



LATE REPORTS, URGENT BUSINESS and SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION

Cabinet

Tuesday, 9 December 2008

The following reports were received too late to be included on the main agenda for this meeting and were marked 'to follow'. They are now enclosed, as follows:

Agenda Item Number	Page	Title	Reason for Late Report	Officer Responsible For Late Report
3	1 - 8	REFERRAL FROM THE FESTIVAL & EVENTS CABINET LIAISON GROUP	Urgent Business	Corporate Director (Regeneration)

Agenda Item Number	Page	Title	Reason for Late Report	Officer Responsible For Late Report
12	9-20	DOME - OPTIONS	Received after publication of agenda	Corporate Director (Regeneration)

Agenda Item Number	Page	Title	Reason for Late Report	Officer Responsible For Late Report
13	21 - 26	INTERNATIONAL YOUTH GAMES 2009	Received after publication of agenda	Chief Executive

Agenda Item Number	Page	Title	Reason for Late Report	Officer Responsible For Late Report
14	27-33	LANCASTER PUBLIC REALM	Received after publication of agenda	Corporate Director (Regeneration)

Please note that Agenda item number 6 *Lancaster and Morecambe Worklessness Project*, has been withdrawn from this agenda.

CABINET

Referral from the Festival and Events Cabinet Liaison Group

9th December 2008

Report of Corporate Director (Regeneration)

PURPOSE OF REPORT			
To seek Cabinet support to recommendations from the Chair of the Festival and Events Cabinet Liaison Group.			
Key Decision	X	Non-Key Decision	Referral from Cabinet Member
Date Included in Forward Plan	December 2008		
This report is public			

RECOMMENDATIONS OF COUNCILLOR SHIRLEY BURNS (Chair of the Festivals and Events Cabinet Liaison Group)

- (1) To hold a further meeting of the Festivals and Events Cabinet Liaison Group once the Navy have confirm that they can participate in the event (i.e., "Look out to sea")
- (2) To approve the Festivals Innovation Fund (FIF) grant allocations for 2009/10 as set out below:-

"Applied" submissions:-

- | | |
|------------------------------|--------|
| • One Planet Festival | £1,000 |
| • The Lunesdale Studio Trail | £1,000 |
| • Tutti Frutti Festival | £3,000 |

"Solicited" submissions:-

- | | |
|---|--------|
| • "Look out to Sea" | £ 500 |
| • Williamson Park Local Music Programme | £2,500 |
| • Summer Sundays (More Music) | £2,000 |
| • Sandcastle Festival | £7,500 |
| • Catch the Wind Kite Festival | £2,000 |
| • Happy Mount Park Halloween | £3,000 |
| • Williamson Park Christmas Event | £5,000 |

- (3) To approve £2,000 out of the remaining budget to advertise all events that take place within the District
- (4) To look at an event or a series of events based on the canal to include the rural areas.
- (5) To reconsider and revisit the Festival Innovation Fund applications for events based in the rural areas to ensure District wide provision of events.
- (6) To request that more detail on the Williamson Park Christmas Ice Skating event be brought back to the next meeting of the Festivals and Events Cabinet Liaison Group.
- (7) To request that discussions be held with Officers and Members on the possibility of holding a fishing event similar to those held in previous years.
- (8) To recommend to Cabinet that the 4 festivals listed below for the main 2009 events programme (funded from Cultural Services “core” 2009/2010 proposed budget):-

• “We do like to be . . . “ (formerly know as Heritage Gala)	£16,200
• Lancaster Jazz Festival	£ 9,200
• Bands in Happy Mount Park	£ 3,300
• Fireworks Spectacular	£14,200

1.0 Introduction

- 1.1 Further to a recommendation from Cabinet on the 7th October 2008 [Minute 72 08/09] the Festivals and Events Cabinet Liaison Group met on the 3rd November 2008 to consider the 2009 programme of events, including the allocations from the Festivals Innovation Fund (FIF). The minutes of the Festivals and Events Cabinet Liaison Group are attached as an appendix to this report.

2.0 Proposal Details

- 2.1 Within its Terms of Reference and the approved criteria for Festivals Innovation Fund (FIF) grants, the Festivals and Events Cabinet Liaison Group considered a number of “Applied” and “Solicited” submissions, taking regards to the qualifying criteria (including an evaluation against the City Council’s corporate objectives) for awarding FIF grants.

- 2.2 In terms of “Applied” submissions, the Festivals and Events Cabinet Liaison Group were advised that 12 applications had been received. The Chair of the Festival and Events Cabinet Liaison Group recommends to Cabinet that the following submissions be approved:-

• One Planet Festival	£1,000
• The Lunesdale Studio Trail	£1,000
• Tutti Frutti Festival	£3,000

- 2.3 Within the “Solicited” category, the Chair of the Festival and Events Cabinet Liaison Group recommends to Cabinet that the following be approved:-

• “Look out to Sea”	£ 500
• Williamson Park Local Music Programme	£2,500

- Summer Sundays (More Music) £2,000
- Sandcastle Festival £7,500
- Catch the Wind Kite Festival £2,000
- Happy Mount Park Halloween £3,000
- Williamson Park Christmas Event £5,000

2.4 From an original 2009/2010 proposed budget allocation £31,900, in respect of the Festivals Innovation Fund, the above total from both of “Applied” and “Solicited” submissions represent a total of £27,500.

2.5 In terms of the remaining total balance i.e., £4,400 – the Chair of the Festival and Events Cabinet Liaison Group recommends to Cabinet that £2,000 be allocated for Cultural Services to assist in promoting and advertising “all” events, by whomever organised, within the District. Finally, of the outstanding balance that would then remain i.e., £2,400 the Chair of the Festival and Events Cabinet Liaison Group recommends that officers attempt to “solicit” further rural based events and report back to the Festivals and Events Cabinet Liaison Group in due course (as per Recommendation 5).

2.6 For the main 2009 events programme, funded from Cultural Services “core” 2009/2010 proposed budget allocation of £42,900 the Chair of the Festival and Events Cabinet Liaison Group recommends to Cabinet the 4 festivals listed below;-

- “We do like to be . . . “ (formerly know as Heritage Gala) £16,200
- Lancaster Jazz Festival £ 9,200
- Bands in Happy Mount Park £ 3,300
- Fireworks Spectacular £14,200

3.0 Details of Consultation

In the way that Cultural Services work alongside partner organisations the 2009 Festivals and Events programme, has by its very nature been the subject of significant consultation. Furthermore the FIF process included advertisement in the local newspaper encouraging individuals and organisations to submit proposals that were eligible for financial support from Lancaster City Council. The Festivals and Events Cabinet Liaison Group itself is also part of the consultation on Festivals and Events.

