



Meeting Agenda

**Special Policy Development Scrutiny Committee,
Call-in,
Town Hall, Lytham St. Annes
Wednesday 25 August 2010, 6:15pm**

The main doors to the Town Hall will be open to the public at 6:00pm
The maximum capacity for this meeting room is 60 persons –
once this limit is reached no other person can be admitted.

POLICY DEVELOPMENT SCRUTINY COMMITTEE MEMBERSHIP

CHAIRMAN	Fabian Craig-Wilson
VICE-CHAIRMAN	Kiran Mulholland

Councillors

Brenda Ackers	Ben Aitken
George Caldwell	Frank Andrews
Patricia Fieldhouse	Richard Fulford-Brown
Craig Halewood	Leonard Davies
John Davies	Howard Henshaw
David Chedd	Elizabeth Oades
Elaine Silverwood	Heather Speak

Contact: Annie Womack, St. Annes (01253) 658423
Email: anniew@fylde.gov.uk



Our Vision

Fylde Borough Council will work with partners to provide and maintain a welcoming, inclusive place with flourishing communities.

Our Corporate Objectives

- To Promote the Enhancement of the Natural & Built Environment
 - To Promote Cohesive Communities
 - To Promote a Thriving Economy
- To meet the Expectations of our Customers

The Principles we will adopt in delivering our objectives are:

- To ensure our services provide value for money
- To work in partnership and develop joint working



AGENDA

PUBLIC PLATFORM

To hear representations from members of the public in accordance with Committee procedure rules

ITEM	PAGE
1. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST: <i>If a member requires advice on Declarations of Interest he/she is advised to contact the Monitoring Officer in advance of the meeting. (For the assistance of Members an extract from the Councils Code of Conduct is attached).</i>	4
2. CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES: <i>To confirm as a correct record the minutes of the Policy Development Scrutiny Committee held on 15 July 2010. As attached at the end of the agenda.</i>	4
3. SUBSTITUTE MEMBERS: <i>Details of any substitute members notified in accordance with council procedure rule 26.3</i>	4
4. CALL-IN REQUEST – INTRODUCTION OF PARKING CHARGES ON NORTH BEACH CAR PARK	7

Personal interests

8.—(1) You have a personal interest in any business of your authority where either—

(a) it relates to or is likely to affect—

- (i) any body of which you are a member or in a position of general control or management and to which you are appointed or nominated by your authority;
- (ii) any body—
 - (aa) exercising functions of a public nature;
 - (bb) directed to charitable purposes; or
 - (cc) one of whose principal purposes includes the influence of public opinion or policy (including any political party or trade union),

of which you are a member or in a position of general control or management;

- (i) any employment or business carried on by you;
 - (ii) any person or body who employs or has appointed you;
 - (iii) any person or body, other than a relevant authority, who has made a payment to you in respect of your election or any expenses incurred by you in carrying out your duties;
 - (iv) any person or body who has a place of business or land in your authority's area, and in whom you have a beneficial interest in a class of securities of that person or body that exceeds the nominal value of £25,000 or one hundredth of the total issued share capital (whichever is the lower);
 - (v) any contract for goods, services or works made between your authority and you or a firm in which you are a partner, a company of which you are a remunerated director, or a person or body of the description specified in paragraph (vi);
 - (vi) the interests of any person from whom you have received a gift or hospitality with an estimated value of at least £25;
 - (vii) any land in your authority's area in which you have a beneficial interest;
 - (viii) any land where the landlord is your authority and you are, or a firm in which you are a partner, a company of which you are a remunerated director, or a person or body of the description specified in paragraph (vi) is, the tenant;
 - (xi) any land in the authority's area for which you have a licence (alone or jointly with others) to occupy for 28 days or longer; or
- (b) a decision in relation to that business might reasonably be regarded as affecting your well-being or financial position or the well-being or financial position of a relevant person to a greater extent than the majority of other council tax payers, ratepayers or inhabitants of the ward, as the case may be, affected by the decision;

(2) In sub-paragraph (1)(b), a relevant person is—

- (a) a member of your family or any person with whom you have a close association; or
- (b) any person or body who employs or has appointed such persons, any firm in which they are a partner, or any company of which they are directors;
- (c) any person or body in whom such persons have a beneficial interest in a class of securities exceeding the nominal value of £25,000; or
- (d) any body of a type described in sub-paragraph (1)(a)(i) or (ii).

