. The PCN levels need to be reviewed to ensure that the deterrent value does not diminish further. In addition, it is noted that staff salaries have risen by 50% in the intervening period and that, as the enforcement operations are intended to be self-financing, PCN levels should be raised to offset rising costs.

3.13 A similar review has been undertaken in England and it is suggested in the Tactran response that the two tier system introduced there should be adopted in Scotland as well. This system penalises motorists at a higher level for contraventions on lengths of on-street restricted parking where the impact of illegal parking is more serious than in off-street car parks and areas of permitted parking.

- 3.14 A copy of the submitted officer response is included at Appendix D, which the Partnership is asked to endorse.

4 CONSULTATIONS

- 4.1 The various responses addressed in this report have been prepared in consultation with partner Councils through the relevant Officer Liaison Groups.

5 RESOURCE IMPLICATIONS

- 5.1 There are no resource implications arising directly from this report.

Michael Cairns
Strategy Manager

For further information e-mail michaelcairns@tactran.gov.uk or tel 01738 475774.

NOTE

The following background papers, as defined by Section 50D of the Local Government (Scotland) Act 1973 (and not containing confidential or exempt information) were relied on to a material extent in preparing the above Report:

Finalised Draft Local Plan, Loch Lomond and The Trossachs National Park

Report to Partnership RTP/09/19 Directors Report, 10 March 2009

Report to Partnership RTP/10/08 Consultations, 15 March 2010

FINALISED DRAFT LOCAL PLAN 2010 – RESPONSE FORM

Please carefully read the accompanying guidance notes on how to respond before completing this form.

If you responded to the Draft Local Plan consultation and consider the matter you raised has not been satisfactorily addressed and you still wish your initial response to be considered, you need to submit a new response for this Finalised Draft Local Plan consultation.

Responses should be concise and no more than 2,000 words. Please note that under the Planning etc. (Scotland) Act 2006 there is no automatic opportunity to expand or submit further information on your response in the event of a local plan examination. Where there are unresolved objections to the Finalised Draft Local Plan these will be considered at a local plan examination undertaken by a Scottish Government appointed Reporter, at a date as yet to be arranged.

Your Details

Title	Mr	First Name	Michael	Last Name	Cairns
Organisation/Agent (if applicable)	Tactran			Job Title (if applicable)	Strategy Manager
Representing (if applicable)					
Postal Address	Bordeaux House, 31 Kinnoull Street, Perth				
Post Code	PH1 5EN			Phone No.	01738 475774
Email	MichaelCairns@tactran.gov.uk				
Signature	<i>M. Cairns</i>			Date	6 April 2010

Do you consider any policies in the Loch Lomond and The Trossachs National Park Finalised Draft Local Plan to be discriminatory in terms of age, disability, race, religion or belief, gender or sexual orientation?

If yes to the above, please state which policies & terms?

Returning Your Response

Please complete the form overleaf and return to the Park Authority by **Tuesday 6 April 2010**:

By Email

localplan@lochlomond-trossachs.org

By Post

National Park Headquarters
20 Carrochan Road

By Fax
+44(0) 1389 722 633

Balloch
G83 8EG

For more information

If you have any questions about the Finalised Draft Local Plan or accompanying documents, please contact the Forward Planning team at the National Park Headquarters by phoning 01389 722600 or by email at the above address.

Details of Response

You may comment on some or all of the Finalised Draft Local Plan or any of its accompanying documents:

- Strategic Environmental Assessment: Environmental Report
- Appropriate Assessment
- Finalised Supplementary Planning Guidance: Sustainable Design
- Finalised Supplementary Planning Guidance: Advertisements
- Draft Supplementary Planning Guidance: Affordable Housing
- Draft Supplementary Planning Guidance: Renewable Energy
- Draft Action Programme

To help us process your response:

- For each comment you make, please clearly state which document you are responding to and all relevant information (section/policy, page number, etc) and if you are in support or objecting.
- Keep your comments short and concise.
- If you are making an objection(s), please identify the change(s) you wish to be made.