4.0 Options and Options Analysis (including risk assessment)

Option	Advantages	Disadvantages	Risks
1, To support the recommendations of the Chair of the Festival and Events Cabinet Liaison Group in respect of the Festivals and Events programme for 2009/10, as set out in the report.	The above will provide for a mixed programme of Festivals and Events in 2009, throughout the District.	The above represents a total expenditure of £74,800 from the 2009/2010 proposed budget allocation.	Unsuccessful implementation – failure to meet objectives. Reductions to budgets later in the budget process, preventing delivery and giving rise to associated reputational risks.
2, Not to support the recommendations of the Chair of the Festival and Events	A revenue saving of £74,800 from the 2009/2010 proposed budget allocation,	No City Council programme of Festivals and Events in 2009	Potential reputational damage and possibility of an adverse response

<p>Cabinet Liaison Group in respect of the Festivals and Events programme for 2009/10, as set out in the report</p>	<p>and opportunities to generate further savings associated with support costs.</p>		<p>from external funding agencies that support other elements of the Cultural programme within the Lancaster District.</p>
---	---	--	--

5.0 Officer Preferred Option (and comments)

5.1 Option 1 is the preferred option in that it provides for a balanced programme of core and FIF supported Festivals and Events in 2009/2010.

6.0 Conclusion

6.1 The report is in accordance with Cabinet’s approved Terms of Reference for the Festivals and Events Cabinet Liaison Group.

RELATIONSHIP TO POLICY FRAMEWORK

“Attract visitors to the district by promotion of cultural events” is a key outcome within the Corporate Strategy.

CONCLUSION OF IMPACT ASSESSMENT (including Diversity, Human Rights, Community Safety, Sustainability and Rural Proofing)

The Festival Innovations Fund (FIF) is part of the City Council’s process of engaging with local communities.

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

The financial information referred to within the report, which amount in total £74,800 represents the 2009/2010 proposed budget allocation.

The budget allocations for the Festivals and Events programme are established on a three-year rolling budget arrangement as part of the Council’s Medium Term Financial Strategy (MTFS), but subject to annual review. In the past, however, it may not always have been recognised that some services for planning festivals and events are genuinely received (and therefore payable) in the year before an event is held. An easy solution to the above is to ensure, in planning budgets, that the timing of Easter events and planning activities is properly considered and reflected accordingly in the three-year budget projections – this has been acted upon in the current budget process.

Furthermore, it could be formally recognised that other commitments associated with planning events may be incurred ‘at risk’, in the year before an event is held. If such an event is then removed as part of the annual budget process, any expenditure commitments would then need to be financed even though the event itself would not go ahead.

Should Cabinet support the recommendations, it is requested to indicate whether it wishes to assume this approach at this stage.

Alternatively, during the budget process Members could decide to remove the event a year

later (e.g. in the current 2009/10 budget process, remove an event from 2010/11 onwards). This would avoid any abortive costs, but still achieve savings in later years. Such arrangements would provide Cultural Services, at least for its Festivals and Events programme, with a similar approach adopted by one of the Council's major funding "partners" – Arts Council England (ACE). Clearly this assists in terms of planning, preparing and marketing, as well as providing Festival and Event organisers (be they Cultural Services directly or FIF supported Festivals/Programmes/Events), the opportunity to lever in maximum support and/or match funding. Unfortunately, a number of external funding partners have very long lead-in and application processes.

Cabinet is requested to indicate whether it wishes to assume this alternative approach at this stage, if it supports the recommendations.

SECTION 151 OFFICER'S COMMENTS

The recommendations as set out would be subject to the budget process as outlined above, and the associated risks involved.

Any consideration of potential new spending pressures (or continuation of existing ones) should be considered in context of competing priorities and demands, and the Council's financial prospects.

LEGAL IMPLICATIONS

Legal Services have been consulted and have no observations to make on this report.

MONITORING OFFICER'S COMMENTS

The Monitoring Officer has been consulted and has no further comments.

BACKGROUND PAPERS

Contact Officer: David Owen
Telephone: 01524 582820
E-mail: d Owen@lancaster.gov.uk
Ref: WDO/wdo/c/f&e/091208

**FESTIVALS AND EVENTS
CABINET LIAISON GROUP**

10.00 A.M.

3RD NOVEMBER 2008

PRESENT:- Councillors Shirley Burns (Chairman), Evelyn Archer, John Barnes, Susan Bray, Abbot Bryning, Chris Coates, Roger Dennison and Janie Kirkman

Apologies for Absence

Councillor Karen Leytham

Officers in attendance:-

David Owen	Head of Cultural Services
Simon Kirby	Leisure Services General Manager
Gill Haigh	Communications Manager
Sharon Marsh	Democratic Support Officer

1 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Councillor Chris Coates declared an interest in the 2009 Festivals Innovation Events Applications and left the room prior to consideration of the item.

Councillors John Barnes and Roger Dennison declared a personal interest in the Naval Event as they had been involved in the organisation of this event.

2 TERMS OF REFERENCE

Members accepted the Terms of Reference for the Festivals and Events Cabinet Liaison Group.

3 GENERAL UPDATE ON THE NAVAL EVENT

Councillors John Barnes and Roger Dennison provided the Group with an update on the proposed Naval Event. It was reported that the event was dependant on funding and the availability and willingness of the Navy to participate in the event.

It was noted that the Sea Cadets from Barrow, who were named the Cadet band of the year, had already stated that they would be prepared to perform at the event and that Halton Army Camp would be prepared to accommodate them for the time they were here.

It was reported that the event would be billed as a naval reunion and would be a District wide event. It was hoped that a vessel could be stationed at Glasson Dock, lectures and performances held in Lancaster and a ceremony held for veterans in Morecambe.

It was noted that a date for the event had not yet been set and that no further details could be reported until hearing confirmation that the Navy were able to take part in the event.

That the Cabinet Member with Special Responsibility be recommended to:-

Hold a further meeting of the Cabinet Liaison Group once the Navy have been in contact to confirm that they can participate in the event.

Items 6 and 7 on the Agenda were taken in conjunction with each other.

4 PROPOSED 2009 PROGRAMME OF EVENTS AND 2009 FESTIVALS INNOVATION EVENTS APPLICATIONS

The Head of Cultural Services reported that 4 festivals were included in the budgeted provision for festivals and events in 2009/10. These were Bands in Happy Mount Park, Lancaster Jazz Festival, We do like to be beside the sea...., and Lancaster Fireworks.

It was reported that out of the 12 applications for the Festivals Innovation Fund, only 3 had met the criteria of the scheme. Members discussed the applications in detail and were given the opportunity to ask questions or make comments on each individual application.

It was noted that that Festival Innovation Fund provision for solicited events was £20,000 and that the Festivals Innovation Fund provision for applications was £10,000.

Members discussed the events included in the solicited provision and requested that more information be brought back to the Cabinet Liaison Group on the Williamson Park Christmas Event (Ice Skating).

The Group considered the location of all events and it was felt that there was an equal number in Lancaster and Morecambe, but that not enough events were to be held in the rural areas. Members felt that applications to the Festivals Innovation Fund for events to be held in rural areas should be reconsidered and that the possibility of holding a festival or event on the canal be looked at. Members also suggested that the possibility of holding a fishing event be looked at.