Disclosure of personal interests

- 9.—(1) Subject to sub-paragraphs (2) to (7), where you have a personal interest in any business of your authority and you attend a meeting of your authority at which the business is considered, you must disclose to that meeting the existence and nature of that interest at the commencement of that consideration, or when the interest becomes apparent.
- (2) Where you have a personal interest in any business of your authority which relates to or is likely to affect a person described in paragraph 8(1)(a)(i) or 8(1)(a)(ii)(aa), you need only disclose to the meeting the existence and nature of that interest when you address the meeting on that business.
- (3) Where you have a personal interest in any business of the authority of the type mentioned in paragraph 8(1)(a)(viii), you need not disclose the nature or existence of that interest to the meeting if the interest was registered more than three years before the date of the meeting.
- (4) Sub-paragraph (1) only applies where you are aware or ought reasonably to be aware of the existence of the personal interest.

- (5) Where you have a personal interest but, by virtue of paragraph 14, sensitive information relating to it is not registered in your authority's register of members' interests, you must indicate to the meeting that you have a personal interest, but need not disclose the sensitive information to the meeting.
- (6) Subject to paragraph 12(1)(b), where you have a personal interest in any business of your authority and you have made an executive decision in relation to that business, you must ensure that any written statement of that decision records the existence and nature of that interest.
- (7) In this paragraph, "executive decision" is to be construed in accordance with any regulations made by the Secretary of State under section 22 of the Local Government Act 2000(d).

Prejudicial interest generally

- 10.—**(1) Subject to sub-paragraph (2), where you have a personal interest in any business of your authority you also have a prejudicial interest in that business where the interest is one which a member of the public with knowledge of the relevant facts would reasonably regard as so significant that it is likely to prejudice your judgement of the public interest.
- (2) You do not have a prejudicial interest in any business of the authority where that business—
- (a) does not affect your financial position or the financial position of a person or body described in paragraph 8;
 - (b) does not relate to the determining of any approval, consent, licence, permission or registration in relation to you or any person or body described in paragraph 8; or
 - (c) relates to the functions of your authority in respect of—
 - (i) housing, where you are a tenant of your authority provided that those functions do not relate particularly to your tenancy or lease;
 - (ii) school meals or school transport and travelling expenses, where you are a parent or guardian of a child in full time education, or are a parent governor of a school, unless it relates particularly to the school which the child attends;
 - (iii) statutory sick pay under Part XI of the Social Security Contributions and Benefits Act 1992, where you are in receipt of, or are entitled to the receipt of, such pay;
 - (iv) an allowance, payment or indemnity given to members;
 - (v) any ceremonial honour given to members; and
 - (vi) setting council tax or a precept under the Local Government Finance Act 1992.

Prejudicial interests arising in relation to overview and scrutiny committees

- 11.—** You also have a prejudicial interest in any business before an overview and scrutiny committee of your authority (or of a sub-committee of such a committee) where—
- (a) that business relates to a decision made (whether implemented or not) or action taken by your authority's executive or another of your authority's committees, sub-committees, joint committees or joint sub-committees; and
 - (b) at the time the decision was made or action was taken, you were a member of the executive, committee, sub-committee, joint committee or joint sub-committee mentioned in paragraph (a) and you were present when that decision was made or action was taken.

Effect of prejudicial interests on participation

- 12.—**(1) Subject to sub-paragraph (2), where you have a prejudicial interest in any business of your authority—
- (a) you must withdraw from the room or chamber where a meeting considering the business is being held—
 - (i) in a case where sub-paragraph (2) applies, immediately after making representations, answering questions or giving evidence;
 - (ii) in any other case, whenever it becomes apparent that the business is being considered at that meeting;
 unless you have obtained a dispensation from your authority's standards committee;
 - (b) you must not exercise executive functions in relation to that business; and
 - (c) you must not seek improperly to influence a decision about that business.
- (2) Where you have a prejudicial interest in any business of your authority, you may attend a meeting (including a meeting of the overview and scrutiny committee of your authority or of a sub-committee of such a committee) but only for the purpose of making representations, answering questions or giving evidence relating to the business, provided that the public are also allowed to attend the meeting for the same purpose, whether under a statutory right or otherwise.