If your representation relates to a piece of land, are you the owner of this land? (tick if applicable)

Yes No

My/our comments are on the following:

Document:	Finalised Draft Local Plan				
Section/Policy:	3.2	Page:	14	Site Code:	
Comment of Support or Objection (please state): Tactran is broadly supportive of the reference to “communities having transport needs”					
Change(s) sought: There is a need here to stress the low levels of accessibility by public transport for residents to many key services, particularly health related. It is suggested also that a further category can be added, namely that of ensuring that future freight demands, particularly timber movement, can be met sustainably.					

Document:	Finalised Draft Local Plan			
Section/Policy:	3.3	Page:	17	Site Code:
Comment of Support or Objection (please state): Tactran is broadly supportive of the Strategy.				
Change(s) sought: Reference should be made to the need to cater for existing and future freight movements, particularly timber, by sustainable modes.				

Document:	Finalised Draft Local Plan			
Section/Policy:	REC1 Recreation Development	Page:	44	Site Code:
Comment of Support or Objection (please state): Tactran is broadly supportive of the Strategy.				
Change(s) sought: For each Activity Area's Specific Opportunities/Constraints the references to sustainable transport should be strengthened by adding – support the provision of good quality bus stop infrastructure and facilities for cyclists to encourage sustainable travel choices and improved interchange facilities for these modes.				

Document:	Finalised Draft Local Plan			
Section/Policy:	3.8	Page:	47	Site Code:
Comment of Support or Objection (please state): Tactran is broadly supportive of the Strategy.				
Change(s) sought: The first paragraph should seek to reduce the need to travel in ways that reduce rather than produce carbon dioxide.				

Document:	Finalised Draft Local Plan			
Section/Policy:	TRAN1 – Safeguarding Sites to Improve the Transport Network	Page:	47	Site Code:
Comment of Support or Objection (please state): Tactran is broadly supportive of the Strategy.				
Change(s) sought: Safeguarding of a site for a coach interchange at Tyndrum or Crianlarich should be included. A further policy should be added to enable provision to be made for freight facilities for rail or sea transport.				

Document:	SEA – Environmental Report			
Section/Policy:	SEA Objectives and Indicators	Page:	25	Site Code:
Comment of Support or Objection (please state): Tactran is broadly supportive of the Objectives.				
Change(s) sought: Objective 17 - Encouraging the movement of freight by alternative modes to road freight should be added to those listed.				

Lesley Millar
Transport Manager
Infrastructure Services Department
Angus Council
County Buildings
Market Street
Forfar
DD8 3LG

Bordeaux House
31 Kinnoull Street
Perth
PH1 5EN
Tel: 01738 475775
Fax: 01738 639705
Info@tactran.gov.uk

24th March 2010

Dear Lesley,

ANGUS COUNCIL – PUBLIC TRANSPORT POLICY STATEMENT

I refer to your letter of 2 March 2010 seeking comment on the Draft Public Transport Policy Statement (PTPS) for Angus, and to our helpful meeting on 23 March to discuss this.

The timing of the consultation did not permit preparation of a proposed response for consideration and approval by our Partnership Board at its recent meeting on 16 March 2010. Consequently this officer response will be reported for endorsement by the Partnership at its next meeting on 15 June 2010. The comments below reflect Tactran's role as both the statutory Regional Transport Partnership covering the Angus Council area, and as statutory Community Planning Partner and signatory to the Angus Single Outcome Agreement.

General Comments

Tactran recognises the need to review the PTPS in light of anticipated public sector funding constraints and associated budget pressures. The need for a robust policy statement which reflects the current financial climate, whilst seeking to safeguard essential public transport services and facilities and prioritise provision where budget pressures require this, is both acknowledged and supported.

An effective public transport network will be crucial in terms of supporting delivery of many of the priority Outcomes relating to the economy, protecting the environment and tackling social inequalities within the Angus Single Outcome Agreement. A number of suggested revisions in this regard are suggested below.