That the Cabinet Member with Special Responsibility be recommended to:

(1) Approve the Festivals Innovation Fund grant allocations as set out below:-

Festival Name	Recommendation
Lancaster Eurodance	No grant
Business Rocks	No grant
Lancaster Community Festival	No grant
Morecambe Salsa	No grant
One Planet Festival	£1000
Festival Market Family Fun Weekend	No grant
The Lunesdale Studio Trail	Up to £1000
Cross Bay Challenge 2009	No grant
Tutti Frutti Festival	£3000
Nice N Sleazy Festival	No grant
Heritage Tea Party	No grant
Carnival of Culture	No grant

- (2) Approve the Festivals Innovation Fund Provision (Solicited) as set out below:-

Festival Name	Recommendation
Look out to Sea	Up to £500
Williamson Park Local Music Programme	£2500
Summer Sundays (More Music)	£2000
Sandcastle	£7500
Catch the Wind	£2000
Happy Mount Park Halloween	£3000
Williamson Park Christmas Event	£5000

- (3) Allocate £2000 out of the remaining budget to advertise all events that take place within the District, if possible.
- (4) Look at an event or a series of events based on the canal to include the rural areas.
- (5) Reconsider and revisit the Festival Innovation Fund applications for events based in the rural areas to ensure District wide provision of events.
- (6) Request that more detail on the Williamson Park Christmas Ice Skating event be brought back to the next meeting of the Cabinet Liaison Group.
- (7) Request that discussions be held with Officers and Members on the possibility of holding a fishing event similar to those held in previous years.

5 DATE AND TIME OF NEXT MEETING

It was agreed that the next meeting would take place after 4 p.m. and that Members would be informed of a specific date once news had been heard from the Navy regarding the Naval Event.

Chairman

(The meeting ended at 11.45 a.m.)

**Any queries regarding these Minutes, please contact
Sharon Marsh, Democratic Services - telephone (01524) 582096 or email
smarsh@lancaster.gov.uk**

CABINET

**Dome – Options
9th December 2008**

Report of Corporate Director (Regeneration)

PURPOSE OF REPORT				
To consider options for the future of the Dome.				
Key Decision	X	Non-Key Decision		Referral from Cabinet Member
Date Included in Forward Plan				
This report is public				

RECOMMENDATIONS OF COUNCILLOR JANE FLETCHER

- (1) **Cabinet is requested to determine an in principle preferred option for the future of the Dome.**
- (2) **Subject to Cabinet's decision with regards to the above, that the revenue and capital consequences identified within the report be taken forward and considered as part of the wider deliberation by Cabinet on the 2009/2010 budget process.**

1.0 Introduction

- 1.1 In January 2008, Cabinet considered a report on the future of the Dome, and resolved [Minute 99 (07/08 refers)]:-

- (1) That the current operation at the Dome be continued in accordance with Option C, with the Condition Survey being undertaken as cheaply as possible and to be funded through the Renewals Reserve, and with a report back to Cabinet about the performance venues in Morecambe.
- (2) That Cabinet approves an increase in the budget, as set out in the report, for Pumping Station works.
- (3) That the revenue and capital consequences identified within the report be taken forward and considered as part of the wider deliberation by Cabinet on the 2008/209 budget process.

- 1.2 As part of the current Star Camber budget process, Officers have been asked to prepare an update report.

1.3 The original report submitted to Cabinet in January 2008 was in the context of the factors listed below. To that end the on-going Star Camber budget process has accentuated some of those issues i.e.:-

- The redevelopment of Morecambe Promenade (as part of the Midland Hotel project).
- The age and condition of the Dome.
- The Council's Medium Term Financial Strategy (MTFS)
- An objective challenge (in terms of revenue costs/duplication, etc) as to whether the Council should operate two venues (i.e., the Platform and the Dome) "across the road to each other".
- Capacity within other existing venues (both public and private) to offer an equivalent programme of events, which could include consideration of the Winter Gardens.

1.4 The future of the Dome is linked to the on-going redevelopment of Morecambe promenade. In the context of the above, the report poses the question whether Cabinet wish to give consideration to closing the Dome pre or post any agreement on the promenade development? Cabinet is also asked to consider whether to continue providing a programme of events/shows in the Dome, or whether to transfer its programme of events/shows to an alternative venue e.g., the Platform, or other venues within the District (including private sector venues), as and when the Dome does ultimately close?

1.5 In respect of the Condition Survey referred to in paragraph 1.1, Capita Symonds was commissioned to undertake the work. The financial summary of their survey identified and recommends a five year refurbishment and repairs programme, amounting to:-

Year 1 (2009/10)	Year 2 (2010/11)	Year 3 (2011/12)	Year 4 (2012/13)	Year 5 (2013/14)
£53,000	£141,000	£102,000	£50,000	£215,000

1.6 In terms of Options listed below for Cabinet' s consideration the refurbishment and repairs programme contained within the Capital Symonds Dome Condition Survey has not to-date been submitted as a request for growth within the Capital Programme, and would need to be subjected to a robust business case and project appraisal.

2.0 Proposal Details

2.1 The 2009/2010 Draft Revenue Budget shows a net expenditure of £125,500 against the Dome and a similar figure against the Platform.

2.2 **Option A - Closure and demolition of the Dome, with no transfer of events.**

2.3 In option A an estimate for demolition of the Dome (*"to one metre below ground level, grubbing up and sealing off of services, removal of debris and arisings off site, etc"*) has been received from Birse Civils Limited. At 2009/10 prices the total cost estimate stood at £85,100 (2008/09 Base plus 2% inflation). Any capital growth in respect of the above has yet to be highlighted as an item for the Capital Programme and approval would be dependent on a project appraisal.

Assumptions:-

- Cessation of all operations at Dome.
- One permanent staff member subject to redeployment, with effect from April 1st 2009. Staff member may alternatively take redundancy option which would result in subsequent redundancy costs.
- Effective 1st April 2009, subject to no contractual costs relating to cancellation of existing bookings.

Projected revenue savings of £111,900 best case and £66,900 worst case scenario based on 2009/10 draft estimates. The projected savings for 2010/11 and 2011/12 are £121,200 and £127,200. A breakdown of the Option A financial appraisal is attached as an appendix to the report.

Risks:-

- The above would have a potentially damaging impact on the reputation of the Council and district. The closure of the Dome and no transfer of events would be viewed negatively in terms of the impact that shows and events make to the district and undermine the events strategy undertaken since the creation of Cultural Services. High profile event/shows such as those undertaken in 2007/2008, including;- the “Arctic Monkeys”, “Athlete”, “Reverend & the Makers”, and “the Kooks”, etc., would cease through the loss of the existing revenue budget.
- The above assumes an effective date of the 1st April 2009, and no contractual costs relating to cancellation of existing bookings. Based on the earlier work undertaken as part of the January 2008 report to Cabinet, bookings scheduled for the Dome in 2008/2009, the potential maximum estimated contractual costs of cancellations were calculated at £45,000 (there has not been time to-date to adjust the figures to reflect 2009/2010 pre-booked events). Pending Cabinet’s decision with regards to a preferred option on the future of the Dome, to avoid the risk of reputational damage the above is hypothetical, as no event promoter or organiser has yet been contacted with a view to negotiating an alternative venue (which could offset some of the potential contractual cancellation costs). However, if the decision was taken now to close the Dome with effect from April 2010, there would be no contractual costs relating to cancellation of bookings, as to-date no bookings have been confirmed for 2010/2011. A decision could be made to coincide with the end of the 2009/2010 season to ensure no commitments are made for events to be held in 2010/2011.
- Permanent staff member could take statutory redundancy if redeployment not successful which would result in a cost, calculated at £6,000 (note this figure is based on March 2008 figures, with no enhancements. There has not been time to-date to adjust the figures to March 2009).
- No budget approval as present to demolish the Dome.