REPORT



REPORT OF	MEETING	DATE	ITEM NO
DEMOCRATIC SERVICES	POLICY DEVELOPMENT SCRUTINY COMMITTEE	25 AUGUST 2010	4

CALL-IN REQUEST – INTRODUCTION OF PARKING CHARGES ON NORTH BEACH CAR PARK

Public Item

This item is for consideration in the public part of the meeting.

Summary

Ten members of the council have invoked the recovery and call-in procedure to question an individual cabinet member decision made on 4 August 2010 relating to the introduction of car parking charges on North Beach Car Park. *Members of the committee must therefore consider whether the decision made is not in the interests of the inhabitants of the borough and ought to be reconsidered.* If they believe that the decision made is not in the interests of residents, they may refer it back to the decision-maker or to the full council for further consideration.

Recommendations

Members are invited to discuss whether the information provided illustrates that the decision taken by the cabinet member on 4 August 2010 was not made in the interests of the inhabitants of the borough.

Cabinet Portfolio

The item falls within the following Cabinet portfolio:

Environmental Wellbeing – Councillor Albert Pounder

Report

1. If ten councillors feel that a decision taken by or on behalf of the Cabinet is not in accordance with the interests of the inhabitants of the Borough, they can ask for it to be 'recovered'. A recovered decision cannot be implemented until the Policy Development Scrutiny Committee has decided whether to call it in or not. Ten councillors have made such a request relating to the decision made by Councillor Pounder on 4 August 2010, to introduce car parking charges on North Beach Car Park. Therefore at this stage the decision in relation to this issue is termed as being recovered; that is, that it cannot be implemented.
2. The recovery request from the Councillors, the relevant decision notice and related report are attached as appendices.
3. The Policy Development Scrutiny Committee has three options.
4. The first is to call-in the decision by asking the decision-maker to reconsider it. The second is to call-in the decision by asking the full council to look at it. Full council could then decide to ask the decision-maker to reconsider the decision if it feels it appropriate. The committee could take either of these two options if it felt that the decision being questioned is not in the interests of the inhabitants of the Borough and ought to be reconsidered. The third option is for the committee to take no further action, in which case the decision can be implemented.
5. It is suggested that the meeting is conducted in the following order:
 - Councillor John Davies is invited to outline why he and his fellow councillors feel that the decision of Councillor Pounder taken on 04 August 2010 was not made in the interests of the inhabitants of the borough
 - A representative of the Cabinet is invited to respond (usually the Portfolio Holder - in this case Councillor Albert Pounder)
 - Policy Development Scrutiny Committee members to question both members and officers, and any other witnesses which they may call to aid them in their judgement
 - Conclusion reached on whether to call-in the decision or otherwise
 - If it is decided not to call-in the decision the committee is requested to state its reasoning in reaching this decision
 - If it is decided to call-in the decision the committee should decide where the matter should be referred and set out its concerns, which the decision-maker or council should have regard to. An alternative recommendation can form part of the committee's deliberations.
6. Under the council's code of conduct, a member must regard himself as having a personal and prejudicial interest in the consideration by a scrutiny committee of a decision made by a council body of which he is a member. However, as the decision in question was taken by Councillor Pounder as portfolio holder, rather than the Cabinet collectively, members of the Cabinet other than Councillor Pounder do not have a personal or prejudicial interest in the consideration of the call-in request and so may attend the meeting. Councillor Pounder may attend and take part only for the purpose of answering questions and giving evidence.

IMPLICATIONS	
Finance	None arising directly from this report
Legal	None arising directly from this report
Community Safety	None arising directly from this report
Human Rights and Equalities	None arising directly from this report
Sustainability	None arising directly from this report
Health & Safety and Risk Management	None arising directly from this report

Report Author	Tel	Date	Doc ID
Annie Womack	(01253) 658423	11 August 2010	Call-in report - Parking charges - North Beach Car Park

List of Background Papers		
Name of document	Date	Where available for inspection

Attached documents

1. Call in request
2. Relevant report
3. Relevant individual cabinet member decision

'CALL-IN' REQUEST

I wish to register a request for the following decision to be called in for reconsideration prior to implementation. My objection to the decision and alternative decision/proposal are set out below.

