

Agenda

TOURISM AND LEISURE COMMITTEE



Date:

Thursday, 9 March 2017 at 6:30 pm

Venue:

Town Hall, St Annes, FY8 1LW

Committee members:

Councillor Cheryl Little (Chairman)
Councillor Tim Ashton (Vice-Chairman)

Councillors Christine Akeroyd, Jan Barker, Brenda Blackshaw, Julie Brickles, Maxine Chew, Richard Fradley, Paul Hodgson, Sandra Pitman, Vince Settle, Raymond Thomas.

Public Platform

To hear representations from members of the public in accordance with council procedure rule 11.

To register to speak under Public Platform: see [Public Speaking at Council Meetings](#).

	PROCEDURAL ITEMS:	PAGE
1	Declarations of Interest: Declarations of interest, and the responsibility for declaring the same, are matters for elected members. Members are able to obtain advice, in writing, in advance of meetings. This should only be sought via the Council's Monitoring Officer. However, it should be noted that no advice on interests sought less than one working day prior to any meeting will be provided.	1
2	Confirmation of Minutes: To confirm the minutes, as previously circulated, of the meeting held on 12 January 2017 as a correct record.	1
3	Substitute Members: Details of any substitute members notified in accordance with council procedure rule 24(c).	1
	DECISION ITEMS:	
4	Lytham Hall Restoration Project - Independent Audit Report	3 - 22
5	Lytham Mussel Tank Improvement Project	23 - 37
6	Blue Flag Beach Award	38 - 51
7	The Island Regeneration Working Group	52 - 54
8	Appointment to Outside Bodies/Working Groups	55 - 63
	INFORMATION ITEMS:	
9	St George's Day Festival	64

Contact: Lyndsey Lacey-Simone - Telephone: (01253) 658504 – Email: democracy@fylde.gov.uk

The code of conduct for members can be found in the council's constitution at
<http://fylde.cmis.uk.com/fylde/DocumentsandInformation/PublicDocumentsandInformation.aspx>

© Fylde Borough Council copyright 2017

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.

DECISION ITEM



REPORT OF	MEETING	DATE	ITEM NO
RESOURCES DIRECTORATE	TOURISM AND LEISURE COMMITTEE	9 MARCH 2017	4
LYTHAM HALL RESTORATION PROJECT - INDEPENDENT AUDIT REPORT			

PUBLIC ITEM

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

SUMMARY

The report provides the findings from the independent audit into the reasons for the withdrawal of funding support for the Lytham Hall restoration project. The audit was requested by the Tourism & Leisure committee at the meeting on November 3rd 2016 where it was resolved:

That the Tourism and Leisure Committee ask for an independent audit to be commissioned to examine in detail and to ascertain:

- (a) The reasons for some of the major funding bodies pulling out of the project.
- (b) The findings of other work undertaken into the project such as the Moore Stephens report prepared by the Heritage Lottery Fund.
- (c) Whether in light of this information the borough council can have any confidence that the existing trustees and management of HTNW will ever be able to complete the restoration of Lytham Hall within a reasonable time period.
- (d) What has the £300,000 that Fylde Council gave to Lytham Hall been spent (to be suitably itemised)
- (e) Whether in light of the outcome of 2 (d) above, the council has any grounds to demand repayment of the £300,000 grant awarded by Fylde Council in 2011.

The audit team at Blackpool Council carried out the investigation work and produced the Fact Finding Report included as Appendix 1 to this report.

RECOMMENDATION

Having regard to the Fact Finding report and the previous information provided at the meeting on November 3rd 2016, the committee concludes as follows:

1. That Heritage Trust North West ("HTNW") have failed to comply with clauses, 5, 8, 9, 14 and 22 of the Heads of Terms of the Lytham Hall Capital Grant agreement dated August 4th 2011.
2. That the committee has no confidence in the ability of the present leadership or management of HTNW to lead the Lytham Hall restoration project and request the immediate removal of HTNW's Chief Executive from the Lytham Hall restoration project.
3. That the committee seeks reassurance, with supporting evidence, from the Heritage Trust North West Board that they have the capability and appropriate personnel to continue to deliver the Lytham Hall restoration project, in particular an appropriately qualified financial officer, without which the committee cannot have confidence in HTNW delivering the Lytham Hall Restoration Project.

4. That the management of the Lytham Hall restoration project includes separate and dedicated accounting and financial management from other projects being delivered by HTNW.
5. That the financial management arrangements include a separate capital account and that all accounts are submitted on an annual basis for inspection to all parties that have made a grant contribution.
6. That the Heritage Trust North West be required to provide an itemised list with costing of the capital initiatives that Fylde Council's £300,000 has been allocated to and the amount of the grant that remains unspent, in accordance with Clause 5 of the grant agreement.
7. That should HTNW decline or be unable to take any of the actions set out above to ensure compliance with the terms of the council's grant, the council will take such action as may be open to it (including legal action) to recover the grant.
8. That HTNW be requested to invite Fylde Council to nominate an elected member of as a member of its Board of Trustees.
9. That six monthly progress reports are provided to the committee by the elected member representative and the appropriately qualified financial officer responsible for the Lytham Hall restoration project.
10. The committee notes the continued challenge of the refusal to release the Moore Stephens report under the Freedom of Information Act and if it is made available that it is brought before the committee for consideration.
11. That the council reviews the protocols for capital grant funding of longer term projects to include milestone payment terms determined by set criteria as opposed to one off up-front payment.
12. That the Council, preferably with other funding partners, seeks the intervention of the Charity Commission to review the overall financial management and governance arrangements of Heritage Trust North West and its respective trading companies.

SUMMARY OF PREVIOUS DECISIONS

November 3rd 2016 Tourism & Leisure - Lytham Hall Capital Grant Monitoring Report
 November 12th 2015 Tourism & Leisure - Lytham Hall Capital Grant Monitoring Report
 January 7th 2015 Tourism & Leisure – Lytham Hall Progress Report: Coastal Revival Fund
 January 15th 2014 Cabinet - Lytham Hall Capital Grant Monitoring Report
 June 27th 2012 Cabinet - Lytham Hall Capital Grant Monitoring Report
 June 28th 2011 Cabinet - Lytham Hall Capital Grant Approval
 March 28th 2011 Full Council – Lytham Hall Capital Grant Request
 March 23rd 2011 Cabinet – Lytham Hall Capital Grant Request

CORPORATE PRIORITIES

Spending your money in the most efficient way to achieve excellent services (Value for Money)	√
Delivering the services that customers expect of an excellent council (Clean and Green)	
Working with all partners (Vibrant Economy)	√
To make sure Fylde continues to be one of the most desirable places to live (A Great Place to Live)	√
Promoting Fylde as a great destination to visit (A Great Place to Visit)	√

REPORT

1. The report provided as Appendix 1 are the factual findings from the independent audit report commissioned by the committee into the financial management of the Lytham Hall Restoration Project being carried out by Heritage Trust for the North West ("HTNW"). The audit team at Blackpool Council were commissioned to carry out the work and have no operational or financial link to Lytham Hall therefore can act impartially presenting only the facts from the research and interviews.
2. The report provides factual clarification with supporting evidence in respect to several issues that were not satisfactorily explained by the HTNW Chief Executive on November 3rd 2016 when he attended the committee meeting to present the annual Capital Monitoring Report. The report covers the following:
 - The reasons for some of the major funding bodies pulling out of the project.
 - The findings of other work undertaken into the project such as the Moore Stephens report prepared by the Heritage Lottery Fund.
 - Whether in light of this information the borough council can have any confidence that the existing trustees and management of HTNW will be able to complete the restoration of Lytham Hall within a reasonable time period.
 - What has the £300,000 that Fylde Council gave to Lytham Hall been spent on (to be suitably itemised).
 - Whether the Council has any grounds to demand repayment of the £300,000 grant awarded by Fylde Council in 2011.
3. A request for the Moore Stephens report was made by Fylde Council to the Chief Executive of HTNW who refused to release the report on the grounds that it was commissioned by the Heritage Lottery Fund (HLF) and the request should be made direct to the HLF. Fylde Council and the MP for Fylde requested the Moore Stephens report from the HLF under the Freedom of Information Act and the request was refused on the grounds that it contained information that had been given in the expectation of confidence and of prejudice to commercial interests. The council is appealing against this decision on the grounds that HLF funding, and some of the other grants to the Lytham Hall Restoration Project, is from public finances and as such it is in the public interest to disclose the report. At the time of publishing this report the appeal is still being considered. In the event that the Moore Stephens report is disclosed it will be reported to the committee.
4. Members are asked to carefully consider the content of the Fact Finding audit report along with the information that was presented in person by the Chief Executive of HTNW and in the report at the meeting on November 3rd 2016 which can be found at [this link](#).
5. It is clear from the detailed financial information provided in the Fact Finding audit report that the financial management systems HTNW have in place made it impossible to allocate grant funding by the various contributors to specific projects and / or works, or to differentiate between revenue and capital expenditure, or that the funds for the Lytham Hall Restoration Project are recorded and contained in a dedicated account. This has made it difficult for HTNW to accurately report back to the council in accordance with clauses 5, 8 and 22 of the Heads of Terms for the Lytham Hall Capital Grant.
6. HTNW were notified in early 2016 that the HLF were closing the project down and withdrawing the remainder of the funding; *'Therefore the previously agreed HLF project was no longer affordable and the project as was ended in 2016 with the last claim which has been settled by the HLF relating to Jan – March 2016'* (2.1.16). Fylde Council was only notified of the HLF decision on Tuesday August 9th at a meeting with the Chief Executive of HTNW and the Project

Manager for the Lytham Hall Restoration Project that was arranged to discuss a press release on the matter. The failure to notify Fylde Council is a breach of Clause 14 of the Heads of Terms.

7. HLF commissioned the Moore Stephens investigation in July 2016 and a report has subsequently been produced. In accordance with Clause 9 to the Heads of Terms in the agreement for the capital contribution to Lytham Hall, Fylde Council should have been informed of the inspection and provided with a copy of the report. HTNW are in breach of the agreement (Clause 9) by not providing the dates of the inspection and the report.
8. The Fact Finding report in Appendix 1 contains a number of factual statements that reflect the competency of HTNW leadership and management of the Lytham Hall Restoration Project which members should consider in coming to their view on the recommendations to this report, the statements include:
 - 2.1.7 – *‘in 2011 that the HTNW had defaulted on a loan’*
 - 2.1.9 – *‘HTNW missed the deadline for submitting the business case’*
 - 2.1.10 – (in 2015) *‘when reviewing the business case submitted by HTNW it was noted that they had not sold the properties which they had stated they would dispose of as part of the 2013 agreement’*
 - 2.1.14 – *‘In retrospect it could be considered that the income target was unrealistic as no evidence has been provided which suggests that Lytham Hall had previously made a profit.’*
 - 2.1.17 – *‘They (the HLF) had identified significant risks with the business plan and the governance and management proposals which meant the request was not supportable.’*
 - 2.2.19 – *‘The Chief Executive of HTNW confirmed, as part of this review, that there is a need to strengthen governance arrangements’*
 - 2.3.1 – *‘It is evident that there has been a breakdown in the relationships between the key stakeholders involved in the project to restore Lytham Hall.’*
 - 2.3.2 – *‘fuelled by an apparent lack of willingness by the Chief Executive of HTNW to share the outcome of the various reviews which have been undertaken’*
 - 2.3.3 – (the Lytham Hall Project) *‘has suffered from a lack of effective management and dedicated financial support from someone who is qualified in financial management’*
 - 2.3.3 – *‘it would be difficult to provide assurance that the HTNW, as this moment and with their current processes, would be able to deliver the Lytham Hall project on a timely basis, nor is there currently the funding available to deliver the scheme.’*
 - 2.4.6 – *‘Due to the way in which the financial records have been maintained it is not possible to categorically say what element of funding was spent on what part of the project’*
 - 2.4.6 – *‘There is no separate bank account for the Lytham Hall Project and the money goes into the main HTNW account’*
 - 2.4.7 – *‘there is no transparent record which can be referred to in order to assess money coming in and out of the project, and no clear audit trail which can be clearly attributed to Lytham Hall.’*
 - 2.5.1 – *‘the financial information provided shows that not all the money (the £3000,00 grant from Fylde) could have been spent on capital works but has been apportioned to contribute to all the costs identified in the HLF project’*
 - 2.5.3 – *‘it is not possible to specifically detail how Fylde Borough Council’s funding has been spent.’*
9. Members of the committee are asked to consider the recommendations included with this report and propose any further recommendations which may arise from the information available and debate on the item.

IMPLICATIONS	
Finance	In August 2011 Fylde Council agreed a capital sum of £300k to support the Lytham Hall Heritage Restoration Project, which was paid in 2011/12. The latest unaudited accounts of the Heritage Trust for the North West (at 31 March 2015) show that at that date a sum of £131,108 of this grant remained unspent. It is anticipated that within the 2015/16 accounts this figure will be significantly reduced to reflect the additional expenditure incurred since March 2015.
Legal	Evidence from the audit report indicates that there has been at least one clause of the Heads of Terms breached by HTNW.
Community Safety	No implications arising from this report
Human Rights and Equalities	No implications arising from this report
Sustainability and Environmental Impact	No implications arising from this report
Health & Safety and Risk Management	No implications arising from this report

LEAD AUTHOR	TEL	DATE	DOC ID
Allan Oldfield	01253 658500	Date of report	


LIST OF BACKGROUND PAPERS		
Name of document	Date	Where available for inspection
Committee Reports	Various	www.fylde.gov.uk

Appendices attached to this report

Appendix 1: Fact Finding Report – Review of Lytham Hall Restoration Project

Fact Finding Report

Review of Lytham Hall Restorartion Project



Audit Team: Tracy Greenhalgh
Stephen Hagan
Date: 31st January 2017

1.