2.4 **Option B - Closure and demolition of the Dome, transferring the majority of events to the Platform and/or alternative venues within the District (including private sector venues) – subject to availability.**

Assumptions:-

- Cessation of all operations at Dome.
 - Transfer of events from the Dome to the Platform and/or alternative venues within the District (including related expenditure and income) – subject to availability.
 - Retention of permanent staff – transferred to within Cultural Services to support events held in alternative venues.
 - Effective 1st April 2009, subject to no contractual costs relating to cancellation of existing bookings.
- 2.5 This option would result in a net revenue saving of £91,100 best case and £46,100 worst case scenario based on 2009/10 draft estimates. The projected savings for 2010/11 and 2011/12 are £93,200 and £95,000. A breakdown of the Option B financial appraisal is attached as an appendix to the report.
- 2.6 As already referred to in option A, option B also contains an estimate for demolition of the Dome. At 2008/09 prices the total cost estimate stood at £85,100 (2008/09 Base + 2% inflation). This capital growth has yet to be highlighted as an item for the Capital Programme and approval would be dependent on a robust business case and project appraisal.
- 2.7 In the event that Cabinet wishes to consider relocating the Dome based events/shows to the Platform, the latter would require a capital investment (staging, “blackouts”, lighting and sound systems, etc) to bring the Platform to an equivalent operational standard - estimated at £132,600 (2008/09 Base + 2% inflation). These improvements have been identified as a request for growth within the Capital Programme but are subject to approval dependent on a robust business case and project appraisal.

Risks:-

- The above assumes an effective date of the 1st April 2009, and no contractual costs relating to cancellation of existing bookings. Based on the earlier work undertaken as part of the January 2008 report to Cabinet, bookings scheduled for the Dome in 2008/2009, the potential maximum estimated contractual costs of cancellations were calculated at £45,000 (there has not been time to-date to adjust the figures to reflect 2009/2010 pre-booked events). Pending Cabinet’s decision with regards to a preferred option on the future of the Dome, to avoid the risk of reputational damage the above is hypothetical, as no event promoter or organiser has yet been contacted with a view to negotiating an alternative venue (which could offset some of the potential contractual cancellation costs). However, if the decision was taken now to close the Dome with effect from April 2010, there would be no contractual costs relating to cancellation of bookings, as to-date no bookings have been confirmed for 2010/2011. A decision could be made to coincide with the end of the 2009/2010 season to ensure no commitments are made for events to be held in 2010/2011.
- It should be noted that non-availability and layout of other potential venues within the District would mean a small percentage of events could not be considered for transfer. For the purposes of consistency all projections within this report are based on transferring 100% of the events from the Dome to

Platform, as at this stage it is not possible to determine otherwise without discussing the situation with promoters.

- No budget approval at present to demolish the Dome.
- No capital investment approval at present to upgrade the Platform, and this would be subject to the business case.
- Failure to manage effective redirection of shows from the Dome to the Platform.
- Failure to achieve show income as estimates.

2.8 **Option C - Continue current operation.**

In this option the City Council would continue to operate the Dome, presumably until such time as the outcome of the Morecambe promenade redevelopment is determined.

Assumptions:-

- Although there would be demolition costs associated with the Dome, estimated at £85,100 (2008/09 Base + 2% inflation), it is assumed that they would be offset against the overall costs of the redevelopment of Morecambe Promenade.
- Subject to a satisfactory outcome to the Morecambe promenade redevelopment, and if Cabinet still wished to consider relocating the Dome based events/shows to the Platform and/or alternative venues within the District (including private sector venues), the former would require a capital investment (staging, "blackouts", lighting and sound systems, etc) to bring the Platform to an equivalent operational standard - estimated at £132,600 (2008/09 Base + 2% inflation). These improvements have been identified as a request for growth within the Capital Programme but are subject to approval dependent on a robust business case and project appraisal.
- There would also be revenue consequences linked to the above, in respect of additional expenditure and income (including staffing costs), associated with staging more events/shows in the Platform. At this time these costs have not been determined.
- That expenditure identified in the Capita Symonds Condition Survey will be capital in nature, starting in 2009/10. These improvements have not yet been submitted as growth within the Capital Programme and are still subject to robust review by both Cultural and Financial Services.
- A breakdown of the Option C financial appraisal is attached as an appendix to the report.

Risks:-

- No approval of budget allocation at present in respect of the condition survey.
- No capital investment approval at present to upgrade the Platform, and this would be subject to the business case.

- No revenue budget approval at present to transfer Dome events/shows to the Platform.

2.9 Option D - Seeking a private operator to take on the operation of the Dome.

Within the January 2008 report, Cabinet was informed of an informal approach undertaken by the former Corporate Director (Regeneration), to identify a potential private operator. The matter was not pursued as only one operator was identified and the management fee sought from the City Council by the operator was prohibitively large.

Assumptions:-

- The outcome of the above would likely involve a Management Fee from the City Council to any operator and would therefore not yield any financial savings.

Risks:-

- The likelihood of finding a suitable and affordable operator for the Dome, for the time that remains before the redevelopment of Morecambe Promenade. It is difficult to identify where any operator would make any savings with regards to fixed costs, such as utilities, etc.
- Cabinet are reminded that the whole Bubbles Complex, including the Dome, has in the past been operated by a private contractor (as part of the Compulsory Competitive Tendering regime). Ultimately that contractor failed and the operation of the facilities reverted to the City Council.
- In the event that a private sector operator was identified for the Dome, it would likely operate in direct competition to the Platform and may impact on the programming and financial viability of the Platform.

3.0 Details of Consultation

3.1 As the position regarding the future of the Dome is to be determined, to minimise the risk of reputational damage to the facility, Council or District, there has not been any consultation to-date.

4.0 Options and Options Analysis (including risk assessment)

4.1 The Options and Options Analysis are as set out in Paragraphs 2.1 to 2.9.

5.0 Officer Preferred Option (and comments)

5.1 Option A provides the greatest financial whole-life saving, whilst option B would allow the Council to retain a programme of events, and option C a deferral on one or both of the above. In view of the uncertainty regarding the long-term future of the Dome and the previous experience with a private operator, option D is not a preferred option.

6.0 Conclusion

- 6.1 The future of the Dome is linked to the on-going redevelopment of Morecambe Promenade. To that end the main issue arising from this report is the question of timescales. Protracted speculation regarding the future of the Dome will have a detrimental impact on potential hirers of the venue (and therefore income) and on staff morale.

RELATIONSHIP TO POLICY FRAMEWORK

Performance venues are an integral part of the Cultural Services “offer” within the District and impact in terms of facilities provided for residents and visitors.

CONCLUSION OF IMPACT ASSESSMENT

(including Diversity, Human Rights, Community Safety, Sustainability and Rural Proofing)

The report raises issues in respect of sustainability.

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

As the reports set out there are a range of financial implications (revenue and capital) arising from the report.

Members are advised that the options and financial information contained within this report are for illustration purposes only at this stage. The potential costs/savings of each option have not yet been possible to fully appraise, in particular whole life costing still needs to be analysed. Subject to Cabinet’s preferred option, further detailed work is required and will be carried out by Cultural Services in conjunction with Finance before any final decision is made, as part of the budget process.