Decision Title: INTRODUCTION OF PARKING CHARGES ON NORTH BEACH CAR PARK

Decision number 2010/014

Date of decision:

04	08	2010
----	----	------

The Objection and Alternative Decision/Proposal

Remember: The objection needs to state how you believe the decision wasn't taken in accordance with the interests of the residents of Fylde Borough

Please continue on a separate sheet if necessary (500 words maximum)

The Objection is:

- 1) THE FINANCIAL CASE IS FLAWED
 - 2) IT WILL CAUSE AN INCREASE IN PARKING IN NEARBY RESIDENTIAL STREETS
 - 3) THE 'DOG WALKERS PERMITS' WILL BE DIFFICULT TO MANAGE
 - 4) IT WILL ADVERSELY AFFECT OUR IMAGE AS A 'CLASSIC COASTAL RESORT' AND A GOOD PLACE TO VISIT.
- PLEASE SEE THE 2 ATTACHED SHEETS FOR DETAILS OF THE ABOVE

The alternative decision/proposal is: (Optional)

- 1) CAR PARK TO REMAIN 'FREE TO USE'
- 2) IMPROVE THE 'ON ROAD' SIGNAGE
- 3) ENCOURAGE ITS USE AS A 'GATEWAY' TO THE DUNES.

Lead Councillor Personal Details

Name (Please print)	JOHN R DAVIES
Address	13. ST. PATRICKS ROAD NORTH, LYTHAM ST. ANNES FY8 2BJ
Daytime contact number	(01253) 720991
Email	CLLR. J DAVIES @ FYLDE. GOV. UK
Signature	<i>John R Davies</i> 10/8/10

Nine other Fylde Borough Councillors who are named below and have signed this request support me in my call-in request

PRINT NAME	SIGNATURE
KEVIN EASTHAM	<i>Kevin Eastham</i>
DAVID CHEDD	<i>D.M. Chedd</i>
LEWIS HENSHAW	<i>Lewis Henshaw</i>
TOM FORD	<i>Tom Ford</i>
KATH HARPER	<i>K Harper</i>
KEN HOPWOOD	<i>Ken Hopwood</i>
KEITH BEECH	<i>K. Beech</i>
PETER HARDY	<i>P Hardy</i>
MAXINE CHEW	<i>M Chew</i>

Call-in Checklist

Please ensure you can tick every box of the 'Have You?' list below before handing in the request

Have You?	Please Tick
Read the guidance notes on the call-in procedure?	✓
Clearly stated the decision title the call-in refers to?	✓
Stated the date the decision was made on?	✓
Obtained the signatures from nine other Councillors to support the call-in?	✓
Stated in the objection box how this decision is not in the interests of the residents of the borough.	✓

Completed requests should be sent to:

~~Democratic Services and Member Support Executive Manager,~~ ANNIE WOMACK
Town Hall, Lytham St. Annes, Lancashire FY8 1LW

To be received by no later than 6 working days from the date when the minutes were published

CALL-IN RE. DECISION 2010/014
PARKING CHARGES NORTH BEACH CAR PARK

I believe that this decision is not in the best interests of Fylde Borough residents for the following reasons.

1. The Financial Case is flawed

- a. The income figures are based on there being **250** spaces. I have looked at the car park and estimate that, after allowing for Coastguard and disabled provision, the number is actually **150**. This number is in line with a report I have from the Council's own Officer. This obviously gives a **40% Reduction** in the '**Estimated Annual Income Potential**'.
- b. Even to get 150 cars in, the car park would need to be **lined**, which would offset some of the capital cost saving projected by going down to 1 'P+D' machine. Signage on the 'town side' of Clifton Drive North also needs money spending on it!
- c. Machines do break down and '**wind-blown**' sand on this site will not help the situation. Having only one machine will lead to loss of revenue. There will also be a cost for regular clearing of this sand from the car park.
- d. The distance from town and the next nearest car park will make servicing, monitoring and enforcement less practical.
- e. The remoteness may well lead to vandalism and theft problems.
- f. Even the Portfolio Holder accepts that 'there is a risk that the income expectations set in the budget may not be achieved' and may require subsequent adjustments to budget.