2. Scope

- 2.1 Blackpool Council was commissioned by Fylde Borough Council to undertake an independent review of the Lytham Hall Restoration Project. This was as a result of a meeting of the Tourism and Leisure Committee in November 2016 where it was determined that the Council could not be confident that grant monies provided by Fylde Borough Council had been spent appropriately.
- 2.2 At the Tourism and Leisure Committee meeting it was requested that the independent audit examined in detail and ascertained:
- The reasons for some of the major funding bodies pulling out of the project.
 - The findings of other work undertaken into the project such as the Moore Stephens report prepared by the Heritage Lottery Fund.
 - Whether in light of this information the borough council can have any confidence that the existing trustees and management of the Heritage Trust North West (HTNW) will be able to complete the restoration of Lytham Hall within a reasonable time period.
 - What has the £300,000 that Fylde Council gave to Lytham Hall been spent on (to be suitably itemised).
 - Whether the Council has any grounds to demand repayment of the £300,000 grant awarded by Fylde Council in 2011.
- 2.3 Blackpool Council's Chief Internal Auditor, Tracy Greenhalgh, was appointed to undertake this review and was supported by Stephen Hagan a member of the Internal Audit and Corporate Fraud Team at the Council.

3. Findings

3.1 The reasons for some of the major funding bodies pulling out of the project.

3.1.1 On the 3rd August 2011 the Heritage Lottery Fund (HLF) wrote to the Chief Executive at the Heritage Trust North West (HTNW) confirming the award of a grant of up to £2,441,200 towards the restoration of Lytham Hall and the surrounding parkland and gardens. This represented 41% of the total eligible project cost of £5,984,437. There were a number of approved purposes which the HLF would monitor progress against and these included:

- To restore, refurbish and interpret Lytham Hall so it is no longer a building at risk.
- Create a conference and events venue with restaurant facilities to generate revenue.
- Increase public access to the Hall and Park including full access for people with disabilities.
- Renovate the parkland and gardens to provide year round access.
- Provide a varied programme of events and activities to engage the public.
- Improve the long term management and maintenance of the Hall and park.

- Provide volunteering and training opportunities for the general public and staff.

3.1.2 The basis of the project required a considerable amount of match funding in order to meet the costs of the project. The partnership funding which was quoted as part of the HLFs agreement letter was as follows:

Income Heading	Description	Secured	Total
Cash	Lancashire County Council	Yes	£1,000,000
Cash	Heritage Trust North West	Yes	£403,312
Cash	Earned Income (HTNW)	Yes	£387,362
Cash	Fylde Borough Council	Yes	£300,000
Cash	Further donations to appeal	No	£249,025
Cash	Public Appeal and Fundraising Events	Yes	£115,000
Cash	Lytham Town Trust	Yes	£100,000
Cash	Grants / Sponsorship	No	£58,000
Cash	Landfill Tax	No	£50,000
Cash	Charitable Trust Donations	No	£50,000
Cash	Due to rounding down	No	£18
Non-cash contributions	Gifts in Kind	No	£197,520
Volunteer Time	Volunteer Tasks	No	£633,000
Total			£3,543,237

3.1.3 However, not all of the funding identified was secured at the time of receiving the HLF grant, even though some of it had been identified as being secured.

3.1.4 The key source of funding which had not been formally secured at the time of submitting the bid was the £1,000,000 from Lancashire County Council (LCC). Whilst discussions started between HTNW and LCC in 2011 about the potential of providing funding it was not until March 2013 that LCC wrote to HTNW outlining the decision which had been made in relation to providing funding for the scheme.

3.1.5 On the 6th March 2013 LCC wrote to the Chief Executive of HTNW outlining their position in terms of funding for Lytham Hall and HTNW. This highlighted that the funding they would provide would be focused on three key areas including:

- An in principle agreement to increase the HTNW's Loan Guarantee from £500,000 to £1,000,000.
- An in principle agreement to investment of £1,000,000 in the refurbishment of Lytham Hall.
- An in principle agreement to provide revenue funding for the operational costs of the HTNW.

3.1.6 The letter stipulated that in order for the above decisions to be implemented a number of actions needed to be undertaken by HTNW. These focused on the drafting of a Development Plan including:

- An Asset Disposal Strategy setting out a schedule for the disposal of identified Trust property assets in order to reduce the Trust's reliance on loans to undertake activity.
- An agreement to LCC taking a charge over Trust property assets as identified in the Asset Disposal Strategy, to a value sufficient to cover potential liabilities from the £1,000,000 Loan Guarantee.
- An agreement to the proceeds of sale on any Trust properties to be either:
 - Applied directly in reduction of Architectural Heritage Fund Loans and the guarantee from LCC reduced by the same amount, or
 - Set aside for loan repayment at a later date.

3.1.7 Discussions with LCC have confirmed that the funding model proposed was based not only on helping to restore Lytham Hall but also to help ensure that the HTNW was on a more sustainable financial footing going forward. LCC had been a Loan Guarantee for the HTNW since the 1990's for Architectural Heritage Fund (AHF) Loans however they had been notified in 2011 that the HTNW had defaulted on a loan and therefore LCC wanted to ensure that they took adequate due diligence before increasing the level of Loan Guarantee provided to the HTNW.

3.1.8 When the funding model was offered to HTNW by LCC it was on the basis that the AHF would be providing a loan for the Lytham Hall project. However, LCC became aware that the AHF would be no longer be making a loan in 2014 and therefore the loan package that LCC had proposed in March 2013 no longer existed, leaving a significant funding gap for the HLF project.

3.1.9 LCC and the Chief Executive of HTNW continued to discuss potential funding models and in January 2015 HTNW were requested to provide a revised business case for funding. HTNW missed the deadline for submitting the business case, however when it was received it was still seeking funding of £1,000,000 for the project.

3.1.10 In 2015 LCC were facing significant financial pressures due to funding reductions inflicted by Central Government as part of austerity measures. Therefore, it would be difficult to justify providing funding for a project at such a significant amount. In addition, when reviewing the business case submitted by HTNW it was noted that they had not sold the properties which they had stated they would dispose of as part of the 2013 agreement. Had they done this then the shortfall to deliver the Lytham Hall project would be much reduced at £300,000. The Chief Executive of HTNW provided a number of reasons as to why the properties had not been sold however LCC did not consider that they could fund the project.

3.1.11 In order to address some of the concerns identified by LCC and in order to pay off the AHF loans the Chief Executive of HTNW and HTNW entered into a £1.5 million refinance package with Unity Trust Bank in order to given the Trust greater flexibility in terms of rental incomes and mortgage payments. In doing so the HTNW would no longer require LCC to act as Loan Guarantee for AHF loans. However, this did not change LCC's view that they could not justify funding Lytham Hall at the levels requested by HTNW.

3.1.12 In May 2016 Lytham Town Trust contacted LCC seeking funding in the region of £300,000 for Lytham Hall as part of a revised package which was being prepared for the HLF which took account of the reduced level of match funding. LCC agreed to provide funding of £300,000 if the revised HLF submission was successful.

3.1.13 The Chief Executive of HTNW considers the protracted negotiations with LCC was the primary reason for the HLF project being delayed however it is evident from the information provided as part of this review that a formal decision was not taken by LCC to provide the funding until 2013 which was after the successful HLF bid in 2011 which indicated that the funding was already secured.

3.1.14 Due to the delays in starting the HLF project the Chief Executive of HTNW believes that the earned income contribution of £387,362 was no longer achievable as they did not have a full product or service to sell in order to generate the required level of income. This therefore created further vulnerabilities in the financial model and a significant shortfall in match funding. In retrospect it could be considered that the income target was unrealistic as no evidence has been provided which suggests that Lytham Hall had previously made a profit. The profit and loss accounts provided by HTNW as part of this review for Lytham Hall show a net loss in 2015/2016 of £109,669.29 and in the first three quarters of 2016/2017 a net loss of £102,746.30 which further supports the fact that the proposed earned income target may have been overstated and was not secured as identified in the HLF bid.

3.1.15 The impact of this significantly reduced the £2,712,717 cash funding which had been included in the HLF bid therefore putting the project at risk. The HTNW and Lytham Town Trust continued to secure some cash funding for the project and the money actually received is shown in the following table:

Source	Value	Terms
Fylde Borough Council	£300,000	Capital grant for restoration project
Getty Trust	£50,000	Restoration of Lytham Hall
Public Appeal	£115,000	-
Further Donations to the Appeal	£36,287	-
Monument Trust	£200,000	Restoration of Lytham Hall
Veolia (Landfill)	£20,828	Restoration of the south park
Lancashire Environmental Fund (Landfill)	£40,000	Restoration of the south park
Coastal Revival Fund	£30,000	Georgian Hall external restoration work
Harold Bridges Trust	£2,000	Not specified.
Country House Foundations	£28,800	External repairs to Lytham Hall
Total	£822,915	

3.1.16 This represented a £1,889,802 shortfall in terms of the level of cash match funding required in order to complete the HLF project. Therefore the previously agreed HLF project was no longer affordable and the project as was ended in 2016 with the last claim which has been settled by the HLF relating to Jan – March 2016. It total the HLF have paid HTNW £716,869 for the project. The HTNW have also submitted a claim to the HLF for the period of April to June 2016 however the HLF have not released payment for this as they are unable to reconcile the claim and are therefore undertaking an internal review of the case.

3.1.17 Given the shortfall in funding a Change of Approved Purpose was submitted to the HLF which presented a reduced scheme at Lytham Hall and an associated Increased Grant Intervention Rate. The HLF wrote to HTNW on the 9th August 2016 to advise that the request had been rejected. It stated that the Board recognised the good progress with the landscaping work, the strong engagement of volunteers and the need to restore the Hall but they did not have

confidence in the proposals submitted. They had identified significant risks with the business plan and the governance and management proposals which meant the request was not supportable.

3.1.18 Although the HLF project is being closed down HTNW have continued to incur costs including project costs for April to June 2016 and salary costs up to and including December 2016 totalling £77,483.

3.2 The findings of other work undertaken into the project.

3.2.1 When the HLF became aware of the need to reduce the Lytham Hall scheme due to funding issues they commissioned Moore and Stephens to undertake a Project and Organisational review. The HTNW were notified by letter on the 4th July 2016 that the HLF had arranged for the visit to take place on the 7th and 8th July 2016.

3.2.2 Discussions with the HLF have confirmed that the review was commissioned as they had concerns over the deliverability of the revised scheme and they had concerns that the initially agreed project was significantly delayed before it commenced, a situation that the HLF had experienced on another HTNW project they are funding. The review focused on the following key areas:

- Financial Health
- Financial and Project Governance
- Project Delivery
- Financial Controls

3.2.3 The HLF have confirmed that the report has identified a number of control failings in each of the above scope areas to varying degrees. The report was issued to the Chief Executive of HTNW who was given an opportunity to review the report and respond if he had any concerns over the contents. However, no formal response was received by the HLF.

3.2.4 The HLF have not provided a copy of the report to Fylde Borough Council and have rejected a Freedom of Information request to access the report. The decision not to respond to the Freedom of Information request is now being appealed by Fylde Borough Council.

3.2.5 The Chief Executive of HTNW has been asked by a number of stakeholders to provide a copy of the report but has been reluctant to do so. When asked to provide a copy of the report for this review the Chief Executive of HTNW advised that the report included a clause that he needed to seek authorisation from the author prior to sharing the report. The Chief Executive of HTNW advised that he considered parts of the report to be factually inaccurate and was not a true reflection of the work of the HTNW. The Chief Executive of HTNW advised that the Trustees were intending for an independent review of the report to be undertaken and then a formal response would be provided to the HLF.

3.2.6 Lytham Town Trust, who own Lytham Hall and lease it to the HTNW to manage, also have a number of concerns in relation to how the HLF project has been managed and the HTNW's ability to deliver the necessary restoration at the Hall. Lytham Town Trust have undertaken there own review of the information which has been made available to them in order to ensure that the funding received was being appropriately spent.

3.2.7 On the 14th July 2016 Lytham Town Trust wrote to the Chief Executive of HTNW advising that they were aware that the HLF has asked for a funding reconciliation in respect of the final grant claim submission. The Project Manager for the Lytham Hall project, could not account for £166k of grants received. The explanation provided by HTNW was that the money had been absorbed by travelling expenses and the cost of raising other grants for the project. Lytham Town Trust did not consider these to be approved costs under the terms of the HLF grant.

3.2.8 As a result of the above concerns Lytham Town Trust constructed an account of funding and capital expenditure on Lytham Hall. Based on the information Lytham Town Trust had available they assessed that there was a £491,605 discrepancy on the account which they sought an explanation for.