Option A

	2009/10 Worst Case	2009/10 Best Case	2010/11	2011/12
Revenue	(66,900)	(111,900)	(121,200)	(127,200)
Capital	85,100	85,100		
Cost/(Saving)	18,200	(26,800)	(121,200)	(127,200)

This option would result in revenue savings but would require capital expenditure for the demolition of the Dome.

Option B

	2009/10 Worst Case	2009/10 Best Case	2010/11	2011/12
Revenue	(46,100)	(91,100)	(93,200)	(95,000)
Capital	217,700	217,700		
Cost/(Saving)	171,600	126,600	(93,200)	(95,000)

This option would result in revenue savings but would require capital expenditure for demolition of the Dome and improvements to Platform facilities to ensure the transfer of events to the Platform could be possible.

Option C

	2009/10 Worst Case	2009/10 Best Case	2010/11	2011/12
Revenue	125,500	125,500	128,300	130,800
Cost/(Saving)	125,500	125,500	128,300	130,800

This option would result in ongoing revenue expenditure, until such time as the City Council determines the outcome of the redevelopment proposals for of Morecambe Promenade. Thereafter, in the event that Cabinet still wished to consider relocating the Dome based events/shows to the Platform, would require a capital expenditure of at least £132,600 (2008/09 Base + 2% inflation) for staging, "blackouts", lighting and sound system. There would also be additional revenue costs and/or savings associated in relocating the Dome based events/shows to the Platform. The Conditions survey carried out by Capita Symonds has also identified a further £561,000 profiled across 5 years for a refurbishment and repairs programme for the Dome (paragraph 1.5)

Option D

This option has not been costed and would be subject to market testing via a Tendering process.

SECTION 151 OFFICER'S COMMENTS

As highlighted above, the financial appraisal of options is not yet updated fully but the report should allow Cabinet to give an indication of the preferred option, which could then go forward as part of the budget proposals. In essence, there are two issues for consideration:

1 - Does the Council wish to continue operating the Dome, until the Promenade Redevelopment is determined;

and

2 - If it wishes to close the Dome, does it wish to upgrade its facilities at other venues, such as the Platform, in order that they could stage other events (assuming that the organisers of such events wished/agreed to use alternative venues)? With regard to this aspect, the Section 151 Officer would advise that the business cases for such proposals would need determining, to support consideration against the draft Capital Investment principles, i.e., capital investment in new (or the expansion of existing) facilities will be considered only where they link clearly with the existing corporate plan and they are either:-

- at least self financing (both in revenue and capital terms).

or

- invest to save proposals that require some up front capital investment but would generate cashable (and where possible, non-cashable) ongoing revenue savings.

Overall, the rationalisation of venues should allow better value for money (VFM) to be achieved, for local taxpayers as a whole, and the Section 151 Officer would advise Members to consider VFM principles carefully in considering future options, in context of the Council's financial context and other competing demands and priorities.

LEGAL IMPLICATIONS

There are no legal implications other than those that may occur if the Dome ceases to operate and there are resultant staff issues or contractual issues arising from cancelled bookings.

MONITORING OFFICER'S COMMENTS

The Monitoring Officer has been consulted and has no comments at this stage.

BACKGROUND PAPERS

N/A

Contact Officer: David Owen

Telephone: 01524 582820

E-mail: downen@lancaster.gov.uk

Ref: WDO/wdo/c/d/091208

Option A Closure and demolition of the Dome, no transfer of events.

	2009/10	2009/10	2010/11	2011/12
	Worst Case Best Case			
Revenue Costs				
Cost of Dome saved	-125,500	-125,500	-128,300	-130,800
Redeployment Costs	13,600	13,600	7,100	3,600
Redundancy Costs	0	0	0	0
Cancellation Costs	45,000	0	0	0
Total Revenue cost/(saving)	-66,900	-111,900	-121,200	-127,200
Capital Costs				
Demolition expenditure	85,100	85,100	0	0
Total Capital cost/(saving)	85,100	85,100	0	0
Overall cost/(saving)	18,200	-26,800	-121,200	-127,200

Assumptions /Risks:**Redundancy Costs**

Based on an end date of 31/03/08 c£6K, however needs re-calculating for revised date of 31/03/09. These costs have not been included in the option appraisal but if this option was taken there would be savings made on redeployment costs as these would no longer be applicable.

Redeployment Costs

Duty Manager post at Platform scp 25 has been used for this calculation based on redeploy date of 01/04/08, therefore requires re-calculating for revised date of 01/04/09. Staff members would be redeployed to the post at lower grade with 3 year protection. Calculation based upon the difference between budgeted scp 25 and existing post at scp 32, using the 100%, 50% and 25% protection plan.

Capital Costs

2008/09 base figure has been inflated by 2% for the purpose of illustration, however this needs to be reviewed more thoroughly.

Option B Closure and demolition of the Dome, transfer majority of events.

	2009/10 Worst Case	2009/10 Best Case	2010/11	2011/12
Revenue Costs				
Operational savings	-125,500	-125,500	-128,300	-130,800
Salary costs still required	34,400	34,400	35,100	35,800
Cancellation Costs	45,000	0	0	0
Net cost/saving of transferred events	0	0	0	0
Total Revenue cost/(saving)	-46,100	-91,100	-93,200	-95,000
Capital Costs				
Demolition expenditure	85,100	85,100	0	0
Blackouts	132,600	132,600	0	0
Total Capital cost/(saving)	217,700	217,700	0	0
Overall cost/(saving)	171,600	126,600	-93,200	-95,000

Assumptions /Risks:**Revenue Costs**

Failure to achieve estimated income, noting that 2009/10 draft budget assumes surplus of £27,900 for this area, however there was a deficit totalling £9,900 in 2007/08, therefore shown as nil above.

Capital Costs

2008/09 base figures have been inflated by 2% for the purpose of illustration, however this needs to be reviewed more thoroughly.

Option C Continue current operations

2009/10 2009/10 2010/11 2011/12
Worst Case Best Case

Revenue Costs

Dome continued operations	125,500	125,500	Taken from draft revised budgets 0910	128,300	130,800
Total Revenue cost/(saving)	125,500	125,500		128,300	130,800

Capital Costs

Demolition - assumed this costs are offset against redevelopment of Morecambe Promen	85,100	85,100		0	0
Demolition - assumed recovered by redevelopment of Morecambe Programme	-85,100	-85,100		0	0
Blackouts	132,600	132,600		0	0
Additional costs of continued operations: Condition Survey	53,000	53,000		141,000	102,000

Total Capital cost/(saving)

185,600 185,600

141,000 102,000

Overall cost/(saving)

311,100 **311,100**

269,300 **232,800**

Assumptions /Risks:

Capital Costs

For the purpose of illustration it has been assumed that the refurbishment works identified by the Capita Symonds Condition Survey will be capitalised, however this is still subject to robust review and some costs may infact be deemed revenue thereby increasing the revenue costs projected above.