The Draft PTPS currently makes no reference to the relationship between the Council and the Regional Transport Partnership (RTP) and Regional Transport Strategy (RTS). In keeping with the statutory nature of these relationships, a number of references to Tactran's role and the RTS are also suggested for inclusion below.

Specific Comments on Draft Policy

Section 1 : Introduction

As indicated above, there is currently no reference to the RTP or the RTS within the Draft PTPS. Inclusion of the following additional text, as a new section 1.3, would update the statutory and policy context within which the PTPS operates:-

“The Transport (Scotland) Act 2005 created Regional Transport Partnerships, who have a duty to develop and oversee the implementation of a Regional Transport Strategy which sets out a 10 – 15 year vision and objectives for meeting the transport needs of people and businesses throughout their region. The Tayside and Central Scotland Transport Partnership (Tactran) covers the Angus, Dundee City, Perth & Kinross and Stirling Council areas. Councils have a duty to perform their functions which relate to, or are affected by, transport consistently with the Regional Transport Strategy covering their area. The Tactran Regional Transport Strategy was approved by Scottish Ministers in June 2008. The Council will have regard to the aims and objectives of the Regional Transport Strategy in determining its public transport policies and priorities.”

Section 3 : Strategic Aims and Objectives of the Council

The current wording focuses exclusively on the Council's public transport aims and objectives. These are broadly consistent with the aims and objectives of the RTS and Regional Buses Strategy and Action Plan, as summarised in the attached Appendix, and are supported.

It is suggested that the PTPS and specific public transport objectives should also be set within the context of the over-arching public sector strategic Objectives and Outcomes set out in the Angus Single Outcome Agreement, in particular those SOA priority areas where accessibility and effective public transport connectivity will provide direct and indirect benefits and opportunities for citizens and communities – e.g. economic growth; lifelong learning; health improvement; safeguarding and improving the built and natural environment.

Linked with the comments above, it is suggested that the penultimate “bullet point” in 3.2 is amended to read :-

- *“To ensure the best value for money from the total expenditure on public passenger transport, taking into account the full range of the Council’s responsibilities **and priority Outcomes within the Angus Single Outcome Agreement**”*

and that the final “bullet point” is amended to read :-

- *“To work in partnership with public passenger transport providers, **Tactran and other transport agencies** to ensure, within the resources available, the delivery of high quality, reliable and efficient public passenger transport services”.*

Section 4 : Contracted Service Provision

The general principles set out in relation to Contracted Service Provision are supported. However, in line with above comments regarding the role of the PTPS as an underpinning policy in support of achieving SOA Outcomes, it is suggested that the methodology for determining supported service priorities should reflect the broader range of accessibility needs which are implicit within the SOA, in particular in support of the SOA Local Outcome that :-

“People in Angus can access amenities and services through a variety of affordable and sustainable means”.

In this regard it is suggested that an additional “bullet point” is added to section 4.3 which reads :-

- *contribution to SOA Outcomes.*

The proposed evaluation and scoring methodology gives priority to travel needs related to access to employment and is, in principle, supported. However, other accessibility needs - for example access to lifelong learning opportunities and health care – are also important in terms of supporting SOA Outcomes. In particular access to health care is consistently raised as a concern by many groups and communities but there is currently no mention of this travel need within the Draft PTPS.

It is suggested that consideration is given to applying a similar scoring approach for other priority travel needs. It may be generally true that contracts with a low subsidy/passenger tend to present good value for money in purely financial terms, however it is important that the scoring and evaluation methodology does not overlook or “score down” lower demand/higher priority travel needs which are then placed at threat of withdrawal in a constrained budget situation.