2. Alternative Parking

If charges are imposed, then there will be a dramatic increase in on-street parking in the surrounding residential area. This area includes Clifton Drive North, Norwood Road, one side of Todmorden Road, Highbury Road, Seaton Crescent and even Caryl Road. This will lead to an increase in traffic and pedestrian safety problems and cause disruption to local residents.

3. Dog Walkers

The proposal to charge Fylde Borough residents to park for 2 hours on payment of £ 50 is fraught with problems. Will only dog owners be allowed this concession and how will they prove ownership? How soon after the 2 hours can they return? If a '2 car' couple take turns at walking their dog(s) will they need a £ 50 permit for each car? If not, how can we monitor usage? How much has been built in for the administration of such a scheme?

4. 'Classic Coastal Resort'

- a. The Sand Dunes are one of the 'jewels in the crown' of the Fylde. We have employed a 'Dunes Officer' and are starting several initiatives to encourage better use of the dunes.
- b. Parking charges will deter residents from using the facility.
- c. As this is, currently, one of the few places visitors can park for free there could be a reduction in overall visitor numbers to St Annes. We should be encouraging people to come here not discouraging them.
- d. We do not want to put any obstacles in the way of the development of the nearby 'Wind Sport' centre.

REPORT

REPORT OF	MEETING	DATE	ITEM NO
DIRECTOR OF STRATEGIC DEVELOPMENT SERVICES	THE PORTFOLIO HOLDER FOR ENVIRONMENTAL WELLBEING	3 AUG 2010	2010/014

INTRODUCTION OF PARKING CHARGES ON NORTH BEACH CAR PARK

Summary

A proposal to introduce charges on North Beach car park was advertised on 20 May 2010 in line with the existing tariff structure for long stay car parks. The proposal has received a number of representations which are summarised in the report.

A decision is required by the Portfolio Holder with consideration to these representations to proceed with the introduction of parking charges on North Beach car park.

Recommendation:

1. To introduce parking charges on North Beach car park as advertised.
2. To introduce a 2 hour maximum stay permit for North Beach car park at a cost of £50 per annum for residents of Fylde Borough only.
3. Install only 1 pay and display machine on this car park.
4. Re-mark the coastguard bays and provide permits to ensure the bays are kept clear for authorised users only.

Alternative options considered and rejected

A decision not to introduce charging would result in an income budget shortfall.

Cabinet Portfolio

The item falls within the following Cabinet portfolio:

Environmental Wellbeing

Albert Pounder

Report

At the Cabinet meeting on 28th April it was resolved that charges should be levied on North Beach car park in accordance with those set by Council using the pay and display method of charging and that a variation of order be advertised.

The Cabinet also agreed that the Portfolio Holder would consider any representations received as part of the consultation before agreeing the final outcome.

A Notice of Proposal setting out Fylde Borough Councils proposal to introduce parking charges on North Beach and the proposed tariff levels was advertised in the Lytham St Annes Express on 20 May 2010. Copies of the Notice of Proposals were erected on North Beach car park and hand delivered to local residents, Trax and the Coastguard on 19 May 2010.

Representations regarding the proposed changes were invited in writing by 10th June. In total 11 representations were received before 10th June 2010 and one representation was received from the Save North Beach Car Park Group by email on 14 June 2010.

Some respondents made representations on a number of grounds and the Save North Beach Car Park Group raised a lot of issues which have been discussed with in a meeting with Councillor David Eaves and Councillor Roger Small.

Summary of representations:

No of representations	Grounds of representation
7 (2 non residents)	High cost to dog walkers
3	Seasonal or reduced tariff level due to low levels of use
2	Increased parking in near by street
1	There will be a reduction in use due to charges
1	Residents permit introduced for Fylde residents
1	The car park should remain in Council ownership and remain as a car park
1	Coastguard requires the re-marking of the coastguard bays and the issue of permits for coastguard vehicles

As a result of the main representations around the cost for dog walkers it is proposed that an annual 2 hour maximum stay permit be introduced at North Beach car park for Fylde Borough residents for a fee of £50 per annum.

Risk Assessment

There is a risk that the income expectations set in the budget may not be achieved. This will require close monitoring and may require subsequent adjustment to budget forecasts. The reduction to only one pay and display machine being installed in the car park will reduce the capital cost of the scheme.

Conclusion

The introduction of parking charges on the North Beach car park will provide additional income to off-set the cost of the car park. The parking tariffs have been set at the existing tariff levels across the borough.

IMPLICATIONS	
Finance	The setting of charges for North Beach car park should raise additional income in line with the budget set by Council. The cost of installation of pay and display machines on the car park can be met from existing budgetary provision.
Legal	The parking places order needs to be amended and a 'Notice of Making' erected on site before charges can be implemented
Community Safety	None arising directly from this report
Human Rights and Equalities	None arising directly from this report
Sustainability and Environmental	None arising directly from this report
Health & Safety and Risk Management	None arising directly from this report

Report Author	Tel	Date	Doc ID
Eugene Leal	(01253) 658641	15 July 2010	

List of Background Papers		
Name of document	Date	Where available for inspection
Cabinet Report	18 April 2010	http://www.fylde.gov.uk/meetings/details/723/
Representations received	May/June 2010	Eugene Leal, Town Hall. (01253) 658641



PORTFOLIO HOLDER FOR ENVIRONMENTAL WELLBEING (COUNCILLOR ALBERT POUNDER)

INDIVIDUAL CABINET MEMBER DECISION DATE – 4 AUGUST 2010

NOTICE OF DECISION

1. INTRODUCTION OF PARKING CHARGES ON NORTH BEACH CAR PARK

The Portfolio Holder for Environmental Wellbeing considered a report by the Director of Strategic Development Services – (reference 2010/014).

Response from Portfolio holder(s)	Approval.
DECISION	<p>The Portfolio holder agreed -</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. To introduce parking charges on North Beach car park as advertised.2. To introduce a 2 hour maximum stay permit for North Beach car park at a cost of £50 per annum for residents of Fylde Borough only.3. Install only 1 pay and display machine on North Beach car park.4. Re-mark the coastguard bays and provide permits to ensure the bays are kept clear for authorised users only.

In accordance with the call-in procedure the decision will come into force, and may then be implemented, on the expiry of six working days after the publication of the decision, (the date of this notification).

4 August 2010

Policy Development Scrutiny Committee



Date	15 July 2010
Venue	Town Hall, St Annes
Committee members	Councillor Fabian Craig-Wilson (Chairman) Councillor Kiran Mulholland (Vice-Chairman) Dawn Prestwich, Ben Aitken, Kath Harper, Patricia Fieldhouse, Richard Fulford-Brown, Leonard Davies, Howard Henshaw, Elizabeth Oades,
Other Councillors	Cheryl Little
Officers	Allan Oldfield, Tracy Scholes, Christine Miller, Darren Bell, Paul Drinnan, Annie Womack
Others	

1. Declarations of interest

Members were reminded that any personal/prejudicial interests should be declared as required by the Council's Code of Conduct adopted in accordance with the Local Government Act 2000.

2. Confirmation of minutes

RESOLVED: To approve the minutes of the Policy Development Scrutiny Committee meetings held on 20 May 2010 as a correct record for signature by the chairman.

3. Substitute members

The following substitutions were reported under council procedure rule 22.3:

Councillor Dawn Prestwich for Councillor Brenda Ackers

Councillor Kath Harper for Councillor John Davies

4. Fairhaven Lake - Masterplan

This report was presented to the committee by Mr Paul Drinnan (Head of Regeneration and Tourism), and Mr Darren Bell (Head of Leisure Services). The report concerned the development of a Landscape Master Plan for

Fairhaven Lake and Gardens, and outlined the procurement process to engage a specialist lead consultant to lead the commission and pull together the master plan and associated work.

Mr Drinnan gave the committee some strategic context for the project and spoke about the Council adopting a strategic approach to the future conservation, protection and development of Fairhaven Lake and Gardens as a leisure facility, building on the natural biodiversity of the area, green trends, and with a view to increasing our tourism industry. He talked about linkage to plans to enhance Lytham and the development of Lytham Hall, the planned improvements to transport infrastructure, the proposed sea defence works and Fairhaven's role within the Regional Park.

Mr Bell talked about the proposed aims of the masterplan, which included the restoration of the historic buildings and landscapes and to increase usage of the facility. He gave a summary of the work required and told the committee that a key driver would be the activity plan. The activity plan would aim to identify the target audience for Fairhaven which in turn would steer the development of the site in terms of tailoring the facilities.

Mr Bell told the committee that they would be appointing a lead consultant in the near future to lead the study, and that it would be the intention to use the findings to form part of a bid to the Heritage Lottery Fund and other potential funding partners.

Members discussed the proposal and expressed opinions about the nature of potential future developments and activities. Mr Bell assured members that consultation would be extensive and that there will be an opportunity in the future for all members to debate the issues. Members expressed concern about the current state of drainage at the lake and the water quality and requested that the replacement of drains should be given a high priority in the masterplan.

After the debate, members RESOLVED:

1. To note the report and to request that updates to the plan be brought to committee for consideration and review.

There was no recorded vote as the Chairman decided that the matter was not controversial, and the resolution was carried by show of hands.

5. The Tourist Information Centre (TIC)

Mr Allan Oldfield (Director of Customer and Operational Services) presented his report to the committee. It was intended to advise them of the current position regarding the service delivery of Tourist Information and to recommend that they should consider alternatives for the future, given the challenging financial situation that the Council will soon be facing.

Mr Oldfield gave the committee some background relating to the closure of the old TIC and the integration of the service with the reception service at the Town Hall. He reminded members that there was also a seasonal service provided from Lytham Windmill.

He advised members that research had been carried out into the nature of enquiries and the way in which the customer chose to engage, which was increasingly through the web and by telephone. He told them that other local authorities had developed innovative means of delivering a tourist information service.

The committee debated the matter and agreed that further investigation by a Task and Finish Group would be appropriate. The following councillors will make up the Task & Finish Group - Cllrs Craig-Wilson, Mulholland, Oades and Chedd with Joceline Greenaway (Customer Service Manager) acting as lead officer for the group

The committee RESOLVED:

1. To establish a Task & Finish Group to investigate future service provision options for TIC(s) across the Fylde.

There was no recorded vote as the Chairman decided that the matter was not controversial, and the resolution was carried by show of hands.

6. Shaping the Place Evaluation Report

Tracy Scholes (Director of Governance and Partnerships) and Christine Miller (Head of Partnerships) gave a presentation to the committee about the evaluation of the Shaping the Place project which had taken place in Central Ward, St Annes.

Mrs Scholes reported that the evaluation report (attached as an appendix to the agenda papers) had already been considered by the Local Strategic Partnership (LSP) Executive.

The report had covered the key areas of the project, including housing, environmental enhancement, young people, community safety and employment and enterprise. It outlined the successes in these areas, and the fact that the project had been well supported by the local community, including residents and businesses.

The LSP Executive, having considered the report, determined that it would give future consideration to rolling the programme out based on the area of greatest need balanced against the affordability of running the programme against other LSP priorities.

This item had therefore been brought before the committee for them to comment on the potential roll out of the project. Ms Scholes suggested some questions that members might like to address, principally whether they felt that

the approach had been successful in bringing about improvements, and could it be used successfully in another area - if so what factors would influence the choice of area.

Members discussed the matter and agreed that the project had been a success and should be rolled out to other areas. However, the Mayor Cllr Oades commented that the impact of the project on jobs and health would have been useful, and that the improvements needed to be sustained.

The committee RESOLVED:

1. To comment to the LSP that the project could be used successfully in other areas and should be rolled out; that members would determine where they believed the project could make a difference to people's lives and advise Mrs Scholes; and that funding for the project should be prioritised as high

© Fylde Borough Council copyright [2010]

You may re-use this document/publication (not including logos) free of charge in any format or medium. You must re-use it accurately and not in a misleading context. The material must be acknowledged as Fylde Borough Council copyright and you must give the title of the source document/publication. Where we have identified any third party copyright material you will need to obtain permission from the copyright holders concerned.

This document/publication is also available on our website at www.fylde.gov.uk

Any enquiries regarding this document/publication should be sent to us at the Town Hall, St Annes Road West, St Annes FY8 1LW, or to listening@fylde.gov.uk.