CABINET

International Youth Games 2009 9th December 2008

Report of the Chief Executive

PURPOSE OF REPORT			
This report sets out the options in respect of proposals for Lancaster to host the International Youth Games in the summer of 2009.			
Key Decision	X	Non-Key Decision	Referral from Cabinet Member
Date Included in Forward Plan		1 st December 2008	
This report is public			

RECOMMENDATION

That consideration be given to the options set out in the report.

1.0 Introduction

1.1 The International Youth Games originated in the 1970s when the Danish town of Aalborg held a sporting event to which Lancaster City Council was invited to send a small team. This has developed over the years and Lancaster now participates in a four yearly games cycle involving Almere (Holland), Aalborg (Denmark) and Rendsberg (Germany). Lancaster District last hosted the Games in 2005 and has participated in the Games in Almere in 2006, Aalborg in 2007 and in Rendsberg this year.

2.0 Background

2.1 A decision was taken in June 2008 (Minutes No. 7) to host the Games in Lancaster in 2009 as follows:

- (1) *That the International Youth Games be held in the Lancaster District in the Summer of 2009 and that the arrangements for the Games be delegated to the Head of Democratic Services and the Head of Cultural Services within the budget allocated.*
- (2) *That an invitation for four civic delegates to attend from Twin Towns and two Civic Delegates from Associate Towns be extended on behalf of the City Council.*

2.2 Since the decision was taken progress has been made with the early planning stages and invitations have been issued.

2.3 When the Games were last held in Lancaster discussions were held with the other host nations which resulted in a general agreement that the 'civic' element of the event should be more closely integrated with the sporting elements and attempts

were made to ensure that there was time available for visiting Mayors to view the Games rather than organising separate events. This has resulted in a scaling down of the civic component of the visits by Aalborg and Rendsburg and is the intention for Lancaster City Council in 2009.

- 2.4 The towns of Almere, Aalborg and Rendsburg have also attempted to widen participation to other cultural events and there have been some dancing and artistic aspects included over the past 3 years. This too has been considered during the planning of the Games and suitable volunteers identified to organise a cultural element to the event.

3.0 Proposals

- 3.1 In view of the impact of the current economic situation on the Council's finances for 2009/10, Members of Cabinet have requested a report on the potential savings, consequences and implications of cancelling the Games proposed for 2009. Since there is the potential for a motion to be moved to rescind a decision of Cabinet made within the past six months, a formal notice of motion signed by a quorum of Cabinet will be required to this effect in accordance with Council Procedure Rule 18.1 in order for any motion other than endorsing the previous decision to be moved.

- 3.2 The current position is:

- 3.2.1 The dates have been set for the Games – the Sporting and Cultural delegations are due to arrive on Sunday, 26th July, ready for competition to begin during the morning of Monday, 27th July. The opening Ceremony for the Games will be held in the evening of Monday 27 July 2009. The Games will close during the afternoon of Friday 31st July and it is expected that participants will leave either that evening, or during the day on Saturday, 1st August 2009. This is a slightly more concentrated programme of sporting events removing the 'free' day when entertainment for the young people had previously been provided. The Civic guests have been invited from Tuesday 28th July to Friday 31st July 2008, reducing the civic presence from five days to three.

- 3.2.2 Participants have been invited from all the Council's Twin Towns (Aalborg, Lublin, Perpignan, Vaxjo and Rendsburg) and a smaller number from our Associate Towns of Viana do Castelo and Almere. Total numbers invited are 325 (compared to 350 in 2005).

- 3.2.3 A Civic Delegation of four has also been invited from each Twin Town, and two from our Associate Towns.

- 3.2.4 Volunteer leaders have been identified to enable the following sports competitions to be offered as well as a dance element – the final list would be dependent upon sufficient competitors from other countries taking part: Athletics, Badminton, Golf, Judo, Karate, Rowing, Swimming and Table tennis.

- 3.3 Replies have been requested by 14th December – to date acceptance of the invitation has been received from Aalborg, Perpignan, Rendsburg and Vaxjo.

- 3.4 Although initial enquiries have commenced in relation to accommodation for example, no financial commitments have as yet been entered into.

4.0 Details of Consultation

- 4.1 Local sports and dance clubs have been consulted over their possible participation in 2009 and volunteer leaders identified. Should Members wish to pursue option 3, the sports clubs would need to be consulted to ensure that they were willing to continue their participation in a revised Games.

5.0 Options and Options Analysis (including risk assessment)

- 5.1 Option 1 is to continue with the arrangements currently underway to hold the Games in the Lancaster District in the summer of 2009, utilising the identified budget of £55,000.
- 5.2 Option 2 is to cancel the proposed Games in the Lancaster District in 2009, saving the budget of £55,000.
- 5.3 Option 3 is to continue with arrangements to hold the Games in the Lancaster District in the summer of 2009, but reduce expenditure by cancelling the civic invitations and making cuts in other areas of expenditure.

5.4

	Option	Advantages	Disadvantages/Risks
1	Continue with the arrangements currently underway to hold the Games in the Lancaster District in the summer of 2009, utilising the identified budget of £55,000.	Honours the invitations already extended to the Council's Twin Towns and meets the expectations of local sports clubs.	Does not assist in the pursuit of the £1.8m savings required to balance the budget for 2009/10.
2	Cancel the proposed Games in the Lancaster District in 2009, saving the budget of £55,000.	Saves £55,000 in the 2009/10 budget	Having already issued invitations to the Games, the Council's reputation with our Twin Towns may suffer both from a civic perspective but also in the disappointment for young people who will already be preparing themselves to compete. Similarly, there are expectations from young people in this district who will be taking part in trials and working towards competing in the Games in their home country.

3	Continue with arrangements to hold the Games in the Lancaster District in the summer of 2009, but reduce expenditure by cancelling the civic invitations and making cuts to other areas of expenditure.	Provides some savings in the 2009/10 budget. Honours the invitations already extended to the Council's Twin Towns and meets the expectations of local sports clubs.	Having already issued invitations to the Games, the Council's reputation with our Twin Towns may suffer from a civic perspective but this will be mitigated by continuing with the Games in a reduced format to enable the young people to participate. Does not provide the full £55,000 saving which would be achieved by cancelling the Games.
---	---	---	---

6.0 Officer Preferred Option (and comments)

6.1 There is no officer preferred option. Work to prepare for and organise a Games in Lancaster has been included in the Business Plans for both Cultural Services and Democratic Services.

7.0 Conclusion

7.1 The International Youth Games are an important part of the City Council's continued commitment to twinning. Holding the Games in the Lancaster District provides an opportunity for the area to be showcased to our Twin and Associate Towns, and also allows the opportunity for us to meet with our Civic counterparts and maintain these important relationships. It also provides children of twinned towns the opportunity of visiting the Lancaster District and the experience of living with a local family as well as enabling the participation of young people from this District.

7.2 Nevertheless this is a discretionary activity which the Council is not required to fund and is a potential source of savings in order to preserve essential services.

<p>RELATIONSHIP TO POLICY FRAMEWORK</p> <p>Priority Outcome 16 in the 2008/09 Corporate Plan includes to deliver a Civic Programme which celebrates local heritage and benefits our communities.</p>
<p>CONCLUSION OF IMPACT ASSESSMENT (including Diversity, Human Rights, Community Safety, Sustainability and Rural Proofing)</p> <p>Should it be agreed to host the Games in 2009, all plans will take account of issues surrounding diversity, community safety and the welfare of children, and risk assessments will be carried out where necessary.</p>

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

Option 1

£55,000 is included in the 2009/2010 budget at this stage and it is intended to tailor the event to ensure that it is delivered within that budget. Sponsorship will be sought to offset some costs, and a contribution from participants will be set at an appropriate level once more detailed plans are underway.