Reflecting the above comments it is suggested that the last sentence of Section 4.5 is amended to read :-

*“In implementing these criteria no service withdrawals will be made without careful consideration by Members of any potential hardships they would cause **or potential conflicts with SOA priority Outcomes**”*

and that Section 4.6 is amended to read :-

*“Where the Council considers that strategic aims and objectives justify service provision over and above what is provided commercially then such services will be secured on a contracted basis” (i.e. delete words **“public transport”** in favour of considering broader strategic objectives, including those within the SOA, as a criteria for supporting services).*

Section 8 : Infrastructure

It is suggested that the references to infrastructure which the Council may support in 8.2 are extended to include specific reference to Bus Priority measures and also Park & Ride facilities, in line with proposals for Park & Ride schemes serving Angus residents which are contained within the Regional Park & Ride Strategy, and which will support SOA aims of reducing the Angus carbon footprint.

Section 9 : Publicity and Promotion

Suggest inclusion of an additional paragraph 9.2, reflecting connection with the RTS and supporting Regional Travel Information Strategy as follows :-

“9.2 In implementing its policies in respect of publicity and promotion of public passenger transport the Council will have regard to the Regional Transport Strategy and Travel Information Strategy”

Section 10 : Partnership Working

Given the statutory relationships and role of the Council within the RTP it is suggested that specific reference is made to Tactran in section 10.1.

Section 11 : Consultation

Linked with previous comments it is suggested that specific mention is made in 11.2 to liaising with *“Tactran and partner Councils”*.

I trust that the above comments are of assistance.

Copied to Angus Council elected Member representatives on the Tactran Partnership Board for awareness.

Yours sincerely,



Eric Guthrie
Director

CC Councillor Iain Gaul
Councillor John Whyte
George Chree, Head of Planning & Transport

Independent Budget Review
c/o Robin Benn
First Floor
Thistle House
91 Haymarket Terrace
Edinburgh
EH12 5HE

Bordeaux House
31 Kinnoull Street
Perth
PH1 5EN
Tel: 01738 475775
Fax: 01738 639705
Info@tactran.gov.uk

12th April 2010

Dear Sirs,

INDEPENDENT BUDGET REVIEW – INITIAL CALL FOR CONTRIBUTIONS

I refer to your letter dated 8 March 2010 seeking initial comments on the Independent Budget Review.

The timing and relatively tight timescale for responses has precluded reporting on this consultation to our Partnership Board, which meets quarterly. The following, therefore, represents in initial officer response and comments are confined to issues which fall within the remit of the Regional Transport Partnership (RTP). Tactran will clearly be interested in, and will wish to contribute as appropriate, to any options and proposals for future distribution of the Scottish Budget which arise from the Review.

Comments on the “Key Questions” posed in section 6 of your consultation paper are as follows :-

a) Impact of Expenditure Reduction Upon Own Organisation or Sector

Reductions in funding/expenditure of the scale anticipated are likely to result in significant challenges in securing funding for delivery of regional transport proposals and priorities. Pressures on public sector funding over recent years have generally resulted in a reduction in, particularly Capital, funding available to support regional transport proposals. The scale of public expenditure reductions over the next 2 – 3 years is likely to add significantly to this challenge.

In terms of broader transport sector funding, there are concerns that budget reductions in the order of 5% plus year on year, when considered against other competing public sector pressures, may result in even more significant reductions in both Revenue and Capital funding allocated by National and Local Government for both maintaining and enhancing transport services and infrastructure. It is generally recognised that effective transport and communications systems are essential to supporting a growing and thriving economy. Investment in more sustainable transport modes and options for the movement of both passengers and freight will also be crucial to supporting achievement of Scotland’s Climate Change targets. The Government’s Strategic Transport Projects Review (STPR) and Regional Transport Strategy Delivery Plans have identified a comprehensive range of targeted transport improvements that will support the Government’s key objective of sustainable economic growth, but may be at risk of severe delay in implementation as a result of the constrained funding situation ahead. In determining future funding priorities it is

essential that the crucial role which transport and efficient and effective regional connectivity plays in supporting economic growth and vitality is fully recognised.