3.2.9 Lytham Town Trust determined that HTNW had received HLF grant to the value of £258,200 in respect of volunteer time and a further £44,743 for gifts in kind and have not been required to account for how this money had been used. This could partially account for the identified discrepancy along with the £200,000 of funding from the Monument Trust which did not appear to be captured in the account.

3.2.10 The Chief Executive of HTNW responded on the 28th July 2016 to provide an explanation to the concerns raised. He advised that project and associated funding was for both revenue and capital purposes as there was a need to develop and deliver an Activity Plan. The Chief Executive of HTNW also stipulates that it was impossible to separate the HLF project from the running costs of Lytham Hall as a holistic approach needed to be applied to ensure the delivery of a seven day operation. The Chief Executive of HTNW also emphasised that the HLF funding was limited to 40.79% which was considered low in comparison to other projects and in the current economic climate it was difficult to secure the 59% of match funding required. The Chief Executive of HTNW also cited the breakdown with LCC which had made it difficult to plan a strategy on the way forward causing expensive delays and uncertainties.

3.2.11 The Chief Executive of HTNW also highlighted a number of errors included in the accounts presented by the Lytham Town Trust and cited that these accounted for £172,613 of the difference. These included:

- The £67,200 from the Country Houses Foundation had not been received.
- The £64,500 was for the non-cash contribution from LCC for a Ranger Post which ceased in January 2015.
- The £25k Lytham Heritage Group funding was included in the figure for the public appeal.
- The actual expenditure on the joinery workshop was £15,933 over the £10k received from the Coastal Revival Fund.

3.2.12 The Chief Executive of HTNW also explained that the cost of the restoration of the Park and preliminary works for the Hall restoration have exceeded the budget due to unforeseen work which was not included in the original HLF project. These included:

- Provision of lavatories in the Stable Block for visitors.
- Repairs and upgrading rooms in the Stable Block to enable storage of the Collection.
- Provision of accommodation and welfare facilities for the volunteers.
- Additional flood lighting for the car parks.
- Creation for a joinery workshop for use by volunteers.
- Additional managing and overheads costs looking after 120 volunteers.
- Amendments and additions to the landscape works.
- Additional overhead costs of running the Activity Programme.

3.2.13 The Chief Executive of HTNW also highlighted that HTNW have invested in capital works at Lytham Hall valuing £18,585.31. The Chief Executive of HTNW acknowledges that these were not grant aided but were project related. Items included:

- Repairs to Gatehouse lock / door handle

- Routine maintenance to the Main House
- West Wing roof repairs and scaffolding
- WW Tearoom repairs
- Slating to the Privy
- Construction of Wood Store
- Made sandwich boards
- Provision and erection of scaffolding to North Porch for paint works and hire of a cherry picker for architects.
- Supplied two joinery work benches and created a secure compound.
- Created storage area for archaeological finds.
- Acquisition of and renovations to Catering Van.

3.2.14 The Chief Executive of HTNW also explained that under the HLF funding the HTNW were eligible to claim for full cost recovery to contribute to the funding's of overheads. It is suggested that the original value of the rebate was based on the 2010/2011 gross annual salary bill however the costs had increased therefore the original calculations were under-estimated on a low cost base.

3.2.15 The Chief Executive of HTNW provided a number of other explanations as to the costs of the project:

- The delays in starting the project since the concept of the lottery bid commenced in 2009, which the Chief Executive of HTNW believes were caused by LCC, resulted in the Trust being in deficit by £148,570.
- No charges were submitted from the HTNW for submitting the original HLF bid. Whilst consultants were paid staff time was not accounted for.
- The LCC negotiations were protracted over a period of 2010 to 2016 which had prevented the Trust from preparing a Strategy.
- HTNW incurring expenditure after April 2016 which they have been unable to claim for.
- The HLF cost plan only allowed for £1,100 for volunteer expenses including welfare provision which was inadequate to cover the number of volunteers. Therefore the HLF funding received for volunteers and non-cash expenses has been used to cover this.
- The HLF budget for volunteer tools and equipment was spent by April 2015 and the HTNW have borne the costs of the additional expense.

3.2.16 Lytham Town Trust replied on the 9th August 2016 in which they dispute that the reason for the delay in the project was due to the actions of LCC. They also state that the net income from the Hall of £387,362 which was projected as part of the match funding was unrealistic as the Hall had never operated at a profit. Concerns were raised that match funding grants had been made specifically for the restoration of the Hall and not to cover operational revenue costs other than those stipulated in the HLF grant letter. It was also suggested that HTNW, rather than Lytham Hall, were the principal beneficiary of the HLF project given the value of overheads charged to the project.

3.2.17 Lytham Town Trust conclude that there is a fundamental difference between them and the HTNW in relation to how the grants received for the HLF project at Lytham Hall should have been applied and also in the way in which a charity should be managed to ensure that protection of public money.

3.2.18 On the 24th August 2016 Lytham Town Trust contacted Fylde Borough Council to outline some of their concerns, which they had shared at a meeting of the Friends of Lytham Hall the previous evening. The key concerns raised were in relation to governance at the HTNW with particular issues being:

- The Chief Executive is instrumental in choosing the Trustees.
- Board meetings are currently only held once a year.
- Minutes are issued by the Chief Executive and issued twelve months in arrears. Any criticism he has received at the meeting is not recorded.
- The Chief Executive is supported by an absentee Chairman.

3.2.19 The above points have not been validated as part of this review. However the Chief Executive of HTNW confirmed, as part of this review, that there is a need to strengthen governance arrangements and has commissioned an independent review of governance which is currently underway.

3.2.20 Given the range of concerns raised with Fylde Borough Council, the Chief Executive instructed Darren Bell, who works at the Council to undertake a fact finding investigation and provide a formal position statement. The outcome of the review was presented to the Tourism and Leisure Committee on the 3rd November 2016. The report concluded that it was difficult to reach a conclusion as to whether the capital grant awarded by Fylde Borough Council had been spent in accordance with the Heads of Terms based on the information provided.

3.2.21 The Chief Executive of HTNW attended the meeting on the 3rd November 2016 and made a presentation which included some of the highlights of 2016, an overview of the HLF approved projects completed and those outstanding, HLF project costs as at 31st March 2016, details of further expected grant funding, matters associated with post HLF and the HTNW strategy for future years.

3.2.22 Mr Gill made a public representation at the meeting in his role as Chair of Lytham Town Trust as did Mr Kitt in his role as Secretary of Lytham Town Trust. Concerns were raised in relation to financial management and governance arrangements.

3.3 Confidence that the HTNW will be able to complete the restoration of Lytham Hall

3.3.1 It is evident that there has been a breakdown in the relationships between the key stakeholders involved in the project to restore Lytham Hall. There is a desire by all parties involved to see Lytham Hall restored, however there is clearly a lack of trust and a difference of opinion relating to the financial management of the HLF project.

3.3.2 This has been fuelled by an apparent lack of willingness by the Chief Executive of HTNW to share the outcome of the various reviews which have been undertaken, particularly the Moore Stephens report.

3.3.3 It should be recognised that HTNW have been in place for a number of years and have managed a number of building preservation projects. However, the Lytham Hall project is complex in terms of the number of funding streams and the scale of the programme, and it appears that it has suffered from a lack of effective management and dedicated financial support from someone who is qualified in financial management, specifically in relation to large scale projects. Based on this it would be difficult to provide assurance that the HTNW, at this moment and with their current processes, would be able to deliver the Lytham Hall project on a timely basis, nor is there currently the funding available to deliver the scheme.

3.4 What has the £300,000 that Fylde Council gave to Lytham Hall been spent on

3.4.1 On the 23rd March 2011 a decision was taken by Fylde Borough Councils Cabinet to potentially support a Capital Funding Request for Lytham Hall for the restoration appeal. Further information was sought from the HTNW and on the 28th June 2011 Cabinet agreed to provide the funding.

3.4.2 On the 4th August 2011 the Heads of Terms were issued by Fylde Council to the HTNW for the Lytham Hall Capital Grant. This stated that a single payment of £300,000 would be payable. There are a number of clauses in the Heads of Terms which are pertinent to the issue being explored namely:

- Clause 5 – The Provider will submit details of how the Grant has been spent within the restoration project and ensure that the capital grant is allocated to the restoration project only.
- Clause 14 – The Provider will notify the Council immediately if the restoration project or the funding requirement changes.
- Clause 19 – The Provider will repay the Grant to the Council in the event that the Heritage Lottery Fund contract terms for the Restoration Project are not delivered in terms of restoring the historic buildings and landscapes, sustaining investment in the long term through delivery of a management and maintenance plan and increasing usage of the facility through delivery on an activity development plan.
- Clause 22 – The Provider will supply sufficient information about its provision of the Services to enable the Council to assess compliance with the Performance Measures.

3.4.3 The Heads of Terms were signed by Phillip Woodward on behalf of Fylde Borough Council on the 8th August 2011 and the Chief Executive of HTNW on behalf of HTNW on the 5th August 2011.

3.4.4 A review of the financial information was undertaken to ascertain how the various streams of funding had been spent. It is apparent that the funding has been used to support the entirety of the HLF project through an apportionment methodology rather than individually detailing and accounting for the specifics which the various funding streams have been spent on. The financial profile for the overall project is as follows:

Cost Head	Description	Total Eligible Cost	Total Claimed Cost
Capital Works	Repair and Conservation Work	£2,291,236	£34,390
	New Building Work	£1,298,668	£0
	Country Park / South Prospect Landscaping and Horticultural Work	£172,853	£174,590
	Equipment and materials – Interpretative exhibitions / installations	£55,125	£539
	Archaeological Works	£29,500	£3,100
	Professional Fees	£410,685	£87,548
	Sub-Total	£4,258,067	£300,167
Further Development Costs	Staff costs – Project Manager 3 years	£108,288	£111,621
	Recruitment for Project Manager	£1,500	£1,493
	Sub-Total	£109,788	£113,114
Activity Costs	Activity Plan Officer 3 years	£84,600	£78,279
	Volunteer / Training Coordinator	£84,600	£44,848
	Training and CPD for staff	£1,000	£887
	Staff travel for 3 years	£3,300	£421
	Volunteer training	£4,600	£2,729
	Volunteer travel	£6,600	£1,843
	Volunteer expenses	£1,100	£1,343
	Equipment and Materials	£26,700	£26,706
	Production of Printed Materials	£5,500	£716
	Activity costs for interpretation	£85,953	£854
	Legal, audit and consultancy fees	£14,300	£12,356
	Sub-Total	£318,253	£170,982

Cost Head	Description	Total Eligible Cost	Total Claimed Cost
Other Project Costs	Recruitment	£1,500	£3,354
	Publicity and Promotion	£10,000	£2,856
	Post completion evaluation	£2,750	£0
	Overheads	£453,559	£423,940
	Gifts in kind	£197,520	£109,691
	Volunteer time	£633,000	£633,000
	Sub-Total	£1,298,329	£1,172,841
	Total Project Expenditure	£5,984,437	£1,757,104

3.4.5 As part of this review an analysis of each of the cost headings has been undertaken and the observations are as follows:

Cost Heading	Observations
Capital Works	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Only £300,167 has been spent on capital works throughout the project and this expenditure is supported by invoices. Of this 40.79% of the funding has been reclaimed from the HLF estimated at £122,438. The grant from Fylde Borough Council for £300,000 was specifically for capital works and little over this has been spent in the entirety of the project. The grants from Veolia and Lancashire Environmental Fund totally £60,828 was specifically for the restoration of South Park which falls under capital works. The grant of £28,800 from Country House Foundations was specifically for external repairs to Lytham Hall which would also fall under capital works. The £30,000 from the Coastal Revival Fund was specifically for external restoration work to the Georgian Hall. Therefore match funding which was received for capital works totals £419,628 of which only £177,729 has been spent.
Further Development Costs	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Invoices for the project manager are in place supporting the expenditure incurred in this area. Of this 40.79% of the funding was reclaimed from the HLF at an estimated value of £46,139. There was no specific grant evident to fund the remainder of this expenditure and therefore it would appear that a proportion of all match funding received has been used to support the additional costs of £66,975.
Activity Costs	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The total cost for activities was £170,982 of which 40.79% was reclaimed from the HLF at an estimated value of £69,231. There was no specific grant for the remaining balance of £101,751 and therefore it would appear that a proportion of all match funding received has been used to support the additional costs. There is evidence of a significant activity programme being run throughout the project.
Other Project Costs	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Costs of £1,172,841 were incurred through other project costs of which 40.79% was reclaimed from the HLF at an estimated value of £478,402. This included £633,000 for volunteer time. This would seem excessive, particularly as the total eligible costs of £633,000 have been claimed for the small proportion of the project

	<p>which was delivered prior to the HLF pulling the funding for the scheme.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • HTNW claimed 40.79% of the volunteer costs back from the HLF at an approximate cash value of £285,200. HTNW were not able to provide a detailed list of how this cash payment had been spent but advised that it was absorbed into the costs to support the volunteers, as there had been significantly more volunteers requiring welfare facilities, training and management, than originally provided for in the activity cost element of the funding bid. • Gifts in kind to the value of £109,691 were also claimed for as part of the project with the HLF providing cash funding for the value of 40.79% at £44,743. As above, a detailed list of how this money had been spent could not be provided but it had been absorbed in the overall project. • A budget of £453,559 was provided for in the bid for overheads of which £423,940 was expended. As the overhead budget was for the entire project it would seem excessive that almost all of this has been spent as the project was ended early. • The HLF funded 40.79% of the overheads budget providing cash payment in the region of £172,925.
--	---

3.4.6 Due to the way in which the financial records have been maintained it is not possible to categorically say what element of funding was spent on what part of the project. This is complicated further by the existing banking arrangements. There is no separate bank account for the Lytham Hall Project and the money goes into the main HTNW account. This is complicated further by the fact that we were advised that revenue costs are met from one of HTNW's trading accounts and then a periodic sweep across the bank accounts is undertaken to balance them.