Option 2

Provides a saving of £55,000 in the 2009/10 budget. The effect of this decision may be that Lancaster is not invited to future Youth Games abroad, or Council may also take the decision not to participate in future. This would provide ongoing savings in future years although these vary dependent on the varying cost of travel to different venues – current projections are for £8,000 in 2010/11 and £12,000 in 2011/12.

Option 3

Detailed planning of the Games for 2009 has not yet been undertaken and the estimated budget at this stage has therefore been based on the £45,000 actual spend in 2005 with an amount added for inflation over 4 years. Members will recall the circumstances in 2005 when the Council took over the organisation of the Games at very short notice and was therefore required to honour previous commitments made and had little time to source the most cost effective delivery. Having examined the accounts from 2005, it is anticipated that the following savings could be made without unduly affecting the delivery of the Games for the young people:

- Cancel the civic element – saving £7,800
- Accommodate all young people with families (cannot be guaranteed, but efforts have already commenced to ensure that this is the case) – saving £7,500
- Fly only those flags available – Council purchased all new flags and flagpoles in 2005, these should be re-usable reducing costs to set up costs only (estimated at £500) – saving £2,000
- Re-use logo from 2005 – saving costs on commissioning, purchasing and framing prints for sale – net saving £2,400
- Use the Council's website for publicity and results rather than an independent website – saving £600

Total saving identified above = £20,300

In addition by reducing the length of the Games by a day and the numbers of participants (already implemented) it is possible that other costs will be proportionately reduced resulting in the anticipated increase in costs of £10,000 since 2005 being reduced.

SECTION 151 OFFICER'S COMMENTS

The S151 Officer has been consulted and would advise that any options for savings should be considered in context of the Council's financial prospects and its corporate objectives and priorities for the future.

LEGAL IMPLICATIONS

There are no direct legal implications in relation to this report.

MONITORING OFFICER'S COMMENTS

The Monitoring Officer has been consulted and has no further comments.

BACKGROUND PAPERS

None.

Contact Officer: Gillian Noall

Telephone: 01524 582060

E-mail: gnoall@lancaster.gov.uk

CABINET

**Lancaster – Public Realm
9 December 2008**

Report of Corporate Director (Regeneration)

PURPOSE OF REPORT				
To advise that the NorthWest Development Agency has offered funding for the Council to prepare detailed design proposals to enhance streets and places in the city centre that are its priorities for improvement and to seek authority to proceed.				
Key Decision	✓	Non-Key Decision		Referral from Cabinet Member
Date Included in Forward Plan		27 th November 2008		
This report is public				

RECOMMENDATIONS OF COUNCILLOR BRYNING

- (1) That the Head of Financial Services is authorised to amend the Council's General Fund Revenue Budget for 2008/09 and that proposed for 2009/2010 to provide for expenditures in preparing design proposals for the city centre subject to these expenditures being fully funded by grant income from the NorthWest Development Agency (NWDA) up to a maximum of £90,000 in costs
- (2) That, to meet NWDA programming requirements, Cabinet delegates to the Corporate Director (Regeneration) authority to select and commission consultants for the required design work after a proper competitive process in accordance with Council procedures.
- (3) That the Head of Planning Services to report to Cabinet on the design options prepared and subsequent public consultation into these in order that Cabinet can then select its preferred options.
- (4) That Cabinet notes there are issues concerning the management of traffic on adopted highways within the pedestrian zone that may require resolution before any designs can be finalised and request a further report on this be submitted to Cabinet as early as possible in the New Year.

1.0 Introduction

Context

- 1.1 The city centre with its history and enviable townscape, is a major economic driver for the District and very important for employment. Lancaster's historic centre is undoubtedly the District's foremost heritage asset and, as the District's main retail and business area, it is a critical driver in the local economy.
- 1.2 Despite its undoubted qualities though the centre to an extent under performs in both economic and social terms. The main reasons for this are that the retail offer is not as good as it should be, heritage assets are under-exploited, some historic buildings are deteriorating and critically, most public places in the city centre are not of sufficient quality.
- 1.3 The condition and appearance of many streets and spaces is poor. There are few places where it is pleasant for people of all ages to stop and rest or linger a little. There is little in the public realm to uplift people and fire imaginations. Key spaces are fragmented and disconnected so pedestrian visitors can find it very difficult to read the geography of the centre and to locate its key features and attractions. Further, vehicles often compromise pedestrian accessibility within the pedestrian zone and pedestrian movements outside are constrained by traffic.
- 1.4 The geography of the centre can also be quite hard to comprehend. Despite magnificent achievements such as the Millennium Bridge it can feel that the centre has turned its back to the river. St George's Quay is quite difficult to find. Signage to / from the railway station is poor. During the daytime the Castle area quite rightly has a quite, more reflective feel to it than does the commercial centre nearby but at night the Castle precincts are less inviting and pedestrian connections to the centre are drab and quite poorly illuminated.
- 1.5 All this shapes peoples' perceptions of the city centre and in turn is a drag on business investment, customer footfall and expenditures. This undermines the efforts of many organisations, both public and private, to help sustain the centre. The Council has a key role, for example through its planning services to try to ensure that any change in the fabric of the historic centre is only for the better and through its street cleansing services. To date, however, the Council has not sought to drive any wide scale uplift.

Project development

- 1.6 The Council's City Centre Strategy (2003) describes how rejuvenating public realm is integral to what is required to develop and grow the centre and makes detailed proposals.
- 1.7 Public interest in the condition of the centre has latterly focused largely on Market Square. In 2006 Cabinet instructed that officers seek peoples' views on how Market Square might be improved. A consultation in March / April 2007 established a strong consensus that the Square needed improving. The Council at this time, however, could not make significant progress with this.

- 1.8 However, the context was developing. The NWDA produced a Position Statement in March 2007 for Historic Towns and Cities in England's Northwest. This identifies Lancaster as a growth city where there is a particular potential to raise economic performance by exploiting its outstanding heritage assets. It recognises that investment into Lancaster makes a strong fit to the Regional Economic Strategy and identifies spatial priorities for investment that are consistent with the Council's aspirations as stated in the City Centre Strategy. The Position Statement suggests a geographic scope and focus for activity extending from the canal corridor west through the commercial centre and via the Castle Quarter down to the historic quayside.
- 1.9 Complementary to this, the adopted Lancaster District Core Strategy (July 2008) identifies the centre as a Regeneration Priority Area. It advocates that via design-led regeneration the centre should be strengthened as a shopping destination, enhanced as a historic city visitor attraction with a restored and enhanced environment, as the District's main centre for office based employment and as a cultural centre.
- 1.10 Close alignment of the regional, NWDA and Council policy positions now makes prospects for bringing forward and delivering public realm improvement projects in the city centre very much more encouraging. With the encouragement of the NWDA officers have focused on a set of projects grounded in the community's and the Council's strategic ambitions. To identify priorities officers first reviewed the strategic policy context including the City Centre Strategy and this work informed preparation of an application to NWDA for £90 k of funding to prepare to a detailed design stage a series of projects to upgrade public spaces in the city. NWDA has now approved the funding application for design work, subject to contract. This report details the proposal and sets out the options by which the Council might proceed.