At an organisational level, recognising the funding situation that the public sector and our partner Councils will face over the next 3 years, the Partnership has already taken early action to effect economies within its own Core operating budget, which has been reduced by just under 9% comparing 2010/11 with 2009/10. As a small, strategically focused body, the scope for further internal efficiencies in our Core operating budget is extremely limited. However RTPs represent a “ready made” opportunity to assist with implementation of Shared Services efficiencies, by working with our partner Councils and other Community Planning Partners to develop regional approaches to service delivery.

b) Constraints on Realising Savings

As indicated above, RTPs are an opportunity to generate efficiencies through Shared Services approaches to transportation service delivery. Existing legislation, in the shape of the Transport (Scotland) Act 2005, enables various transport powers to be transferred to RTPs, or shared concurrently by RTPs and partner Councils. Consequently much of the legislative framework to enable RTPs to play a positive role in contributing to Shared Services efficiency opportunities with partner Councils already exists.

c) New Sources of Finance

The Partnership already seeks to explore alternative sources of funding to support delivery of regional transport schemes/initiatives, including European funding and partnering with Scottish Government and the private sector. Recognising the impending constraints on both Revenue and Capital funding RTPs collectively, along with CoSLA, are currently investigating options for new/alternative sources of funding transportation priorities. This work is presently ongoing.

d) Innovative Approaches to Service Provision

As stated above, RTPs are well positioned to work with partner Councils in exploring Shared Services efficiency opportunities in relation to a range of local authority transportation functions. These opportunities, and associated funding mechanisms, need to be considered and developed in close collaboration with our partner Councils and other Community Planning partners. The Partnership has already agreed that further investigation of such opportunities will be explored over the coming months, for consideration as part of 2011/12 – 2013/14 Budget deliberations with our partners.

e) Ways in Which Public Sector Bodies Might Work Better Together

See above comments in relation to Shared Services efficiency opportunities. In addition to Shared Services opportunities across local authority service providers there are likely to be other efficiency opportunities through adopting a more “joined up” regional approach to delivery of transport services, including with Health Boards, Scottish Ambulance Service, and also closer integration between the public sector and 3rd sector on transport delivery.

f) More Fundamental Change to Organisations

See above comments regarding Shared Services opportunities across the wider public, private and 3rd sectors.

g) Key Issues

The main issues, concerns and opportunities are highlighted in the answers given above.

This response and any further developments will be reported to the Partnership's next meeting on 15th June 2010 and I will update you on any further comments the Partnership may have in relation to the Independent Budget Review at that time. In the meantime, if you wish any clarification or expansion of any of the above points please do not hesitate to contact me.

Yours sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'E. Guthrie', with a stylized flourish at the end.

Eric Guthrie
Director

Ian Gardiner
Bus, Freight and Roads Division
Area 2-F
Scottish Government
Victoria Quay
Edinburgh
EH6 6QQ

31st May 2010

Dear Sir,

Decriminalised Parking Enforcement – Variation of Level of Penalty Charge Notice

I refer to the above consultation.

Tactran supports the proposed variation of Penalty Charge Notice (PCN) levels. As indicated in the consultation this reflects the need to meet increased costs, particularly staffing that has risen in line with inflation since 2001. It is believed also that, although effective enforcement will reduce the number of contraventions and hence PCN income, a minimum level of adequately-funded, visible enforcement is needed to ensure compliance is maintained.

It is suggested that a two tier PCN system should be considered, similar to that in operation in England. This should use the lower proposed level of PCN for contraventions in off-street car parks and areas of permitted parking, and the higher level where the impact of illegal parking is more serious, for example, in terms of preventing low-floor buses reaching the kerb at bus stops with clearway markings or giving rise to congestion or safety hazards where there are lengths of no waiting at any time restriction.

I trust that the above comments are of assistance. If you require any further information, or clarification of any aspect in this response, please contact Michael Cairns, Strategy Manager on 01738 475774 in the first instance.

Yours sincerely,



Eric Guthrie
Director