3.4.7 Therefore, there is no transparent record which can be referred to in order to assess money coming in and out of the project, and no clear audit trail which can be clearly attributed to Lytham Hall.

3.5 **Whether the Council has any grounds to demand repayment of the £300,000 grant awarded**

3.5.1 The Head of Terms provided by Fylde Borough Council for the funding for Lytham Hall clearly state that the £300k was a capital grant. However, the financial information provided shows that not all the money could have been spent on capital works but has been apportioned to contribute to all the costs identified in the HLF project.

3.5.2 Under the Heads of Terms Fylde Borough Council requires HTNW to:

- Clause 8 – The Provider will keep accurate financial records in accordance with good management practice and will make them available to the Council on request. The records will in particular provide a clear audit trail of how any Grant has been used.
- Clause 9 – The Provider will provide the Council with a schedule of dates when any external audit of accreditation inspection of the services will be undertaken and provide the Council with a copy of any resulting report.

3.5.3 Arguably the above clauses have not been met as it is not possible to specifically detail how Fylde Borough Council's funding has been spent. However, this needs to be balanced with the fact that considerable work has been done on the grounds at the Hall.

3.5.4 We also note that how the grant was being spent had previously been reported to the Council on:

- Cabinet – 27th June 2012
- Cabinet – 15th January 2014
- Tourism and Leisure Committee – 12th November 2015

3.5.5 At each of the above meetings it was resolved that the capital grant awarded to Lytham Hall was spent in accordance with the Heads of Terms.

DECISION ITEM

REPORT OF	MEETING	DATE	ITEM NO
DEVELOPMENT SERVICES DIRECTORATE	TOURISM AND LEISURE COMMITTEE	9 MARCH 2017	5
LYTHAM MUSSEL TANK IMPROVEMENT PROJECT			

PUBLIC ITEM

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

SUMMARY

The report details a scheme developed by the Civic Society to landscape one of the former mussel tanks adjacent to Ribble Cruising Club site. The Civic Society have designed the scheme based around the mussel fishing heritage of the site, raised the necessary funding and have undertaken extensive consultation with the community.

In the delivery of the scheme the Civic Society have requested that the Council be the accountable body and include the scheme within the 2017/18 Capital programme. The scheme has been tendered by the Council and the report requests approval to appoint Landscape Engineering at a tender sum of £112,506.50 to implement the scheme on an 8 week programme.

RECOMMENDATIONS

The Tourism and Leisure Committee are asked to give consideration to and recommend to the Finance and Democracy Committee to:

1. Agree that the Council act as accountable body for the Lytham Mussel Tank Improvement Project as described within the report in the overall sum of £130,000 (inclusive of professional fees, contingencies, and provisional sums);
2. Approve an addition to the 2017/18 capital programme in respect of the Lytham Mussel Tank Improvement Project in the sum of £130,000 fully funded by a grant from the LSA Civic Society in the same amount;
3. Authorise the proposed expenditure in respect of the scheme to undertake improvements to the mussel tank as detailed in the report contingent upon the Finance and Democracy Committee approving the addition of the project to the capital programme;
4. Agree the letting of the contract for the construction of the hard landscaping scheme and associated improvement works to Landscape Engineering Ltd in the sum of £107,149.05 + a contingency of £5,357.45 for a total of £112,506.50, subject to the scheme addition of £130,000 to the 2017/18 capital programme, being approved by the Finance & Democracy Committee.

SUMMARY OF PREVIOUS DECISIONS

Tourism and Leisure 12th November 2015 –Lytham promenade mussel tank improvement project progress report: After full consideration it was resolved -

1. To note the progress to date by the Lytham St. Annes Civic Society with the Mussel Tank Improvement Project.
2. To agree in principle that the Council will act as accountable body on behalf of the Civic Society in delivering the proposed Mussel Tank Improvement Project.
3. To note that a further report will be presented to the Finance and Democracy Committee seeking approval for a fully funded addition to the capital programme, and a subsequent report will be presented to Tourism and Leisure Committee in due course detailing the full financial and management details of the project before any work is approved or commence.

Cabinet 27th May 2014- Scrutiny Recommendation – Regeneration of Former Scruples Site, Lytham: Having received the clarification sought, Cabinet considered the details set out in the report before it and at the meeting RESOLVED to support the proposal by the Lytham St Annes Civic Society for development of the former Scruples site on Lytham Promenade, as recommended by the Community Focus Scrutiny Committee on March 13th 2014 as the preferred option, subject to the Council's policies and permission requirements.

Community Focus Scrutiny 13th March 2014 – Regeneration of the Former Scruples Site - Lytham
The proposal was carried and it was therefore RESOLVED:

1. To recommend to Cabinet that the Lytham St Annes Civic Society proposal for the redevelopment of the former Scruples site be explored further, subject to the Council's policies and usual permission requirements.

Cabinet 28th April 2010 - Community Parks Improvement Programme:

Cabinet considered the details set out in the report before it and at the meeting and RESOLVED:

2. To agree that the Council will act as the accountable body for individual schemes and funding streams where necessary.
4. To present individual detailed reports of the remaining schemes to future meetings of Cabinet to ensure that the Council's financial regulations are satisfied.

CORPORATE PRIORITIES	
Spending your money in the most efficient way to achieve excellent services (Value for Money)	✓
Delivering the services that customers expect of an excellent council (Clean and Green)	✓
Working with all partners (Vibrant Economy)	✓
To make sure Fylde continues to be one of the most desirable places to live (A Great Place to Live)	✓
Promoting Fylde as a great destination to visit (A Great Place to Visit)	✓

REPORT

BACKGROUND

1. The Council owns the site of the three former mussel tanks on Lytham foreshore originally used for the purification of sea food brought ashore by local fishermen.
2. Following Cabinet approval on 27th May 2014 the Lytham St Annes Civic Society have been working to secure the necessary funding to develop a scheme to landscape one of the former mussel tanks adjacent to Ribble Cruising Club site.
3. The Civic Society have engaged BCA Landscape (Chartered Landscape Architects), to develop and project manage the scheme to practical completion.
4. Widespread consultation has influenced the development of the proposals. Local groups, professional members of the Civic Society, officers from the Council and BCA Landscape have all contributed towards the design and development of the scheme.
5. During the development phase the scheme has been altered to reflect the original mussel tank design in the paving and the material choice has been substituted from natural stone to Kellen which is a pre cast concrete material with a natural stone veneer.
6. The revised scheme was costed based on recent estimates and industry rates. The total project costs were estimated around £100k (excludes professional fees, provisional sums and contingencies)

SCHEME DETAIL

7. The tanks were built by Lancashire County Council in 1934 as part of a strategy to improve public health by cleansing the mussels prior to consumption. This practice stopped in the 1940's, since when the area has been redeveloped to include the Lifeboat Station, the Ribble Cruising Club, and (on the proposed site) a variety of uses including a cafe/nightclub; this building was demolished and the site paved over to provide a viewing point over the Ribble estuary.
8. The Civic Society have promoted a scheme which celebrates the mussel fishing heritage. The proposals maintain the basic configuration of paving and levels, but refreshes this to provide a facility which will contribute to the enjoyment of the place and explain (through artwork and interpretation) aspects of Lytham's heritage.
9. All surfaces are renewed with contemporary materials; these are the 'Kellen' paving material which is a precast concrete block with a stone veneer, thus ensuring the material will retain its vibrancy and colour over time. The product range allows a distinctive design to be presented as the focal point, this being based on the original configuration of brick plinths used to support the mussel sacks during the cleansing process.
10. The existing access points are retained. The ramp on the west side will be flanked by a new in situ concrete wall in which recesses will be cast to receive the artwork tiles being produced by Lytham Sixth Form College as a student project (BCA Landscape and the Civic Society have contributed to the students' teaching sessions to assist). The steps on the east side are retained but rebuilt to modern standards with tactile paving and new handrails.
11. The level of the north (inland) side of the site have been raised by 300mm to create two low terraces, for informal sitting and to create an 'amphitheatre effect' to view any performances which might be arranged in the central space. The existing stone wall along the promenade is retained, with a new face constructed from precast concrete wall units, installed at a convenient height for sitting. The same units are used to create a raised planting bed on the east side, along the boundary with the Ribble Cruising Club: the bed will be planted to display species typically found in the local foreshore as part of the general aim to explain the context of the estuary.

12. Interpretation boards are included as a provisional sum - the detail is to be resolved as a further consultation exercise, but will include summary notes and images produced as 'photocast' panels to explain the origins of the site.

A COST BREAKDOWN OF THE SCHEME

Mussel Tank Project			
	Design Categories as described in the schedule of works	Net Figure	Note
i)	Site Clearance	£ 8,285.65	
ii)	New Kerbs & Edgings	£34,378.20	
iii)	New Paving	£41,587.60	
iv)	Site Furniture	£ 3,816.00	
v)	Wall to Edge of Ramp	£ 6,664.00	
vi)	Drainage & Services	£ 2,310.00	<i>Includes P/ Sum for cleaning drains</i>
vii)	Painting (perimeter walls)	£ 1,000.00	
viii)	Planting	£ 2,976.80	<i>Includes P/ Sum for plants/planting</i>
ix)	Maintenance (12 months)	£ 1,130.00	<i>Includes P/ Sum for watering</i>
x)	Provisional Sums	£ 5,000.00	<i>For Signage (£2k) and Interpretation (£3k)</i>
xi)	Contingency	£ 5,357.45	<i>Calculated at 5% of Items 1 - 10</i>
		<hr/>	
S/total		£112,506.50	
Add -	Allowance for Fees, surveys	£ 15,500.00	
		<hr/>	
TOTAL		£128,006.50	

THE METHOD AND COST OF FINANCING THE SCHEME

13. The total project cost has been calculated at around £130k (inclusive of professional fees, provisional sums, and contingencies)
14. The Civic Society have developed a funding strategy itself, to deliver the project, based around potential funding sources that are identified in the following table.

Funding Stream	Amount	Status
Civic Society Legacy Funding	£60,000	Secured
Civic Society - reallocation from other projects	£17,000	Secured
Thomas Blason Trust	£30,000	Secured
Lytham Schools Foundation	£20,000	Secured
Civic Society - specific fund raising for Mussel Tank project	£3,000	Secured
Total	£130,000	

ACCOUNTABLE BODY STATUS

15. The Civic Society has requested that the Council act as the accountable body for the delivery of this project. The role of an accountable body in grant funded schemes involves taking on the responsibility and accountability for the spending of grant monies and the delivery of planned outcomes. Requirements include actively managing the expenditure, ensuring specific milestones and planned delivery outputs are met, completing regular claims to funding partners and producing evidence of spend. The accountable body is obliged to undertake monitoring visits to ensure the outputs are being delivered and maintain robust systems for collecting, collating and reporting on both the outputs and the associated spend. The accountable body undertakes to pay back any grant which is deemed to relate to either spend that is not eligible for funding or to schemes that do not fully deliver their outputs.
16. It is recommended that the council agrees to act as the accountable body and that a report be presented to the Finance and Democracy Committee to seek approval for a fully funded addition to the capital programme.
17. In respect of the proposed Mussel Tank Improvement Scheme, if funding bids are successful the role of ensuring compliance with the grant conditions of the awarding body would be undertaken by officers from the Technical Services Team at no additional cost to Fylde Council.

FUTURE REVENUE BUDGET IMPACT

18. The mussel tank site is 780 sq m and is owned by Fylde Borough Council. The scheme is fundamentally a paving scheme with 91 sq m of planting. The paving is relatively maintenance free. The planting is densely planted with a 12 months maintenance period which should allow the shrubs to touch cover which will prevent weeds from establishing within the shrubbed areas. The Civic Society have agreed to undertake periodic community clean ups to keep the site maintained in the long term.

RELEVANT VALUE FOR MONEY ISSUES

19. In order to ensure that value for money is achieved a procurement exercise has been undertaken in accordance with the Council's contract procedure rules. Selection of the successful tenderer will be on the basis that value for money is a key consideration as well as the suitability of the new facility.

RISK ASSESSMENT

20. A risk assessment has been carried out to identify and mitigate any risks associated with the project which is attached as appendix 1.

VIABLE ALTERNATIVES

21. The project could have been procured and delivered by the Community group or Parish Council. However, professional assistance from Council Officers with specific regard to landscape design, procurement and project management proves to provide the best value for money, competent schemes and is the favoured delivery option by external funders.

PROCUREMENT PATH (AND ANY DELEGATIONS AS REQUIRED)

22. Officers from the Technical Services Team have led the procurement process. A select list of tenderers was drawn up and the tender followed the restricted tendering procedure using the CHEST procurement portal.
23. Quotations have been received for the refurbishment of the existing paved area to create a public open space with associated artwork.
24. 8 tenders were sought and 3 completed tenders were received and evaluated on a 60% cost and 40% quality basis.
25. The quality evaluation was carried out as follows: quality criteria formed 40% of the total, based on the following quality criteria:

• Quality	25
• Schedule of Works	5
• Experience	5
• Health and Safety	5
Quality Total	40

26. The quality evaluation was made under the criteria listed below, and the information required from the suppliers was scored on the following basis:

Score	Description
0	The Evaluation Panel felt that none of the requirement was met or demonstrated or no response was provided.
1	The Evaluation panel felt that a few areas (20% or less) of the requirement has been met or demonstrated.
2	The Evaluation panel felt that some areas (between 21% and 59%) of the requirement has been met or demonstrated.
3	The Evaluation panel felt that most of the requirement (60% and above) has been met or demonstrated
4	The Evaluation panel felt that the requirement has been fully met or demonstrated.
5	The Evaluation Panel felt that the supplier had exceeded this requirement.

27. The 3 quotes for the work received via the Chest system were as follows:-

Landscape Engineering Ltd	£107,149.05 + 5,357.45 contingency = £112,506.50
William Pye Ltd	£131,524.85 + 6,576.24 contingency = £138,101.09
Clement Dickens & Sons Ltd	£132,681.00 + 6,634.00 contingency = £139,315.00

J & C Devlin Ltd, King Construction, W Monks Ltd, Lanes Landscapes Ltd and Creative Landscapes of Lytham did not quote.

28. The cost and quality evaluation scores were as follows:

Company	Evaluation score
Landscape Engineering	65
William Pye	64.91
Clement Dickens	57.99

29. Following the evaluation procedure it is therefore recommended that Landscape Engineering Ltd be awarded the contract.

OBJECTIVES, OUTPUTS AND OUTCOMES

30. Objectives, Outputs and Outcomes:

- Refurbish a life-expired area of public realm as an attractive destination point for users of The Green
- Achieve the ambitions of the local community
- Explain a feature of Lytham's heritage.
- Involvement of the local community in the design development, including the installation of artwork generated by the local Sixth Form College
- Clean and Green – “Deliver high quality parks and open spaces”
- Great Place to Live – “Support and promote volunteers effort to improve their local community”

DRAWINGS AND PLANS

31. A drawing detailing the scheme proposals is included in Appendix 2.

PROGRAMME AND DELIVERY

32. Following approval the contractor will be appointed in March 2017 to deliver the project. The contractor will be on site by the end of April with a completion date of Mid-June 2017 allowing an 8 week construction period.

CONCLUSION

33. The proposal is to award the tender to refurbish the existing paved area to create a public open space with associated artwork as detailed in this report at Mussel Tank, Lytham as per the agreed tender specification to Landscape Engineering Ltd, to the value of £107,149.05 + a contingency of £5,357.45 for a total of £112,506.50 for completion before 28th July 2017.

IMPLICATIONS	
Finance	The report requests that the committee recommend to the Finance and Democracy Committee a fully-funded addition to the 2017/18 capital programme in respect of the Lytham mussel tank development project. The scheme cost is £130,000 and is to be funded by a grant from the LSA Civic Trust.
Legal	The procurement process is in accordance with the council's contract procedure rules, notwithstanding that the council is acting as accountable body rather than incurring spend on its own behalf.
Community Safety	None arising from this report
Human Rights and Equalities	None arising from this report
Sustainability and Environmental Impact	None arising from this report
Health & Safety and Risk Management	None arising from this report

LEAD AUTHOR	TEL	DATE	DOC ID
Darren Bell	01253 658436	24 Feb 2017	

LIST OF BACKGROUND PAPERS		
Name of document	Date	Where available for inspection

Attached documents

1. Committee risk assessment
2. Scheme drawings

Appendix 1

Committee Risk Assessment Template

Directorate: Development Services		Date of Assessment: 24 th February 2017		
Section: Technical Services		Assessment Team: Darren Bell + BCA Landscape (Landscape Architect/Consultant)		
Assessment Activity / Area / Type: Mussel Tanks site, Lytham Green - refurbishment of existing paved public space to improve facilities and explain the site history (sponsored by the Lytham St Annes Civic Society (LSCAS))				
Do the hazards create a business continuity risk? No				
RISK DESCRIPTION	RISK SCORE (Likelihood x Impact)	RISK MITIGATION	RESIDUAL RISK SCORE (Likelihood x Impact)	RISK OWNER / RISK REGISTER
Increased maintenance implication for Fylde Borough Council.	4	<p>The Mussel Tank site is owned by Fylde Borough Council (FBC), and the refurbishment project has been sponsored by LSACS.</p> <p>The current balance of 'hard' paved areas and 'soft' planted areas is unchanged, and the maintenance of the former will be facilitated by the use of modern paving materials laid more accurately to consistent line and level. There are no additional litter bins to be placed in the project (reflecting the current situation) : there is no new lighting. The current maintenance commitment is thus largely unchanged.</p>	2	LSACS

RISK DESCRIPTION	RISK SCORE (Likelihood x Impact)	RISK MITIGATION	RESIDUAL RISK SCORE (Likelihood x Impact)	RISK OWNER / RISK REGISTER
Continued.....		<p>The new planting will reflect local coastal species and facilitate maintenance; LSCAS will collaborate with the Friends of the Estuary to maintain the planting as part of their desire to explain the character of the context.</p> <p>The contract documentation includes 12 months' maintenance by the Contractor.</p>		
Failure of contractor to deliver to specification	6	The work is to be implemented as a fixed price contract under the terms & conditions of the JCT Minor Works Contract. The Contract Administration is to be carried out by an experienced Chartered Landscape Architect (BCA Landscape). All works to be completed to the detailed design and specification.	2	BCA Landscapes FBC
Possibility of personal injury to the public during the construction period.	8	<p>A Pre-Contract Health & Safety Information pack has been prepared by the CDM Co-Ordinator. The successful Contractor will prepare and submit his Construction Stage Health & Safety Plan on the basis of this information, to ensure safe operation within the site and on the adjacent public areas : the Contractor will need to use a short length of the promenade to access the site, and there will be a particular focus on the management of this route.</p> <p>Areas of active construction will be fenced off and information provided about safety aspects of the construction site.</p>	6	BCA Landscapes FBC

RISK DESCRIPTION	RISK SCORE (Likelihood x Impact)	RISK MITIGATION	RESIDUAL RISK SCORE (Likelihood x Impact)	RISK OWNER / RISK REGISTER
Continued.....		Insurances - the contractor will carry £5m Public Liability insurance, and £10m Employers Liability insurance.		
The improvement works fail to meet community or stakeholder aspirations.	4	<p>The existing facility is life expired and contributes little to the enjoyment of the waterfront. The refurbishment proposals have evolved over a longer period of time than is usual ; it has been promoted by LSCAS at a pace to suit their voluntary input and the requirements of the sources of potential funding.</p> <p>The proposals have thus evolved to ensure that aspiration is matched to the available funding : they have been shown to the local community and stakeholders at consultation events including -</p> <p>4th December 2013 - first presentation to FBC Officers.</p> <p>April 2014 - presentation at FBC public consultation session to seek feedback on the relative merits of the LSACS scheme and the alternative Play Park proposal (determined by Cabinet in favour of the LSACS scheme in June 2014).</p> <p>September 2014 - LSACS exhibition at HOD in Town Hall showing LSACS proposal.</p> <p>23rd September 2014 - proposals displayed at FBC Coastal Strategy exhibition at RSPB : LSACS issue Press release</p>	4	LSACS BCA Landscapes

RISK DESCRIPTION	RISK SCORE (Likelihood x Impact)	RISK MITIGATION	RESIDUAL RISK SCORE (Likelihood x Impact)	RISK OWNER / RISK REGISTER
Continued....		<p>23rd April 2015 - presentation at RCC to 15 Local Groups including:</p> <p>Friends of the Estuary : Lytham St Annes Art Society Friends of Lytham Hall : Ribble Cruising Club : RNLI RSPB : Lytham Cricket Club : Lytham Heritage Group Fylde Borough Council : Richard Marshall Arts Project Officer : Local Historians</p> <p>30th June 2017 - a major event for the business people of Lytham held at Jubilee House, courtesy of DANBRO</p> <p>LSCAS have been actively involved in the development of the proposals, and have raised the required funding. Regular updates have been included in LSACS newsletters and website.</p> <p>The Lytham Sixth Form College are involved in the project : they are producing 105 ceramic tiles to illustrate local themes and these are to be incorporated into a new wall proposed as part of the artwork design.</p>		

RISK DESCRIPTION	RISK SCORE (Likelihood x Impact)	RISK MITIGATION	RESIDUAL RISK SCORE (Likelihood x Impact)	RISK OWNER / RISK REGISTER
Increased risks to the public as a result of the development.	6	<p>All pavings are renewed, thus providing a consistent surface removing potential trip hazards of the existing site: the level of the paving around the outer concrete wall remains unchanged. There will be localised repairs to the existing seawall (otherwise excluded from the works) to make safe areas where reinforcement is exposed.</p> <p>The gradient of the existing ramp access into the site will be unchanged : the step access is to be rebuilt to current DDA standards, with tactile pavings at top and bottom.</p> <p>The works will be fully inspected prior to handover and opening to the public.</p>	4	<p>LSACS</p> <p>BCA Landscapes</p> <p>FBC</p>
Project not delivered on time and funding not utilised.	6	<p>The work is to be implemented as a fixed price contract under a JCT Minor Works Contract ; this allows penalties for the late completion of the works giving the Contractor incentives to perform to the agreed programme.</p> <p>The 8-week construction programme takes into account the use of Lytham Green for local fairs and festivals, and aims to complete in mid June 2017. This requires the Contractor to access the site on 24th April 2017.</p> <p>The funding for the project is from LSACS thus no implication to Fylde Borough Council</p>	4	<p>BCA Landscapes</p> <p>FBC</p>

RISK DESCRIPTION	RISK SCORE (Likelihood x Impact)	RISK MITIGATION	RESIDUAL RISK SCORE (Likelihood x Impact)	RISK OWNER / RISK REGISTER
Project overspend	4	The Contract Administrator (BCA Landscape) will monitor & control costs. The contract sum is within the budget allocated by LSACS ; it contains an element for contingencies, and includes a provisional sum for signage and interpretation which could (if required) be omitted and fitted at a later date if required.	2	BCA Landscapes FBC

Risk Likelihood

6 = Very High

5 = High

4 = Significant

3 = Low

2 = Very Low

1 = Almost impossible

Risk Impact

1= Negligible

2 = Marginal

3 = Critical

4 = Catastrophic

Multiply the likelihood by the impact and if the score is above 12 then mitigating action should be undertaken to reduce the risk. This action should be recorded and monitored in either a directorate or corporate risk register.

NEW KERBS AND EDGINGS

SURFACES

Furniture

WALL

DRAINAGE

PLANTING

Planting bed 2
Supply and lay 450 depth topsoil (premium grade BS3882) in 150mm layers to planting bed, include placing of approx 600x600 pcc slabs reclaimed from central area as soldier course along boundary wall of Cruising Club

General Arrangement
1:100@A2

19 OLD HALL STREET
LIVERPOOL
L3 9JQ
TELEPHONE +44 (0)151 242 6161
FACSIMILE +44 (0)151 236 4467
EMAIL office@bcandscape.co.uk
WEB SITE www.bcalandscape.co.uk

DECISION ITEM

REPORT OF	MEETING	DATE	ITEM NO
DEVELOPMENT SERVICES DIRECTORATE	TOURISM AND LEISURE COMMITTEE	9 MARCH 2017	6
BLUE FLAG BEACH AWARD			

PUBLIC ITEM

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

SUMMARY

In February 2016, Council agreed the new Corporate Plan which runs from 2016 to 2020. The plan contains five themes. Two of the priorities over the next four years under the theme 'Clean and Green' is 'Strive to achieve Blue Flag status for the beaches', and "Ensure beaches and bathing waters are clean and safe".

This report details the Blue Flag criteria and what requirements would need to be fulfilled by the Council to achieve Blue Flag Award accreditation for the two beaches in St. Annes. The report describes the current standard of each beach, current provision of facilities and the impact of bathing water quality on any award application.

RECOMMENDATIONS

The Tourism and Leisure Committee is requested:

1. To assess the list of requirements that would need to be fulfilled to allow a competent application for Blue Flag accreditation for the two beaches.
2. To decide if the proposed list of requirements are to be further detailed and costed, to be presented in a further report to the Committee.
3. To offer 'in principal' support to any future capital bids and/or revenue increases based on a more detailed list of requirements in a future report.

SUMMARY OF PREVIOUS DECISIONS

No Previous Decisions

CORPORATE PRIORITIES	
Spending your money in the most efficient way to achieve excellent services (Value for Money)	√
Delivering the services that customers expect of an excellent council (Clean and Green)	√
Working with all partners (Vibrant Economy)	√
To make sure Fylde continues to be one of the most desirable places to live (A Great Place to Live)	√
Promoting Fylde as a great destination to visit (A Great Place to Visit)	√

REPORT

BACKGROUND

1. In February 2016, Council agreed the new Corporate Plan which runs from 2016 to 2020. The plan contains five themes. Two of the priorities over the next four years under the theme 'Clean and Green' is 'Strive to achieve Blue Flag status for the beaches', and 'Ensure beaches and bathing waters are clean and safe'.
2. The Council has 2 public beaches – St. Annes Pier Beach that stretches from the RNLI slipway behind the boating pool to the toilet block at North Promenade Car Park and St. Annes North Beach which stretches from opposite Sandgate to the Coast Guard Station, North Beach Car Park.

SEASIDE AWARD

3. The Pier beach has achieved the Seaside Award in 2002, 2003, 2004, 2005, 2015 and 2016. During the other years the water quality did not achieve the minimum water quality standard, and therefore an application for the award was not submitted.
4. Keep Britain Tidy's Seaside Award celebrates the quality and diversity of England's coastline. Formerly called the Quality Coast Award, the scheme is the nationwide standard for the best beaches across the UK. While Seaside Award beaches can be vastly different, the flag is a symbol of quality which ensures visitors are guaranteed to find a clean, safe, attractive and well-managed coastal stretch. At a time when more and more people are choosing to holiday closer to home, the Seaside Award is vital in ensuring visitors know they are enjoying the best of our delightful and dramatic coastline. The Seaside Award is specially designed to recognise all the different uses of our coastline.

BLUE FLAG AWARD

5. North Beach has never been submitted for any award. However, as the bathing water quality achieved "Excellent" status in 2015, it was seen as an opportunity to prepare a Blue Flag application. The bathing water quality has since reduced to "Good", due to several external factors which are listed in the report.
6. The Blue Flag is a certification by the Foundation of Environmental Education (FEE), "that a beach, marina or sustainable boating tourism operator meets its stringent standards".
7. The Blue Flag is a trademark owned by the FEE, which is a not-for-profit, non- governmental organisation, consisting of 65 organisations in 60 countries in Europe, Africa, Asia, North America and South America. The criteria include standards for water quality, safety, environmental education and information, the provision of specific services and general environmental management criteria.
8. The Blue Flag award is widely considered to be the Gold Standard for beaches and is internationally recognised. In 2015 there were 4,266 Blue Flags around the world. There are currently 199 Blue Flags flying in the British Isles (UK & Ireland).
9. The Blue Flag Programme is run by Keep Britain Tidy, who are a UK based independent environmental charity, established in 1955 as an anti-litter campaign. In 1987 they became the Tidy Britain group and changed again in 2002 to Encams (Environmental Campaigns), returning back to Keep Britain Tidy in 2009.
10. Keep Britain Tidy run a number of Environmental Programmes including: Eco schools, seaside awards, beachcare, rivercare, watersidecare, LOVEmyBEACH, Love parks, Big Tidy Up, Green Flag awards for parks & open spaces and Blue Flag for Beaches.

11. Applications are made annually in January. The certification process is carried out each year and beaches can lose or gain a Blue Flag. In the UK results are announced in June.
12. The actual benefits of Blue Flag on local tourism cannot be accurately estimated, however research by Keep Britain Tidy shows that visitors prefer visiting beaches that demonstrate high quality standards in the Blue Flag key areas: Provision of Information, Bathing Water Quality, Environmental Management, Safety and Management.
13. Keep Britain Tidy list the 4 main advantages on achieving and retaining Blue Flag status to be:
 - A better quality of environment which gives visitors to your beaches a superior experience, therefore by increasing their profile
 - Protection from the local environment from the destabilising effects of unmanaged practices
 - An opportunity for the region to capitalise on this reputation for environmental protection and market itself as such a destination
 - A higher standard of environment for local people and the associated health benefits

BLUE FLAG AWARD CRITERIA (ENGLAND)

14. The following criteria must be fully met to achieve Blue Flag status:

Environmental Education and Information

- Information about the Blue Flag must be displayed at the beach.
- Environmental education activities must be offered and promoted to beach users.
- Information about bathing water quality must be displayed.
- Information relating to local eco-systems and environmental phenomena must be displayed.
- A map of the beach indicating different facilities must be displayed.
- A code of conduct that reflects appropriate laws governing the use of the beach and surrounding areas must be displayed.

Water Quality

- The beach must fully comply with the water quality sampling and frequency requirements.
- The beach must fully comply with the standards and requirements for water quality analysis.
- No industrial, waste-water or sewage-related discharges should affect the beach area.
- The beach must achieve 'excellent' water quality as set out in the Bathing Water Directive.

Environmental Management

- The local authority / beach operator should establish a beach management committee.
- The local authority / beach operator must comply with all regulations affecting the location and operation of the beach.
- The beach must be clean.
- Algae vegetation or natural debris should be left on the beach (exceptions apply).
- Bins must be available at the beach and they must be regularly emptied.
- Facilities for the separation of recyclable waste materials should be available at the beach.
- Toilet facilities must be provided.
- The toilet or restroom facilities must be kept clean.
- The toilet or restroom facilities must have controlled sewage disposal.
- There should be no unauthorised camping, driving or dumping of waste on the beach.
- During the bathing season dogs must be excluded from the award area of the beach.
- All buildings and beach equipment must be properly maintained.
- Coral reefs in the vicinity of the beach must be monitored.
- A sustainable means of transportation should be promoted in the beach area.

Safety and Services

- If appropriate, an adequate number of lifeguards and/or lifesaving equipment must be available at the beach.
- First aid equipment must be available on the beach.
- Emergency plans to cope with pollution risks must be in place.
- There must be management of beach users and events to prevent conflicts and accidents.
- There must be safety measures in place to protect beach users.
- A supply of drinking water should be available at the beach.
- Wheelchair access and accessibility features must be in place for at least one Blue Flag beach in each municipality.

CURRENT POSITION

15. As stated St. Annes Pier Beach currently holds a Seaside Award, with St. Annes North Beach not currently holding any award.
16. A Seaside Award can be achieved if the bathing water quality is to a “Sufficient” standard under the current EU Bathing Water Directive 2006/7/EC, and all the other criteria is met including cleanliness, provision of facilities, management, safety and relevant provision of information.
17. However, to gain Blue Flag accreditation the bathing water quality must be classed as “Excellent” under the EU Bathing Water Directive 2006/7/EC.
18. To put this into perspective there are 4 quality standards in the Directive – Excellent, Good, Sufficient and Poor.
19. Bathing water is subject to short term pollution. Short term pollution is caused when heavy rainfall washes faecal material into the sea from livestock, sewage and urban drainage via rivers and streams. The risk of encountering reduced water quality increases after rainfall and typically returns to normal after 1-3 days. The Environment Agency makes daily pollution risk forecasts based on rainfall patterns and will issue a pollution risk warning if heavy rainfall occurs to enable bathers to avoid periods of increased risk. The Environment Agency works to reduce the sources of this pollution through pollution prevention measures, work with agriculture and water companies. 41 warnings advising against swimming due to an increase risk of short term pollution were issued in 2016 for St Annes bathing water. These warnings were issued because of the effects of heavy rain and high tides on the water quality.

BATHING WATER QUALITY

20. The main objective of the Bathing Water Directive 2006/7/EC is to protect public health and the environment from faecal pollution at bathing waters. The Environment Agency establish a monitoring calendar and take 20 bathing water samples during the bathing season.
21. The Bathing season at Fylde runs from 1st May – 30th September. Fylde have two bathing waters:-St Annes Pier & St Annes North.
22. The Environment Agency have been working with Fylde since 2014, to improve bathing water quality and has been making regular predictions of pollution risks at the borough’s two bathing waters. Signs have been displayed when a risk of increased pollution has been expected, which can be short term pollution events that last for less than 72 hours.
23. Where pollution forecasts have coincided with statutory bathing water sampling there is a potential for discounting samples at the end of each season under The Bathing Water Regulation 2013, 12(5). No more than 3 samples can be discounted in a bathing season.

24. Signs have been displayed at Fylde Beaches during Short Term Pollution Events, to protect public health and the environment from faecal pollution at bathing waters.
25. The Bathing Water Regulations 2013 allow the Environment Agency to determine the relevant assessment period where it considers that the profile of a bathing water has changed. These are the recent catchment changes that affect Fylde's bathing waters

Improvement work completed prior to the 2014

- Delivery of the Preston 7 scheme – the Preston Tunnels
 - Delivery of the Preston 32 of which 12 outputs had bathing water drivers
 - Provision of ultra-violet (UV) disinfection at Blackburn Wastewater Treatment Works.
26. These improvement works were considered to affect the classification of St Annes Pier and St Annes North Bathing Waters.
27. The current Bathing Water Standards at the time of writing this report are:
- St. Anne Pier Beach - Good
 - St. Annes North Beach - Good
28. Improvement of Bathing Water Quality is a corporate objective. Officers from Technical Services are working in partnership with the Environment Agency and numerous external partners to improve the bathing water quality at both beaches. UU are currently working with the farmers / landowners along the Fylde coastline to see if any improvements can be made.
29. The tables in appendix 1 refer to the Pier Beach and North Beach and show what requirements will need to be fulfilled against each of the Blue Flag criteria with an estimated revenue or capital cost against each item, and how these items could be potentially funded.

IMPLICATIONS			
Finance	None arising directly from this report		
Legal	None		
Community Safety	None		
Human Rights and Equalities	None		
Sustainability and Environmental Impact	None		
Health & Safety and Risk Management	None		
LEAD AUTHOR	TEL	DATE	DOC ID
Mark Wilde	01253 658475	16 th February 2017	

LIST OF BACKGROUND PAPERS		
Name of document	Date	Where available for inspection
Corporate Plan 2016-20	8 Feb 2016	http://www.fylde.gov.uk/council/performance/

Appendix 1

Table of Requirements for St. Annes North Beach
 Table of Requirements for St. Annes Pier Beach

Blue Flag Award Assessment

St Annes - North Beach

Blue Flag Criteria	Actions Required	Actions Completed	Estimated Cost
<u>Environmental Education</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Information about Blue Flag must be displayed at the beach. Environmental Education activities must be offered and promoted at the beach. Information about water quality must be displayed. Info relating to local eco systems and environmental phenomena must be displayed. A map of the beach indicating different facilities must be displayed. A code of conduct that reflects appropriate laws governing the use of the beach and surrounding areas must be displayed. 	Install 2 x interpretation signs.	N	Est. £2,000
	Environmental Education can be offered as part of the existing Ranger Service, Fylde Sand Dunes Project and LoveMyBeach team programmes. Includes volunteer days, public events and environmental education.	Y	Utilise existing staff. Materials and publicity costs £1,000 per annum.
	Install 2 x safety signs with integral notice board showing beach safety information, bye-laws, emergency contacts and water quality information.	N	Est. £1,500
	This can be incorporated in the 2 x interpretation signs.	N	-
	This can be incorporated in the 2 x interpretation signs.	N	-
	This can be incorporated in the 2 x safety signs as above.	N	-

Blue Flag Criteria	Actions Required	Actions Completed	Estimated Cost
<u>Water Quality</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Beach must fully comply with the water quality sampling and frequency requirements. The beach must fully comply with the standards and requirements for water quality analysis No industrial, waste water or sewage- related discharges should effect the beach area. The beach must achieve 'EXCELLENT' water quality as set out in bathing water directive. 	<p>Bathing Water Quality tests ongoing Environment Agency. BWQ status currently 'GOOD'. Multi-agency approach to improving water standards. More localised dog and litter controls to be examined.</p> <p>As above. Multi-agency approach to improving water standards. More localised dog and litter controls to be examined.</p> <p>As above. Multi-agency approach to improving water standards. More localised dog and litter controls to be examined.</p> <p>As above. Multi-agency approach to improving water standards. More localised dog and litter controls to be examined.</p>	<p>N</p> <p>N</p> <p>N</p> <p>N</p>	<p>Undetermined at present. Cost implications to beach cleansing, enforcement of bye-laws and improved signage.</p> <p>-</p> <p>-</p> <p>-</p>
<u>Environmental Management</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Local Authority should establish a beach management committee. The Local Authority must comply with regulations affecting the location and operation of the beach. The beach must be clean. 	<p>Form sub group of the Fylde Environmental Forum.</p> <p>To be determined.</p> <p>Existing beach clean operation. Poor access causing H&S risks. Review operational methodology and volunteer capacity.</p>	<p>N</p> <p>-</p> <p>Y</p>	<p>-</p> <p>-</p> <p>Maintenance implication.</p>

Blue Flag Criteria	Actions Required	Actions Completed	Estimated Cost
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Algae vegetation or natural debris should be left on the beach exceptions apply. 	Man-made waste items removed only.	Y	-
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Bins must be available at the beach and must be regularly emptied. 	Existing beach clean operation. Poor access causing H&S risks. Review methodology and volunteer capacity.	Y	Maintenance implication.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Facilities for separation of recyclable waste materials should be available at the beach. 	None at present. As above, review beach cleansing operation and assess feasibility of the introduction/ emptying of recycling bins in key locations.	N	TBC
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Toilet facilities must be provided. 	None at present - feasibility report produced. Obtain accurate costings from Danfo for 2-4 x units.	N	Estimate between £90,000 - £140,000 construction and installation installed. Maintenance costs to be factored and weighed against the revenue of for-charge units.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Toilets/ restroom facilities must be kept clean 	As above.	N	Estimate of £ 5,000 per annum
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Toilets/ restroom facilities must have controlled sewage disposal. 	As above.	N	-
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There should be no unauthorised camping, driving or dumping of waste on the beach. 	Vehicular access controls and signage required. PSPO's could be utilised to control ASB and be enforced by rangers.	N	Enforcement time implication.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> During the bathing season dogs must be excluded from the area of the beach. 	Dog exclusion applies 1 st May – 30 th September.	Y	-
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> All buildings and beach equipment 	Coast and Countryside Service inspect and	Y	Maintenance implication.

Blue Flag Criteria	Actions Required	Actions Completed	Estimated Cost
<p>must be properly maintained.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> A sustainable means of transport should be promoted at the beach area. 	<p>maintain infrastructure.</p> <p>Cycling and bus access options and infrastructure to be explored. Install bike stands where appropriate.</p>	N	£1,000 - bike stands.
Safety and Services			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> If appropriate, an adequate number of lifeguards and/or lifesaving equipment must be available at the beach. 	Life belts present and inspected daily. Rangers patrol daily.	Y	-
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> First Aid equipment must be available at the beach. 	Coast Guard Station possible first aid point but access limited. Emergency procedures and contacts to be advertised on new signage. Rangers carry first aid provision in vehicles.	N	-
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Emergency Plans to cope with pollution risks must be in place. 	Informal process in place. Coastal Emergency Plan to be developed to ensure formal approach to incidents. New safety notice boards to be utilised for risk notices.	N	-
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There must be management of beach users and events to prevent conflicts and accidents. 	Coastal Emergency Plan and corporate Event Management Procedures to be utilised to achieve this.	N	-
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There must be safety measures in place to protect beach users. 	Signage, water safety equipment, staff patrols and enforcement, Coastal Emergency Plan.	N	-
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A supply of drinking water should be available at the beach. 	Only practicable through toilet block provision. Signage to nearby shops and facilities could be sufficient.	N	-

Blue Flag Criteria	Actions Required	Actions Completed	Estimated Cost
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Wheelchair access and accessibility features must be in place for a least one blue flag beach in each council. 	Well signposted ramped access to beach from disabled parking zones could assist accessibility – as well as short boardwalks where appropriate. Flat beach path surface options feasible, but costly.	N	Est. £8,000 installation of concrete ramp at designated area, and floor sign hieroglyphics. Boardwalks to be funded through Fylde Sand Dunes Project (EA funding).

Blue Flag Award Assessment

St Annes – Pier Beach

Blue Flag Criteria	Actions Required	Actions Completed	Estimated Cost
<u>Environmental Education</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Information about Blue Flag must be displayed at the beach. Environmental Education activities must be offered and promoted at the beach. Information about water quality must be displayed. Info relating to local eco systems and environmental phenomena must be displayed. A map of the beach indicating different facilities must be displayed. A code of conduct that reflects appropriate laws governing the use of the beach and surrounding areas must be displayed. 	Install 2 x interpretation signs.	N	Est. £2,000
	Environmental Education can be offered as part of the existing Ranger Service, Fylde Sand Dunes Project and LoveMyBeach team programs. Includes volunteer days, public events and environmental education.	Y	Utilise existing staff. Materials and publicity costs est. £1,000 per annum.
	Install 2 x safety signs with integral notice board showing beach safety information, bye-laws, emergency contacts and water quality information.	N	Est. £1,500
	This can be incorporated in the 2 x interpretation signs.	N	-
	This can be incorporated in the 2 x interpretation signs.	N	-
	This can be incorporated in the 2 x safety signs as above.	N	-

Blue Flag Criteria	Actions Required	Actions Completed	Estimated Cost
<u>Water Quality</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Beach must fully comply with the water quality sampling and frequency requirements. The beach must fully comply with the standards and requirements for water quality analysis No industrial, waste water or sewage- related discharges should effect the beach area. The beach must achieve 'EXCELLENT' water quality as set out in bathing water directive. 	<p>Bathing Water Quality tests ongoing Environment Agency. BWQ status currently 'GOOD'. Multi-agency approach to improving water standards. More localised dog and litter controls to be examined.</p> <p>As above. Multi-agency approach to improving water standards. More localised dog and litter controls to be examined.</p> <p>As above. Multi-agency approach to improving water standards. More localised dog and litter controls to be examined.</p> <p>As above. Multi-agency approach to improving water standards. More localised dog and litter controls to be examined.</p>	<p>N</p> <p>N</p> <p>N</p> <p>N</p>	<p>TBC</p> <p>-</p> <p>-</p> <p>-</p>
<u>Environmental Management</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Local Authority should establish a beach management committee. The Local Authority must comply with regulations affecting the location and operation of the beach. The beach must be clean. 	<p>Form sub group of the Fylde Environmental Forum.</p> <p>To be determined.</p> <p>Existing beach clean operation. Poor access causing H&S risks. Review operational methodology and volunteer capacity.</p>	<p>N</p> <p>-</p> <p>Y</p>	<p>-</p> <p>-</p> <p>Maintenance implication.</p>

Blue Flag Criteria	Actions Required	Actions Completed	Estimated Cost
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Algae vegetation or natural debris should be left on the beach exceptions apply. 	Man-made waste items removed only.	Y	-
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Bins must be available at the beach and must be regularly emptied. 	Existing beach clean operation. Poor access causing H&S risks. Review methodology and volunteer capacity.	Y	Maintenance implication.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Facilities for separation of recyclable waste materials should be available at the beach. 	None at present. As above, review beach cleansing operation and assess feasibility of the introduction and emptying of recycling bins in key locations.	N	TBC
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Toilet facilities must be provided. 	Existing Danfo toilet Units within Promenade Gardens and are on a maintenance contract.	Y	-
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Toilets/ restroom facilities must be kept clean 	As above.	Y	-
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Toilets/ restroom facilities must have controlled sewage disposal. 	As above.	Y	-
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There should be no unauthorised camping, driving or dumping of waste on the beach. 	Vehicular access controls and signage required. PSPO's could be utilised to control ASB and be enforced by rangers.	N	Enforcement time implication.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> During the bathing season dogs must be excluded from the area of the beach. 	Dog exclusion applies 1 st May – 30 th September.	Y	-
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> All buildings and beach equipment must be properly maintained. 	Assets to be registered. Coast and Countryside Service inspect and maintain infrastructure.	Y	Maintenance implication
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A sustainable means of transport should be promoted at the beach 	Cycling and bus access options and		

Blue Flag Criteria	Actions Required	Actions Completed	Estimated Cost
area.	infrastructure to be explored. Install bike stands where appropriate.	N	£1,500 - bike stands.
<u>Safety and Services</u>			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> If appropriate, an adequate number of lifeguards and/or lifesaving equipment must be available at the beach. 	Life belts present and inspected daily. Rangers patrol daily.	Y	Maintenance implication.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> First Aid equipment must be available at the beach. 	First aid points to be established, drawing support from private sector business and site based gardeners. Emergency procedures and contacts to be advertised on new signage.	N	TBC
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Emergency Plans to cope with pollution risks must be in place. 	Informal process in place. Coastal Emergency Plan to be developed to ensure formal approach to incidents. New safety notice boards to be utilised for risk notices.	N	-
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There must be management of beach users and events to prevent conflicts and accidents. 	Informal process in place. Coastal Emergency Plan and corporate Event Management Procedures to be utilised to achieve this.	N	-
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There must be safety measures in place to protect beach users. 	Signage, water safety equipment, staff patrols and enforcement, Coastal Emergency Plan.	N	-
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A supply of drinking water should be available at the beach. 	There is a sufficient number of cafes and refreshment staffs to facilitate this.	N	-
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Wheelchair access and accessibility features must be in place for a least one blue flag beach in each council. 	Review accessibility of beach. Existing ramp to south of St Annes Pier. Flat beach path surface options feasible, but costly.	N	TBC

DECISION ITEM



REPORT OF	MEETING	DATE	ITEM NO
DEVELOPMENT SERVICES DIRECTORATE	TOURISM AND LEISURE COMMITTEE	9 MARCH 2017	7
THE ISLAND REGENERATION WORKING GROUP			

PUBLIC ITEM

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

SUMMARY

The report presents an update to committee on progress with The Island Regeneration project and proposes extending the member working group to include the Leader.

RECOMMENDATIONS

That the committee

1. notes progress with The Island Regeneration project;
2. agrees that membership of the working group be extended to include the Leader of the Council

SUMMARY OF PREVIOUS DECISIONS

Tourism and Leisure 2 June 2016 – The Island Regeneration

Following consideration of this matter it was RESOLVED:

To note the report and agree to the principle of marketing The Island site to seek proposals or its redevelopment and regeneration.

1. To instruct officers to prepare a brief and particulars for the marketing of the site which would set out those parameters to guide the exercise.
2. To agree that once the brief and particulars are prepared that marketing is undertaken through appropriate media to seek interest from developers.
3. To agree that a working group is approved made up of the chairman (or their nominee) from each of the following committees: Tourism & Leisure, Operational Management, Development Management and Finance & Democracy to assess any interest received.
4. To agree that a report presenting the outcome of the exercise be produced and reported to members in due course.

CORPORATE PRIORITIES	
Spending your money in the most efficient way to achieve excellent services (Value for Money)	✓
Delivering the services that customers expect of an excellent council (Clean and Green)	✓
Working with all partners (Vibrant Economy)	✓
To make sure Fylde continues to be one of the most desirable places to live (A Great Place to Live)	✓
Promoting Fylde as a great destination to visit (A Great Place to Visit)	✓

REPORT

BACKGROUND

1. The committee considered a report at its meeting on 2nd June 2016 in relation to the regeneration of The Island site on the Promenade, St Annes. The committee approved the report and instructed officers to prepare a brief and particulars for the marketing of the site.
2. A development brief and particulars were prepared and the site has been marketed via the council's website since early September 2016 with additional promotion through an advert in the Estates Gazette. The brief and particulars are available on the [council's website](#).
3. To date there has been a good number of initial enquiries with several expressions of interest submitted in December. Those expressions of interest have been initially evaluated by an estates surveyor employed through Blackpool Council who has extensive experience in managing a number of major assets for Blackpool Council, including the airport and Winter Gardens.
4. Recently the member working group appointed by committee met to consider the expressions of interest received. The group is made up of the chairman (or their nominee) from each of the following committees: Tourism & Leisure, Operational Management, Development Management and Finance & Democracy. The group is supported by appropriate financial, legal, regeneration and estates professional officers.
5. The initial meeting recommended shortlisting those expressions of interest received and to ask for a presentation of proposals from the shortlisted developers. A second meeting of the group to receive those presentations is being arranged.
6. It is considered that the group would benefit from the additional attendance of the Leader of the Council who could take a strategic oversight of any proposals for regeneration of the site.
7. Further reports will be presented as the project proceeds.

IMPLICATIONS	
Finance	There are no financial implications arising directly from this report.
Legal	There are no legal implications at this stage. Specialist advice is likely to need to be taken as the project moved forward.
Community Safety	None arising from this report
Human Rights and Equalities	None arising from this report
Sustainability and Environmental Impact	None arising from this report
Health & Safety and Risk Management	None arising from this report

LEAD AUTHOR	TEL	DATE	DOC ID
Paul Walker	01253 658431	24 Feb 2017	

LIST OF BACKGROUND PAPERS		
None		

DECISION ITEM



REPORT OF	MEETING	DATE	ITEM NO
RESOURCES DIRECTORATE	TOURISM AND LEISURE COMMITTEE	9 MARCH 2017	8
APPOINTMENT TO OUTSIDE BODIES/WORKING GROUPS			

PUBLIC ITEM

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

SUMMARY

In May 2015 Council asked that the programme committees make recommendations to appointments from within their respective memberships for those outside bodies relating to the brief for the committee. This report covers those appointments that relate to the Tourism and Leisure Committee.

Council will make appointments to outside bodies for the forthcoming municipal year at its meeting on 3 April 2017.

RECOMMENDATION

The committee is invited to

1. recommend nominations to the outside bodies listed for consideration by council
2. confirm the establishment of the working groups(s) listed which will meet as and when required
3. to note the reports from members currently serving on outside bodies

SUMMARY OF PREVIOUS DECISIONS

20th May 2015 - Council sought recommendations from individual programme committees as to nominations for representation.

6 July 2015 – Council confirmed the nominations from the programme committees.

11 April 2016 – Council confirmed the nominations from the programme committees.

CORPORATE PRIORITIES	
Spending your money in the most efficient way to achieve excellent services (Value for Money)	√
Delivering the services that customers expect of an excellent council (Clean and Green)	√
Working with all partners (Vibrant Economy)	√
To make sure Fylde continues to be one of the most desirable places to live (A Great Place to Live)	√
Promoting Fylde as a great destination to visit (A Great Place to Visit)	√

REPORT

1. The Council makes a number of appointments to outside bodies in each municipal year. In an election year these appointments are made at the AGM. In non-election years, these appointments are made at the last Council meeting of the municipal year. In May 2015, the Council deferred the decision to appoint to *'.... allow the various programme committees the opportunity to recommend appointments from within their respective memberships for those outside bodies relating to the brief of their committee'*.
2. The Council needs to make appointments to outside bodies at its meeting on 3 April 2017 for the forthcoming municipal year 2017/18. Nominations are sought from the programme committees for representatives to the outside bodies.
3. This report deals with the outside bodies that relate to the terms of reference for the Tourism and Leisure Committee. The first table below includes the name of the body/group, the role/purpose and which elected member currently represents the Council. The committee is invited to recommend nominations for consideration by Full Council.
4. Under the previous governance arrangements there existed the facility through scrutiny for members to establish specific task and finish groups to look in some depth at particular issues and make recommendations to Cabinet. With the adoption of the new governance arrangements that is no longer possible. However programme committees may wish to establish their own subject specific working groups to be set up when required in order to advise the parent programme committee on a particular topic/issue.
5. The second table below lists those working groups that relate to the terms of reference of the Tourism and Leisure Committee that are currently established. The establishment of working groups is within the responsibility of the individual programme committees and does not need the approval of Council.
6. It is important that the members nominated to represent the Council on outside bodies/working groups have an appropriate interest in the body/partnership/subject, can commit to positively represent the Council and be available to commit the time to attend the majority of the meetings involved.
7. The members nominated should ideally be a member of the programme committee to which the matter relates to.
8. The current protocol is that members are required to produce regular reports about the outside bodies on which they serve, currently every six months. It is the intention that this information will be made available to the programme committee members to which the external partnership relates.
9. The conclusion of any working group would be brought to committee in a formal report as previously occurred in scrutiny.

Tourism and Leisure Committee- Outside bodies/partnerships			
Outside body / partnerships	Role/Purpose	Frequency of meetings	Current representation
Lowther Trust	To represent the Council as a Trustee in the management of Lowther Trust	Monthly (12xp/a)	Councillor Cheryl Little
Lytham Town Trust	To represent the Council as a Director on the Lytham Town Trust	Quarterly (4xp/a)	Councillor Tim Ashton
Fylde Coast YMCA Partnership Board	Fylde Coast YMCA Partnership Board dealing with leisure and sporting activities including swimming, provided by the YMCA on the Fylde Coast	Quarterly (4xp/a)	Councillor Sandra Pitman
Fylde Arts Association	To further the development of arts education through the appreciation and enjoyment of the Lytham St Annes Art Collection	Quarterly (4xp/a)	Councillor Raymond Thomas
St George's Day Festival Committee	To ensure effective links and liaison with the St George's Day Festival Committee	Several times per annum/more often prior to the festival in April	Councillor Cheryl Little
Arts Partnership for Lytham	The APL is a working group of local artists and arts organisations committed to increasing the profile and importance of arts in Lytham, and developing partnerships to create new opportunities in the arts		Councillor Raymond Thomas
Arts Working Group	To further the development of arts education through the appreciation and enjoyment of the Lytham St Annes Art Collection. To maintain and conserve the artistic heritage of the Collection for the benefit of the community. To assist community development through support to local arts societies/groups.	Meets quarterly (4xp/a)	Councillor Vince Settle

Tourism and Leisure Committee– Working groups			
Working group	Role/purpose	Notes	Current representation
Arts Service Review	To review the Arts Service and in particular the Lytham St Annes Art Collection	When required	Councillors Christine Akeroyd, Julie Brickles, Maxine Chew, Sandra Pitman, Vince Settle and Ray Thomas.
The Island Regeneration	To assess any interest received following the marketing process undertaken for the site	When required	Councillors Cheryl Little, David Eaves, Trevor Fiddler and Karen Buckley.

IMPLICATIONS	
Finance	No implications arising from this report
Legal	No implications arising from this report
Community Safety	No implications arising from this report
Human Rights and Equalities	No implications arising from this report
Sustainability and Environmental Impact	No implications arising from this report
Health & Safety and Risk Management	No implications arising from this report

LEAD AUTHOR	TEL	DATE	DOC ID
Tracy Morrison	01253 658521	Date of report	

LIST OF BACKGROUND PAPERS		
Name of document	Date	Where available for inspection

Appendices attached to this report

Appendix 1 – Status of reports from Outside Bodies representatives

Appendix 2 – Reports from Outside Bodies representatives.

Outside Bodies Returned Forms – Feb/March 2017

Outside Body		Councillor	Info First Requested	First Reminder	Second Reminder	Date Returned	Notes
Tourism & Leisure, 9/3/17 meeting. Closing Date for reports Friday 24 February							
	Arts Partnership for Lytham	Raymond Thomas	9/01/2017	31/1/17		14/2/17	Nil return – no meeting
	Arts Working Group	Vince Settle	9/01/2017	31/1/17	20/2/17	21/2/17	Nil return – unable to attend the meeting
	Fylde Arts Association	Raymond Thomas	9/01/2017	31/1/17		14/2/17	Nil return – no meeting
	Fylde Coast YMCA Partnership Board	Sandra Pitman	9/01/2017			26/1/17	Saved in T&L folder
	Lowther Trust	Cheryl Little	9/01/2017	31/1/17		31/1/17	Saved in T&L Folder
	Lytham Town Trust	Tim Ashton	9/01/2017	31/1/17	20/2/17	22/2/17	Saved in T&L Folder
	St Georges Day Festival Committee	Cheryl Little	9/01/2017	31/1/17		31/1/17	Saved in T&L Folder

Details

Councillor Name and Role on Outside Body (for example, Observer, Trustee, Director)	Cllr Sandra Pitman
Email	cllr.spitman@fylde.gov.uk
Period this report covers (date):	September 2016 - January 2017
Name of Outside Body:	YMCA
How often does the organisation meet? And how often have you attended?	Meetings are quarterly I attended meetings on September 21 & November 16 2016
Key issues arising for Fylde Borough Council	Budget: major repair programme for St. Anne's Pool; health & fitness among Fylde residents.
	Examples of issues could be those that may affect decisions regarding budget setting, challenges for residents, policy changes that affect partnership working etc
Who did you inform of these issues within Fylde Borough Council?	Chairman of Tourism & Leisure
In the light of these meetings, is it worthwhile for the Council to continue to have a representative/representatives on this body?	Yes
Any further comments?	<p>St. Anne's pool continued to have issues regarding locker room facilities, floor covering and heating as a result of the impasse between contractor Crudens and the Council . Some progress has been made on the locker issue but other issues were still outstanding.</p> <p>The St. Anne's pool and both Lytham & St. Anne's sites have had very encouraging quarterly figures for pool usage and profitability as membership figures rise. Ansdell Arena facilities are popular, sometimes obstructed by the school's maintenance work when pupils are on holiday. Kirkham Rural Splash facilities remain the exception to a very positive picture as income has dropped and the maintenance of the ageing facilities continues to be an issue. Ribby Hall & possibly future developments at Mill Farm may also provide ongoing competition for this Kirkham facility. Surrounding parishes are now being approached to make regular contributions to provide much needed income.</p>

LOWTHER TRUSTEE REPORT 2016/17

I have attended all Lowther Trustees meetings and also supplementary meetings with regard the smooth running of this venue. I have attended tendering processes, presentations, shows and fundraising events and been included in the improvements notably to the roof and new seating.

This year was widely considered to be the most successful yet. All the events were extremely well supported and the turnout was high. All the events ran smoothly with no major problems with increased audiences. **In summary, the main strength of the venue is the balance between providing the community with high quality and enjoyable events.** Lowther will hopefully continue to grow and increase footfall and its place in the community.

Lowther Trustees aim to raise vital funds for important improvement to the building and the gardens. It hopes that the new and improved building will celebrate with a fantastic atmosphere at all the events and provides Lytham/Fylde with a wonderful theatre giving the opportunity to strengthen community links. The range of events and shows means there's something for everyone from all demographics. With a varied programme and LINKS to local festivals ie SGF and Lytham Festivals it is proving very popular among local residents and businesses in addition to bringing people to Lytham from all over the country, raising the profile of the town and providing families with a great day and evening theatre experience. In summary, Lowther is the perfect combination of a local theatre!

Along with this report there also is financial data that will be available to members along with a presentation by the Chair of SGF Tim Lince at a future Tourism and Leisure committee – but feedback from residents and visitors shows that Lowther is growing from strength to strength and it has seen the most successful year yet, both in terms of quality of the events and profile. The committee members were thrilled with the turnout at each event and the high number of tickets sold, which also accounted for the most frequent comment and that was that the atmosphere at all events was fantastic !

The response to all events has been reported and is again open for any members to ask questions and alleviate any queries they have.

In summary, Lowther is the perfect combination of a local theatre for local residents as well as promoting the tourist economy to visitors from a wider area.

Details

Councillor Name and Role on Outside Body (for example, Observer, Trustee, Director)	Councillor Tim Ashton Director
Email	tim.ashton@lancashire.gov.uk
Period this report covers (date):	2016
Name of Outside Body:	Lytham Town Trust
How often does the organisation meet? And how often have you attended?	Quarterly and quarterly
Key issues arising for Fylde Borough Council	<p>Lytham Town Trust owns Lytham Hall and has granted a lease to operate the hall to The Heritage Trust Northwest.</p> <p>Parkrun takes place every Saturday morning at 9am attracting over 200 runners and volunteers</p> <p>The tearooms have been refurbished and prove extremely popular and therefore provide an important revenue stream for the hall.</p> <p>A large regeneration project is taking place both within the grounds and on the building at Lytham Hall. The works on the building were due to start in Spring 2016 and it was hoped that residents would see a considerable amount of improvement on site. However the Heritage Lottery Fund has withdrawn their grant and this has slowed progress considerably.</p> <p>The trust also operates the Assembly Rooms in Lytham and these rooms are not very well used and on occasion the council holds events there. The Trust is actively considering some business use on the ground floor and residential space on the upper floor both with a view to increasing revenue income.</p> <p>The Trust owns a residential property in Hastings Place Lytham and is in the process of modernising this property in order to increase income.</p>
	Examples of issues could be those that may affect decisions regarding budget setting, challenges for residents, policy changes that affect partnership working etc
Who did you inform of these issues within Fylde Borough Council?	Paul Walker
In the light of these meetings, is it worthwhile for the Council to continue to have a representative/representatives on this body?	Yes
Any further comments?	There is an ongoing dialogue with Fylde Borough Council and the Trust that operates the Hall regarding the use of the Capital Grant of £300k from Fylde Council which Blackpool Council Audit team are investigating; there will be a report at the next Tourism & Leisure Committee Meeting in March.

ST. GEORGE'S DAY FESTIVAL 2016/17

I have attended all SGF committee meetings and also supplementary meetings with regard the smooth running of this event and to observe OPENNESS. I have attended tendering process, presentations and volunteered at the event throughout.

This year marked the Eighth Annual St George's Day Festival and was widely considered to be the biggest and most successful yet. All the events were extremely well supported and the turnout was high. SGF raised in total £82,000 for the three charities; ABF The Soldiers Charity, Trinity Hospice and Love Lowther. All the events ran smoothly with no major problems with increased number of attendees to this year's festival compared to previous. **In summary, the main strength of the festival is the balance between providing the community with high quality and enjoyable events, whilst still maintaining fundraising as the top priority.** Overall, the St George's Festival of 2016 was a huge success and will hopefully continue to grow and increase in profit for the benefit of the charities involved.

The St George's Day Festival aims to raise vital funds for three important charities, both local and national, as well as putting Lytham St Annes and Lancashire on the national map and finally making St George's Day a national holiday. It celebrates with a fantastic atmosphere at all the events and provides Lytham with a wonderful opportunity to strengthen community links. The range of events means there's something for everyone from all demographics. From the Flag raising, the well supported parade, to the newly welcomed Comedy Night, not forgetting the most popular Lunch and Black Tie Dinner which provided an excellent platform to both network and socialize and which proves very popular among local residents and businesses. The Parade and Family Fun Day bring people to Lytham from all over the country, raising the profile of the town and providing families with a great day out. In summary, the festival is the perfect combination of fun exciting events, whilst raising money for three vital causes and it has continued to grow, year on year, with 2016 being no exception!

Along with this report there also is financial data that will be available to members along with a presentation by the Chair of SGF Tim Lince at the next Tourism and Leisure committee – but feedback from guests and committee members shows that this festival has been the most successful yet, both in terms of quality of the events and profit. The committee members were thrilled with the turnout at each event and the high number of tickets sold, which also accounted for the highest share of revenue. The most frequent comment was that the atmosphere at all events was fantastic !

The organisation of all events has been reported and is again open for any members to ask questions and alleviate any queries they have.

INFORMATION ITEM



REPORT OF	MEETING	DATE	ITEM NO
DEVELOPMENT SERVICES DIRECTORATE	TOURISM AND LEISURE COMMITTEE	9 MARCH 2017	9
ST GEORGE'S DAY FESTIVAL			

PUBLIC ITEM

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

SUMMARY OF INFORMATION

At the last meeting, members considered a report on developing a policy on events including club days, festivals and concerts. As part of the debate on the report, members RESOLVED:

"4. To invite representatives of the St George's Day festival to attend a future meeting of the committee to brief members on its arrangements".

Representatives of the St George's Day festival will be in attendance at the meeting to give a presentation on the event and answer any questions that members may have.

SOURCE OF INFORMATION

Director of Development Services

LINK TO INFORMATION

[Tourism and Leisure Committee 12 January 2017](#)

WHY IS THIS INFORMATION BEING GIVEN TO THE COMMITTEE?

To facilitate the attendance of representatives of the St George's Day festival in accordance with the resolution from the last committee.

FURTHER INFORMATION

Contact Paul Walker, tel: 01253 658431