2.0 Proposal Details

- 2.1 As a preliminary stage officers will prepare a Design Code for public realm in the city centre as a whole. This be founded in an analysis to understand contexts, constraints, needs and opportunities. The Code should set parameters for future change to public realm and help ensure that change is for the better. The code should identify the palette of surfacing materials and treatments that will be acceptable, identify appropriate types / styles of signage, street furniture and lights (including columns and fixings) and cover the planting and management of street trees, Finally, the Code should set objectives for how specific public spaces might be improved and thereby provide the framework for undertaking the design work now proposed.
- 2.2 Subsequent to this designs will be prepared for a range of locations in the centre. The locations proposed are all within the strategic axis as proposed by the NWDA in its 2007 Position Statement. Improvement projects for these and improvement of these would fit to the City Centre Strategy, best help address deficiencies in the centre and give most support to the centre's heritage and retail offers. The locations with outline aims for these are as follows:

Location	Outline aims
Market Square	Transformation into a civic space that is definitively the heart of the city
Market Street	This main route between the commercial centre and the Castle area is poorly lit and dingy at night and could be transformed using innovative lighting techniques
Sun St Square / Sun Street	To enhance these historic places only yards from Market Street so they offer a much more enriching experience
Horseshoe Corner	Footfall is highest here and with sensitive interventions this could be made into a real place
Upper and Lower Church Street, Frances Passage and Gage Street	These key linking routes are all to a varied extent in poor condition and less inviting than they should be and warrant improvement.
Castle Hill and Castle Park	The setting to the Castle here could be improved through sensitive restoration of historic features, improving certain surfacings and addressing signage and other elements that clutter and despoil views.
Castle and Quay greenspace	The green areas of Vicarage Meadow and Quay Meadow feel half forgotten and while are of undoubted quality much more could be made of these to the benefit of local people and visitors alike and to make better connections down to the historic Quay.
Castle precincts signage	To make the area and links to adjacent areas more legible for visitors

- 2.3 The design work will have two stages:
- 2.4 Stage 1 Preparation of outline design options in the form of pictorial visions, supported by provisional cost estimates; stakeholder and community engagement
- 2.5 Stage 2 Selection of preferred options and detailed design work, specification and costing work on these.
- 2.6 The NWDA requires as a condition of its funding that the Council procures expert external consultants to undertake the design work itself. The procurement must be competitive in accordance with Council procedures but the NWDA does further require that the selection be made from its panel consultants. The Council would lead stakeholder and community engagement. Selection of preferred options would be for the Council.

2.7 The following project programme is proposed:

Activity	Programming (end date)
Confirm parameters for the project	05/01/09
Issue project brief for landscape design services and invite tenders	05/01/09
Complete Design Code	31/01/09
Appoint an appropriate multi-disciplinary private sector consultancy for landscape design services	31/01/09
Produce pictorial visions as design options	30/03/09
Undertake community and stakeholder engagement on design options over two weeks in early April	15/04/09
Agree and confirm preferred design options	15/05/09
Detail up and cost preferred options	30/06/09

2.8 Subject otherwise to the ongoing effects of the “credit crunch” and economic recession, the Council should be well placed to deliver discrete improvement projects just as soon as delivery funding might be secured (on a project-by-project basis and as determined by the Council’s priorities). Project works will best be funded from a mix of sources including hopefully NWDA but also perhaps from the Council (via its Capital programme) and via any S106 planning contributions.

2.9 At this early stage it is envisaged that the Council will want to make the improvement of Market Square its top priority for delivery.

3.0 Details of Consultation

3.1 The project will involve a significant element of community engagement given the designs will inform projects that will have a lasting impact on the public realm and many people and organisations will rightly want to contribute to options selection. The engagement should involve exhibition of options in the centre itself and will require innovative promotion to generate the maximum interest.

3.2 Officers have consulted with the NWDA and the County Council, its key partners in preparing the project proposal. NWDA has a significant role given it is providing all funding for the design stage and further, officers anticipate that the Council will be heavily reliant on the NWDA for future delivery funding.

3.3 The County Council has a key role in that as Highway Authority it is responsible for the management and maintenance of the adopted highway and a majority of the locations proposed for the design work are within the highway or impact upon it. County Council officers have advised that in principle they welcome the City Council bringing forward this project subject to all design proposals having proper regard to highways considerations. One such consideration is the management of traffic on adopted highway within the pedestrian zone and it is apparent that there are issues concerning this that will need to be resolved before any designs affecting these are finalised.

4.0 Options and Options Analysis (including risk assessment)

4.1 The options are:

- (i) to proceed as set out in this report and prepare designs for the locations proposed, utilising the funding available from the NWDA
- (ii) not to proceed and decline the funding offer from NWDA

4.2 A comprehensive policy review and close liaison with the NWDA informs Option 1 and its priorities for design work. Option 2 would lose for the Council any opportunity to drive forward improvements to public realm in the city centre.

5.0 Officer Preferred Option (and comments)

5.1 Option 1 is preferred given what is proposed fits very well to the Council's policy framework and has won the funding support of the NWDA and the encouragement of the Highway Authority

6.0 Conclusion

6.1 This proposal is entirely consistent with Council and NWDA aspirations for the City. It presents the Council with a significant opportunity to drive forward improvement in the quality and attraction of the historic and commercial centre of Lancaster to increase vitality and footfall thereby helping sustain the centre and strengthen its economic performance.

RELATIONSHIP TO POLICY FRAMEWORK

The proposal fits well to the Council's policy framework, specifically the City Centre Strategy (2003) and Core Strategy (2008).

**CONCLUSION OF IMPACT ASSESSMENT
(including Diversity, Human Rights, Community Safety, Sustainability and Rural Proofing)**

The views and needs of disabled people and community safety considerations will be factored for in preparing design proposals. The Design Code will direct the use of as sustainable materials as possible and practice in sustainable construction will inform the detailed design proposals. There are no implications otherwise for diversity and no implications for Human Rights and Rural Proofing.

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

The total expenditure of £90K outlined in the body of the report will be split £25K in 2008/09 and £65K in 2009/10 and will be fully funded by NWDA grant. There will be no impact on the Council's financial resources. Expenditure will be incurred and claimed for in arrears as is

normal in these situations, however the amount involved can be contained easily within daily cashflow limits.

Members should note that there will be no clawback of grant if the Council is unable to do the subsequent works as this is a standalone study, i.e. the Council will need to put a further bid for funding to the NWDA subject to the outcome of the design proposals.

SECTION 151 OFFICER'S COMMENTS

The Section 151 Officer has been consulted and has no further comments to add.

LEGAL IMPLICATIONS

There are no legal implications arising from this report.

MONITORING OFFICER'S COMMENTS

The Monitoring Officer has been consulted and has no further comments to make

BACKGROUND PAPERS

Planning Services Files

Contact Officer: Julian Inman

Telephone: 01524 582336

E-mail: jinman@lancaster.gov.uk

Ref: