



Committee: CABINET

Date: TUESDAY, 19 JANUARY 2010

Venue: MORECAMBE TOWN HALL

Time: 10.00 A.M.

A G E N D A

1. Apologies

2. Minutes

To receive as a correct record the minutes of Cabinet held on Tuesday, 8 December 2009 (previously circulated).

3. Items of Urgent Business Authorised by the Leader

To consider any such items authorised by the Leader and to consider where in the agenda the item(s) are to be considered.

4. Declarations of Interest

To consider any such declarations.

5. Public Speaking

To consider any such requests received in accordance with the approved procedure.

Reports from Overview and Scrutiny

None

Reports

6. 2010/11 Budget and Policy Framework Update: Strategic Context and Planning, Housing Revenue Account and Capital Programme and General Fund Revenue Budget and Capital Programme

(Cabinet Member with Special Responsibility Councillor Thomas)

Reports of Corporate Director (Finance and Performance), Corporate Director (Community Services) and Head of Financial Services to follow.

- 7. Health and Strategic Housing Fees & Charges 2010/11** (Pages 1 - 14)
(Cabinet Member with Special Responsibility Councillor Kerr)
Report of Corporate Director (Community Services).
- 8. Vacant Shops Funding** (Pages 15 - 23)
(Cabinet Member with Special Responsibility Councillor Archer)
Report of Corporate Director (Regeneration).
- 9. Targeted Intervention Project** (Pages 24 - 28)
(Cabinet Members with Special Responsibility Councillors Bryning and Fletcher)
Report of Corporate Director (Regeneration).
- 10. Room Hire Review** (Pages 29 - 42)
(Cabinet Member with Special Responsibility Councillor Thomas)
Report of the Head of Property Services.
- 11. Museums Service** (Pages 43 - 51)
(Cabinet Member with Special Responsibility Councillor Ashworth)
Report of Corporate Director (Regeneration).
- 12. Review of Parking Fees and Charges 2010/11** (Pages 52 - 63)
(Cabinet Member with Special Responsibility Councillor Thomas)
Report of Corporate Director (Regeneration).
- 13. Williamson Park**
(Cabinet Member with Special Responsibility Councillor Ashworth)
Report of Corporate Director (Regeneration) to follow.
- 14. Chatsworth Gardens, Morecambe**
(Cabinet Members with Special Responsibility Councillors Archer and Kerr)
Report of Corporate Director (Regeneration) to follow.
- 15. Roman Bath House & Vicarage Field, Lancaster** (Pages 64 - 67)
(Cabinet Member with Special Responsibility Councillor Thomas)
Report of Corporate Director (Regeneration).

16. Cabinet Appointments to Outside Bodies (Pages 68 - 70)

Report of Chief Executive.

17. Exclusion of the Press and Public

Members are asked to note that, whilst the report for agenda item 17 is a public report, the appendix has been marked as exempt. Agenda item 18 is an exempt report.

Cabinet is recommended to pass the following recommendation should reference need to be made to the information in the appendix to item 17, and in relation to item 18:-

“That, in accordance with Section 100A(4) of the Local Government Act, 1972, the press and public be excluded from the meeting for the following item of business, on the grounds that they could involve the possible disclosure of exempt information as defined in paragraph 12 of Schedule 12A of that Act.”

Members are reminded that, whilst the following item has been marked as exempt, it is for the Council itself to decide whether or not to consider it private or in public. In making the decision, Members should consider the relevant paragraph of Schedule 12A of the Local Government Act 1972, and should balance the interests of individuals or the Council itself in having access to information. In considering their discretion Members should also be mindful of the advice of Council Officers.

Members are asked whether they need to declare any further declarations of interest regarding the exempt report.

18. Reorganisation of the Facilities Management function (Pages 71 - 113)

(Cabinet Member with Special Responsibility Councillor Thomas)

Report of Corporate Director (Regeneration).

19. Land at Kellet Road, Carnforth (Pages 114 - 119)

(Cabinet Member with Special Responsibility Councillor Thomas)

Report of Corporate Director (Regeneration).

ADMINISTRATIVE ARRANGEMENTS

(i) Membership

Councillors Stuart Langhorn (Chairman), Evelyn Archer, June Ashworth, Jon Barry, Eileen Blamire, Abbott Bryning, Jane Fletcher, David Kerr, Roger Mace and Malcolm Thomas

(ii) Queries regarding this Agenda

Please contact Debbie Chambers, Democratic Services, telephone 01524 582057 or email dchambers@lancaster.gov.uk.

(iii) Apologies

Please contact Members' Secretary, telephone 582170, or alternatively email memberservices@lancaster.gov.uk.

MARK CULLINAN,
CHIEF EXECUTIVE,
TOWN HALL,
DALTON SQUARE,
LANCASTER LA1 1PJ

Published on 7 January 2010

CABINET

**Health and Strategic Housing
Fees & Charges 2010/11
19 January 2010**

Report of Corporate Director (Community Services)

PURPOSE OF REPORT			
This report has been prepared as part of the 2010/11 estimate procedure and sets out options for increasing the level of fees and charges.			
Key Decision	X	Non-Key Decision	Referral from Cabinet Member
Date Included in Forward Plan	November 2009		
This report is public.			

RECOMMENDATIONS OF COUNCILLOR KERR

- (1) That Cabinet decides whether the Health & Strategic Housing fees in Appendix 1 should be increased by either 0.75%, 2% or 4% with the exception of the fees for rats, mice and fleas.
- (2) That the fees for rats and mice are retained at £25.00 with a reduction to £12.50 for customers in receipt of Council Tax and/or Housing Benefit.
- (3) That the fee for fleas and wasps be increased to bring them in line with fees for other insects, but retaining the 50% discount for flea treatments for those in receipt of Council Tax and/or Housing Benefit.
- (4) That the authority to set contract prices for pest control contracts is delegated to the Head of Health & Strategic Housing to enable current market conditions to be taken into account and allow for negotiation of contract prices. (Subject to financial services agreement to the methodology for setting contract prices).
- (5) That registered charities are charged the domestic rate fee for treatment visits up to 1 hour and then charged the commercial hourly rate thereafter (per visit).
- (6) That a fee be introduced for the return of stray dogs to owners from the dog warden service prior to dogs being taken to kennels.

- (7) That the cemeteries fees and charges for the Neptune Baby and Young Child Memorial Garden are not increased except for the Exclusive Right of Burial fee which is 50% of the adult fee.
- (8) That the cemetery fees and charges for the cremated remains memorial vaults are not increased in order to encourage demand.
- (9) That the suggested increases for walled brick vaults are approved to more accurately reflect the actual cost to the council of providing this service.

1.0 Introduction

Fees and charges for Health & Strategic Housing Services are reviewed every year and Members set fee levels as part of the budget process.

2.0 Proposal Details

- 2.1 Appendix 1 details the current charges and the options for increases. The charges are rounded to the nearest 25p.
- 2.2 Pest control fees

Rodents

It is suggested that fees for rats and mice be retained at £25.00 (still maintaining the reduction of 50% to £12.50 for those in receipt of Council Tax and/or Housing Benefit).

This is recommended for the following reasons:

- a) The charges for rats and mice were previously £20.00 (with a reduction for those in receipt of Council Tax and/or Housing Benefit) from 2006/07 to 2008/09.
- b) Officers feel any further increase in the current financial climate could result in residents being deterred from requesting rats and mice pest control treatments which could then lead to an escalation of pest problems in the district which the council could end up being involved in through its enforcement role, or because pests have spread to our own land. By this point, solving the problem is more difficult, costly and labour intensive.
- (c) A detailed benchmarking exercise has just been carried out with both Lancashire and CIPFA group authorities. The results show that Lancaster's pest control service offers exceptional value for money with the key findings being:
 - Revenue income being the highest amongst the responding authorities;
 - The net cost of the service being significantly lower than average and four times lower than the 3 other responding authorities in Lancashire.
 - Significantly less staff than other authorities per 100 km².
 - Our fees and charges are very similar to those made by other authorities that charge for this service.
- (d) Officers have investigated increasing fees to try and align with the actual cost of the treatments. However, recent evidence from a Cumbrian authority has shown that when they increased fees for pest control to £50.00, there was a massive reduction in uptake and income targets suffered.

Insects

Currently the Council has 3 different fees for fleas, wasps and other insects. To simplify the charging structure for both customers and administration, it is proposed to have one common fee for each of these insects. It is proposed to retain the 50% discount for flea treatments for those on council tax and/or housing benefit.

This would mean the fee for flea treatment would increase from £25.00 to £36.25 and the charge for wasps from £35.25 to £36.25. (if an increase of 0.75% is approved) Whilst this appears a substantial increase for flea treatments, officers have investigated other authorities' charges who appear to charge around £35.00 or more for flea treatments. Officers are confident that the proposed increase is fair and reasonable for flea treatments as these treatments are often in excess of 1.5 hours per property and can involve repeat visits. Whilst the increase in charge doesn't cover the cost to the council of undertaking the treatment, a higher fee is likely to dissuade residents from taking up the service. It is estimated this will raise additional income of £600.

The fee options for fleas, wasps and other insects would then be subject to inflation in line with all other fees and charges included within Appendix 1.

Contract fees

Approximately 35% of the pest control income comes from contracts with businesses, community organisations and village halls. In the past the service manager has set the prices for contract work each year based on the actual number of visits required for the contract and the commercial hourly rate. It is proposed to improve on this methodology for calculation of contract prices (in conjunction with financial services) to ensure that the council is charging the right fee for contract work. Delegation is sought to allow the Head of Service to authorise contract fees.

Registered charities

Request for treatments are sometimes received from registered charities and there has been confusion about whether the fee should be the domestic fee or the business rate. It has been custom and practice generally to charge the domestic fee but, to regularise this, the following is proposed:

	Per Visit
Registered charities (on production of charitable status registration number)	Domestic rate for visits up to 1 hour. Business hourly rate thereafter

Dog Warden Service – return of stray dog fee

When stray dogs are collected from the district, the arrangement is for them to be taken to the kennels that the council has a contract with for this service. A fee is chargeable to the owners for the return of their dogs. Occasionally, an owner will contact the dog warden service to reclaim their dog before the wardens have taken them to the kennels. However, by this time the dog wardens have incurred administration time and investigation time in trying to trace the owner. It is proposed to introduce a fee of £35.00 for the return of dogs prior to kennelling, made up of £25.00 statutory prescribed fee and £10.00 for the detention and administration fee. Charging this fee should act as a deterrent to owners who allow their dogs to stray. Officers are aware that other councils charge for this service. It is estimated this will raise additional income of £400

2.3 Cemetery Fees

Brick Vaults

It is proposed to significantly increase the fee for the construction of brick vaults as the fee set for 2009/10 does not meet the current costs of construction based on the cost charged by the Council's RMS section following the last vault request in August 2009.

In order to recover the costs of construction and the cemeteries team costs of excavation, removal of soil off site and ancillary materials, it is proposed to increase the cost of a walled vault as follows:-

	Cost 2009/10	Proposed 2010/11
For one person	£ 951.75 +VAT	£1,800.00+VAT
For two persons	£1,586.00 +VAT	£2,500.00+VAT

Neptune Baby and Young Child Memorial Garden

This new area has only been available since August 2009 when new fees and charges were approved by Cabinet. The memorial options have been purchased by the Council and the current fees and charges reflect the cost of construction and memorial options provided. Therefore, it is proposed not to increase the fees and charges for 2010/11 for this sensitive area except for the Exclusive Right of Burial (EROB) which is to be 50% of the adult fee (Cabinet min. 123(4) of 20 January 2009 refers).

Cremated Remains Vault Area

This small garden of remembrance area was created in June 2009 as a pilot but to date there has been no demand and therefore it is proposed that the charges for this facility are not increased.

3.0 Options and Options Analysis

3.1 Options to Members include:

- a) To approve either the 0.75%, 2% or 4% increase in fees for Health & Strategic Housing's fees and charges.
- b) To approve a different % increase.
- c) To retain the fees for rats and mice at £25.00 (with a reduction to £12.50 for customers in receipt of Council Tax and/or Housing Benefit).
- d) To increase the fees for rats and mice in line with the other increases or a different amount.
- e) To increase the fees for fleas and wasps to bring them in line with other insects (but retaining the 50% discount for flea treatments for those in receipt of Council Tax and/or Housing Benefit).
- f) Not to increase the fees for fleas and wasps by this amount and to increase them in line with the other increases or a different amount.

- g) To delegate authority to set contract prices for pest control contracts to the Head of Health & Strategic Housing to enable current market conditions to be taken into account and allow for negotiation of contract prices. (Subject to financial services agreement to the methodology for setting contract prices).
- h) Not to approve the delegation.
- i) To approve the suggested charges for registered charities.
- j) Not to approve the suggested charges for registered charities.
- k) To approve the introduction of a fee for the return of stray dogs from the dog warden service prior to dogs being taken to kennels.
- l) Not to approve the introduction of a fee for the return of stray dogs from the dog warden service prior to dogs being taken to kennels.
- m) To approve an increase in the Exclusive Right of Burial only for the Neptune Baby & Young Child Memorial Garden.
- n) To approve an increase in fees as well as the Exclusive Right of Burial for the Neptune Baby & Young Child Memorial Garden.
- o) To approve no increase for the fees for cremated remains memorial vaults.
- p) To approve a % increase for fees for cremated remains memorial vaults.
- q) To increase the charges for walled bricked vaults as suggested or by a different amount.

4.0 Officer Preferred Options

4.1 The officer preferred options are:

- a) 0.75% increase to keep the increase in charges to a minimum to support residents at a time of recession and also, c), e), g), i), k), m), o) and q) for the reasons set out in the report. The suggested increases and new fees would enable a slight increase in income for the council, whilst retaining fair and reasonable fees for the services offered.

RELATIONSHIP TO POLICY FRAMEWORK

Fees and charges form an integral part of the budget setting process, which in turn relates to the Council's priorities.

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

Large increases in fees can disadvantage those residents least able to pay. However any of the proposed increases are considered to be fair and reasonable and in the case of pest control fees are less expensive than most commercial companies charge.

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

The 2010/11 draft budget includes an inflationary increase of 0.75% in respect of fees and charges. The proposed fees are detailed in Appendix 1 and can be summarised as follows:-

	Draft Budget 0.75%	Inflation Increase 2.00%	Inflation Increase 4.00%
Fee Charging Area	£	£	£
Cemeteries	1,500	2,900	7,500
Pest Control	400	700	1,900
Private Housing	100	100	300
Public Health/ Port Health	0	100	200
Total	2,000	3,800	9,900

In addition to the above inflationary increases, the report sets out a number of changes to current fee structures which have not been included in the above table.

Pest Control Service

It is proposed to abolish differential charging in respect of fleas, wasps, and other insects and introduce a single charge. It is anticipated that this will generate recurring additional income of £600.

Dog Warden Service

The introduction of a fee for stray dog collection prior to kennelling would generate an additional £400.

Cemeteries

The recommendations above for cemeteries outlines retaining the fees for the Young Child Memorial Garden and Cremated remain vaults at current levels along with increasing the fees for Brick Vaults. The effect on income is not quantifiable as the take up of the service offered for the young child memorial garden and the cremated remains vault area is unknown, as the service is new to the Lancaster district. For these reasons currently income targets have not been built into the base budget for 2010/11 and no adjustments will be required.

This is reiterated when the service for brick vaults is offered. Due to the ad-hoc nature of this service income targets are not built in to base budget. It is therefore proposed that any income be received during the year will be highlighted as part of the corporate financial monitoring process reported during the year

All other fees increases for cemeteries are in line with inflation and have been included within the draft budget.

Should members approve a different percentage than the options in the report, the impact on the base budget will be unknown until new financial implications are assessed based on the new percentage proposed.

SECTION 151 OFFICER'S COMMENTS

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

LEGAL IMPLICATIONS

Legal have been consulted and have no comments to make

MONITORING OFFICER'S COMMENTS

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

BACKGROUND PAPERS

Fees & Charges 2009/10 report to Cabinet
20 January 2009.

Contact Officer: Suzanne Lodge
Telephone: 01524 582701
E-mail: slodge@lancaster.gov.uk
Ref: C85

HEALTH AND STRATEGIC HOUSING**FEES AND CHARGES FOR THE YEAR 2010/11****CEMETERY CHARGES**

	2009/10 Current Fee	2010/11 Proposed Fee @ 0.75%	2010/11 Proposed Fee @ 2%	2010/11 Proposed Fee @ 4%
Exclusive Right of Burial:				
i) For the exclusive right of burial for a period of 75 years from the date of purchase, of a single earthen grave, walled grave or vault	612.50	617.00	624.75	637.00
ii) Exclusive right of burial in a woodland area - 1 space	268.75	270.75	274.25	279.50
iii) Exclusive right of Burial in Baby area	50% of adult fee	50% of adult fee	50% of adult fee	50% of adult fee
Transfer of Grave Deed	Legal Costs	Legal Costs	Legal Costs	Legal Costs
Duplicate Grave Deed	79.00	79.50	80.50	82.25
Searches – hourly rate	35.50	35.75	36.25	37.00
Interment Charges				
(a) For the interment in a grave or woodland site either where the exclusive right of burial HAS or HAS NOT been granted:-				
i) of the body of a child whose age at the time of death exceeded one year but did not exceed 16 years.	162.25	163.25	165.50	168.75
ii) of the body of a person whose age at the time of death exceeded 16 years.	547.50	551.50	558.50	569.50
iii) interment of cremated remains	131.25	132.25	133.75	136.50
iv) interment of cremated remains under headstone	200.00	201.50	204.00	208.00
(b) There is no charge for the interment or burial of cremated remains of a non-viable foetus, the body of a still-born child or a child whose age at the time of death did not exceed one year.				
Scattering of Cremated Remains	34.25	34.50	35.00	35.50
Use of Cemetery Chapel	89.75	90.50	91.50	93.50

	2009/10 Current Fee	2010/11 Proposed Fee @ 0.75%	2010/11 Proposed Fee @ 2%	2010/11 Proposed Fee @ 4%
Walled Graves & Vaults:				
For one person	951.75*	1800.00*	1800.00*	1800.00*
For two persons	1586.00*	2500.00*	2500.00*	2500.00*
For opening and resealing vault	318.75*	321.25	325.25	331.50
Garden of Remembrance Memorials				
(a) Aluminium Plaque – Carnforth	108.75*	109.50*	111.00*	113.00*
(b) Bronze plaque – Price on Application				
©Torrisholme, Scotforth, Skerton, Hale Carr, Carnforth				
Old Style:				
i) Granite memorial incorporating flower vase and inscription up to 3 lines	456.75*	460.25*	466.00*	475.00*
ii) Each additional line (up to 6 in total)	44.00*	44.50*	45.00*	45.75*
iii) Carriage fee for returning memorials for additional inscription	41.25*	41.50*	42.00*	43.00*
New Style:				
i) Granite memorial incorporating flower vase and full inscription	484.25*	488.00*	494.00*	503.50*
ii) Deed of grant fee	32.25	32.50	33.00	33.50
iii) New inscription	96.75*	97.50*	98.75*	100.50*
iv) Motif	10.75*	10.75*	11.00*	11.25*
Vault Memorial				
i) Granite memorial for up to 4 plastic urns, including first interment and flower vase (25 year lease)	630.00*	634.75*	642.50*	655.25*
ii) Back to back vault for up to 2 plastic urns including first interment inscription, flower vase for a 25yr lease	500.00*	503.75*	510.00*	520.00*
iii) Additional inscribed plaque for second interment	145.00*	146.00*	148.00*	150.75*
iv) Renewal of lease period	125.00	126.00	127.50	130.00
* = PLUS VAT				

	2009/10 Current Fee	2010/11 Proposed Fee @ 0.75%	2010/11 Proposed Fee @ 2%	2010/11 Proposed Fee @ 4%
The Neptune Baby and Young Child Memorial Garden				
Burial Options				
Purchased Grave including headstone and plaque with up to 6 lines of text.	1,140.00*	1,140.00*	1,140.00*	1,140.00*
Public Grave	Free of Charge	Free of Charge	Free of Charge	Free of Charge
Cremated Remains				
Niche Wall Plaques including up to 4 lines of text	195.00*	195.00*	195.00*	195.00*
10 year lease for external niche wall	175.00	175.00	175.00	175.00
10 year lease for internal altar niche	350.00	350.00	350.00	350.00
Scattering of ashes	Free of Charge	Free of Charge	Free of Charge	Free of Charge
Memorial Plaques				
Perimeter plaque including up to 4 lines of text	195.00*	195.00*	195.00*	195.00*
10 year lease for perimeter plaque	150.00	150.00	150.00	150.00
Centre feature plaque including up to 6 lines of text	345.00*	345.00*	345.00*	345.00*
10 year lease for centre plaque	350.00	350.00	350.00	350.00
Charges for Extras				
Additional line of inscription	30.00*	30.00*	30.00*	30.00*
Posy holders for niche wall	10.00*	10.00*	10.00*	10.00*
Motifs	30.00*	30.00*	30.00*	30.00*
Custom Motif	P.O.A.	P.O.A.	P.O.A.	P.O.A.
Oval Ceramic Photo Plaque 5cm x 7cm (Colour)	65.00*	65.00*	65.00*	65.00*
Oval Ceramic Photo Plaque 5cm x 7cm (Black & White)	35.00*	35.00*	35.00*	35.00*

	2009/10 Current Fee	2010/11 Proposed Fee @ 0.75%	2010/11 Proposed Fee @ 2%	2010/11 Proposed Fee @ 4%
Memorial Fees				
A memorial not exceeding 6' (1800 mm) in height	94.50	95.25	96.50	98.25
Kerb or border stones not exceeding 2' 6" (750 mm) in height:				
(a) enclosing a space not exceeding 7' 9" (2325 mm) in length by 3' 3" (975 mm) in width	126.75	127.75	129.25	131.75
(b) enclosing a space not exceeding 7' 9" (2325 mm) in length by 7' 3" (2175 mm) in width	254.00	256.00	259.00	264.25
A tablet or footstone not exceeding 1' 6" (450 mm) by 1' (300 mm)	57.75	58.25	59.00	60.00
Additional charge for exceeding above size	36.25	36.50	37.00	37.75
An inscribed vase	31.25	31.50	32.00	32.50
Temporary marker	13.75	13.75	14.00	14.25
* = PLUS VAT				
Lawn Sections				
A memorial not exceeding 4' (1200 mm) in height, 2' 6" (750mm) in width and 1' 6" (450 mm) in depth from front to back.	94.50	95.25	96.50	98.25
The charges indicated include one inscription (name)				
For each additional inscription (name)	31.25	31.50	31.75	32.50
Annual registration fee for memorial mason	40.00*	40.25*	41.00*	41.50*

DOG WARDEN SERVICE CHARGES

	2009/10 Current Fee	2010/11 Proposed Fee @ 0.75%	2010/11 Proposed Fee @ 2%	2010/11 Proposed Fee @ 4%
Kennelling charge per day	10.50	10.50	10.75	11.00
Detention Fee	8.75	8.75	9.00	9.00
Dog faeces bags	1.45/100	1.50/100	1.50/100	1.50/100
Return of stray dog from dog warden service (prior to kennelling)	35.00	35.00	35.00	35.00

PEST CONTROL CHARGES

	2009/10 Current Fee	2010/11 Proposed Fee @ 0.75%	2010/11 Proposed Fee @ 2%	2010/11 Proposed Fee @ 4%
Common Insects:				
Domestic Premises				
- Cockroaches and bedbugs	FREE	FREE	FREE	FREE
- Fleas	25.00	36.25	36.75	37.50
- Those in receipt of Housing and/or Council Tax benefits.	12.50	18.25	18.50	18.75
- All other insects (excluding wasps)	36.00	36.25	36.75	37.50
- Wasp treatment	35.25	36.25	36.75	37.50
Multiple nests at same property at one visit.	Half full price treatment	Half full price treatment	Half full price treatment	Half full price treatment
- Moles and squirrels	25.00/hr	25.25/hr	25.50/hr	26.00/hr
Business Premises				
- All visits (including wasps) (minimum 1 hour)	69.75*/hr	70.25* /hr	71.25* /hr	72.50* /hr
Rodents:				
- Domestic premises	25.00	25.25	25.50	26.00
- Those in receipt of Housing and/or Council Tax benefits.	12.50	12.50	12.75	13.00
- Business premises (minimum 1 hour)	63.75*/hr	64.25* /hr	65.00* /hr	66.25* /hr

* = PLUS VAT

All charges inclusive of VAT where appropriate.

	2009/10 Current Fee	2010/11 Proposed Fee @ 0.75%	2010/11 Proposed Fee @ 2%	2010/11 Proposed Fee @ 4%
Emergency Callouts:				
- Weekday (outside 0800-16.30 hrs)	Standard Rate x 1.5	Standard Rate x 1.5	Standard Rate x 1.5	Standard Rate x 1.5
- Saturday	Standard Rate x 1.5	Standard Rate x 1.5	Standard Rate x 1.5	Standard Rate x 1.5
- Sunday and Bank Holidays	Standard Rate x 2	Standard Rate x 2	Standard Rate x 2	Standard Rate x 2

Disclosure of Information on Health & Safety matters:				
- Full factual statement which may also include sketches, copy of F2508, witness statements, etc.	127.25	128.25	129.75	132.25
- Brief statement where the information may be of limited use to the recipient.	44.75	45.00	45.75	46.50
- Photographs & an administration charge	2.50 each & admin charge to be 12.50	2.50each & admin charge to be 12.50	2.50each & admin charge to be £12.75	2.50each & admin charge to be £13.00
- Photocopying	14p/sheet	14p/sheet	14p/sheet	15p/sheet

Contaminated Land Information:				
- Domestic enquiry	98.00*	98.75*	100.00*	102.00*
- Industrial enquiry	124.75*	125.75*	127.25*	129.75*

PORT HEALTH CHARGES

	2009/10 Current Fee	2010/11 Proposed Fee @ 0.75%	2010/11 Proposed Fee @ 2%	2010/11 Proposed Fee @ 4%
Ship Inspection Charges				
Gross Tonnage:				
Up to 3,000	105.00	105.75	107.00	109.25
3,001-10,000	157.50	158.75	160.75	163.75
10,001-20,000	210.00	211.50	214.25	218.50
20,001-30,000	241.50	243.25	246.25	251.25
Over 30,000	315.00	317.50	321.25	327.50
With the exception of:				
• Vessels with the capacity to carry between 50 and 1000 persons -	315.00	317.25	321.25	327.50
• Vessels with the capacity to carry more than 1000 persons -	525.00	529.00	535.50	546.00
Water Sample Charges:				
Water sample as part of sanitation certificate	78.75	79.50	80.25	82.00
Water sample from Heysham Port	86.75	87.50	88.50	90.25
Water sample from Glasson Dock	99.75	100.50	101.75	103.75

STRATEGIC HOUSING:

	2009/10 Current Fee	2010/11 Proposed Fee @ 0.75%	2010/11 Proposed Fee @ 2%	2010/11 Proposed Fee @ 4%
- Immigration Inspection Charges	56.50	57.00	57.75	58.75
- Accredited Property Scheme	52.50	53.00	53.50	54.50
- HMO Licence Fees:				
Discounted Rate (Renewal within 2 months)	420.00 (Fee per additional unit) £63.00	423.25 Fee per additional unit) £63.50	428.50 (Fee per additional unit) £64.25	436.75 (Fee per additional unit) £65.50
Basic Rate	525.00 (Fee per additional unit) £73.50	529.00 (Fee per additional unit) £74.00	535.50 (Fee per additional unit) £75.00	£546.00 (Fee per additional unit) £76.50
Admin Fee	63.00	63.50	64.25	65.50
* = PLUS VAT				

CABINET

Vacant Shops Funding 19 January 2010

Report of Corporate Director (Regeneration)

PURPOSE OF REPORT			
To seek approval for the use of additional funding provided by central government to support high streets and town centres during the recession.			
Key Decision	X	Non-Key Decision	Referral from Cabinet Member
Date Included in Forward Plan	17 December 2009		
This report is public			

RECOMMENDATIONS OF COUNCILLOR ARCHER

- (1) That Cabinet approve the use of the additional grant allocation of £52,631 for initiatives to support temporary re-use of vacant shops and other retail support measures in Lancaster, Morecambe, and Carnforth
- (2) That Cabinet support option 2 for use of the funds, comprising a grant scheme to support re-use of vacant shop premises in Lancaster, Morecambe, and Carnforth, plus a second scheme to provide funding for promotional festivals/events in the retail centres of Lancaster & Morecambe
- (3) That Cabinet considers the amounts of funding to be allocated between the two schemes
- (4) That approval of the details of the two schemes is delegated to Councillor Archer as the Cabinet member with responsibility for the economy, in consultation with the Chambers of Commerce Cabinet Liaison Group
- (5) That in principle any underspend of the grant allocation in the financial year in which it is received be held in an earmarked reserve and this be built into the Council's Provisions and Reserves Policy for subsequent approval by Council.

1.0 Introduction

On 3rd December 2009, the Secretary of State for Communities & Local Government announced the award of additional funding to 50 local authorities to help them support high streets and town centres during the current recession.

Lancaster City Council is one of the authorities awarded funding under this initiative, and is to receive an additional grant allocation of £52,631. The funding forms part of a package of support the Government is providing for town centres that have been particularly affected by shop closures and is aimed at helping local councils try out new approaches to make use of vacant shops and other ideas for boosting town centres

The funding is unringfenced and each local authority has discretion to decide how and when to spend it.

2.0 Proposal Details

This is the second round of funding awarded nationally under this scheme. Information supplied with the DCLG grant offer letter highlights a number of examples of best practice by other local authorities (see appendix). Many of these have focused on the creative re-use of vacant shops, which has been a particular problem in many town centres.

Locally, the level of vacant shops is not particularly high in Lancaster city centre (although the situation may have been masked by short term lets prior to Christmas). Vacant shops are however a significant problem in Morecambe.

An initial meeting has been held with representatives of Lancaster District Chamber of Commerce, Trade and Industry, to obtain their views on how the funds might best be used. As a starting point, the meeting considered the following possible range of options:

- temporary use of vacant shop units for use by artists, creative industries, community groups, or new small retail businesses, using a new form of short term lease which has been developed by government
- some form of targeted promotion for the independent retail sector, which is recognised as playing a key role in creating the “distinctiveness” of Lancaster as a retail centre
- a grant scheme to help existing independent retailers improve their own shop front displays
- a specific short term marketing campaign, festival, or event
- pump-priming funding for development of a Business Improvement District. Whilst this would take some time to establish and would not have immediate impact during the recession, it would lead to long term, sustainable funding for enhancement of the retail centre
- some form of open competition, inviting ideas from retailers and/or the local community and funding the implementation of the best ideas

The consensus view from the meeting with the Chamber was that the funding might best be used by a combination of two initiatives:

- a small grants scheme to support the creative temporary re-use of vacant retail premises by artists or creative industries, using the new short term lease format. This should be operated across Lancaster, Morecambe, and Carnforth centres, and could also include support for temporary shop window artwork and displays, as well as temporary occupation of the premises.

- Funding for a small number of special events/festivals to promote the two main retail centres and draw additional trade into them.

It was suggested that £20,000 of the funding should be allocated to the grants scheme, and the balance used for the festivals and events. It was also recognised that it not be realistic to implement the two schemes during the current financial year and that the bulk of the funding would need to be carried forward into 2010/11.

It was also suggested that the details of the two schemes (including the design and choice of festivals) should be considered by the newly merged Chambers of Commerce Cabinet Liaison Group.

3.0 Details of Consultation

Meeting with Chamber of Commerce on 23rd December 2009, as outlined above.

4.0 Options and Options Analysis (including risk assessment)

Option	Advantages	Disadvantages	Risk
1) Do nothing option: do not use the additional grant allocation for retail support initiatives	Would support the revenue budget	Likely to attract criticism from local retail businesses, press, and DCLG	Could contribute to adverse judgment in future CAA assessments
2) Allocate funding to the two initiatives identified in consultation with the Chamber of Commerce	Allows the benefits to be spread across the retail centres of Lancaster, Morecambe, and Carnforth Provides a "quick win" for the newly merged Chambers Liaison Group and should help build its capacity Allows time for well planned promotional events to be worked up	A danger that the impact of the funding is dissipated across the three centres – targeted use of the funding on one specific initiative (eg development of a Business Improvement District) could have greater long term impact	A risk of poor take-up of the vacant shops grant scheme, in which case the funding might need to be reallocated
3) Support one of the other options identified in section 2 of this report	Depends on the nature of the option selected	Disregards the consultation with the Chamber of Commerce	That the option selected is ineffective because it is does not reflect the knowledge of the private sector

5.0 Officer Preferred Option (and comments)

Option 2 is the preferred option, because it reflects the outcome of the consultation meeting with the Chamber of Commerce and also retains flexibility in the use of the funds.

6.0 Conclusion

Cabinet are asked to approve the allocation of £20,000 towards a grant scheme to support re-use of vacant shop premises in Lancaster, Morecambe, and Carnforth, and £30,631 for promotional festivals/events in the retail centres of Lancaster & Morecambe, and to delegate the detailed implementation of the two schemes to the Cabinet portfolio holder for the Economy, in consultation with the Chambers of Commerce Cabinet Liaison Group.

RELATIONSHIP TO POLICY FRAMEWORK

Complies with Corporate Plan Priority “Work in partnership to ensure a strategic approach to economic development and regeneration”.

Use of the funding to support Lancaster’s retail centre would also complement specific actions under the approved LDLSP Economy thematic action plan, including:

- Place shape LANCASTER CITY and RIVER SIDE as a regionally significant visitor and shopping destination
- Delivering a step-change in the City’s retail offer;
- Town Centre Improvement Partnership and Delivery Mechanism

CONCLUSION OF IMPACT ASSESSMENT

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

No significant impact

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

Any grants or events funded under the scheme would be 100% funded from the additional grant allocation and there would be no net cost to the Council. There will however be some staff costs in administering the scheme, which will have to be met from existing resources.

The establishment of an earmarked reserve for any unspent grant would be built into the Council’s Provisions and Reserves Policy, subject to approval by Council. In effect, this would carry forward any such grant, to make it available to support spending in the subsequent financial year.

SECTION 151 OFFICER’S COMMENTS

The s151 Officer has been consulted and has no further comments.

LEGAL IMPLICATIONS

There are no legal implications arising immediately from this report, but it will be desirable for Legal Services to be consulted and advise on the format of the new "model" leases being developed to encourage short term re-use of vacant shop units.

MONITORING OFFICER'S COMMENTS

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

BACKGROUND PAPERS

Letter from Secretary of State for
Communities & Local Government,
3rd December 2009

Contact Officer: Peter Sandford
Telephone: 01524 582094
E-mail: psandford@lancaster.gov.uk
Ref: PWS



The Rt Hon John Denham MP
Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government

Department for Communities and Local Government
Eland House
Bressenden Place
London SW1E 5DU

Tel: 020 7944 3013
Fax: 020 7944 4539
E-Mail: john.denham@communities.gsi.gov.uk

www.communities.gov.uk

3 December 2009

Dear Colleague,

FURTHER SUPPORT FOR TOWN CENTRES

I am writing to let you know that I will announce tomorrow a further £2.6 million funding as part of this Department's initiative to support high streets and town centres during the recession. Your council is one of 50 local authorities that will each receive a grant of £52,631. In combination with the £3 million funding for town centres that we distributed in August, this will mean that 107 local authorities in England will now benefit under this initiative.

This funding forms part of a package of support we are providing for town centres that have been particularly affected by shop closures, as set out in the Government's guide "*Looking after our town centres*", published in April.

The recession is affecting town centres in various ways. The sight of boarded-up shops, in particular, can damage people's confidence in their local high street, perhaps prompting them to go elsewhere for shopping and entertainment. This can be a more of an issue in deprived areas where shop closures often compound issues like poor local environment, crime and anti-social behaviour, and worklessness.

The funding that we are allocating recognises that your authority is in the top half of the index of multiple deprivation and has relatively high shop vacancy rates. I hope that this support will prove especially useful in the run-up to Christmas, when high streets need to look their best to attract visitors.

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "John Denham". The signature is written in a cursive, slightly slanted style.

JOHN DENHAM

Government Guide – “Looking after our town centres”

“Looking after our town centres” provided practical help for town centres and high streets in response to the recession. Copies of the guide can be downloaded from our website at:

<http://www.communities.gov.uk/publications/planningandbuilding/towncentres>.

It:

- set out the benefits of looking after our town centres, showing how strong partnerships and positive management can help keep them attractive and vibrant places;
- highlighted the range of powers, guidance and tools that can help town centres, and showed some of the creative approaches that local partnerships are already taking in response to the downturn; and
- explained the steps that the Government is taking to help local authorities and their partners take positive action in their town centres, particularly in enabling temporary use of boarded-up shops.

We have seen many examples over the last few months of councils taking steps to promote their town centres and high streets. For example:

- *Camden and Birmingham* are using vacant units for “pop-up” shops. These enable local people to try out new business ideas for a few days – e.g. fashion designers selling clothes.
- *Barnsley* is running an integrated culture and town centre management programme to boost its main shopping area. This involves a seasonal culture programme, temporary gallery space, free parking on Saturdays, and using vacant shop fronts to display posters promoting Barnsley.
- *Darlington* is supporting a range of initiatives including window graphics for empty units which have helped the units to be let quickly, interactive arts workshops for local people in vacant shops, and a “shop local” campaign.
- *Redcar and Cleveland Adult Community Learning’s “Showcase”* project will develop creative and performance arts workshops incorporating new media and technology using existing learning centres and three new learning venues such as unused retail premises bringing shop front learning to the High Street. Video box installations will also be used to promote learning. Learning will be available during the day, twilight and weekend making it as widely accessible to all those in the surrounding communities.
- *Dursley* has used its successful “on view” scheme to develop a ten step guide to help and inspire other areas to use vacant shop windows as display space for local artists. Of the four shops that originally participated in the scheme, two have been let to new tenants and one sold for redevelopment. Dursley District Council plan to extend the scheme to the neighbouring town of Stroud.
- In partnership with Derbyshire County Council, *High Peak Borough Council* is running a number of free workshops for retailers on improving their marketing, productivity and customer care and has also produced a number of shopping guides to encourage visitors and local people to discover independent retailers.
- *Melton Mowbray and Market Harborough Councils* are amongst five local authorities that have come together in the Welland area of the East Midlands to launch a benchmarking process for regular year-on-year comparisons between 15 neighbouring towns. Benchmarking is a web-based system that can help towns track progress for key performance indicators, such as the variety of shops, and underpin future strategy development and cooperative marketing between towns. Nearly 60 towns are now participating in the benchmarking scheme across the country. Further information is available at www.townbenchmarking.org.uk.

- *Scarborough* – temporary use of an empty shop to accommodate a project office for volunteers preparing a lottery bid for a Maritime Heritage centre, allowing members of the community to learn about and input into the bid.

In Sheffield, young people are being trained in visual merchandising, the skills from which they utilise to create window displays in city centre shops in Sheffield. By the end of November FJF will extend this scheme to 18 to 24 year olds. This scheme both tackles the scourge of empty shops whilst giving young people the chance to learn new skills and further their opportunities in the jobs market.

In Preston, the council is using empty shops creatively to engage people in the arts, and bringing new energy to unused spaces. This year, people were involved in a series of workshops held in the Mall, where two artists delivered carnival costume workshops in empty shops. People were encouraged to come along and take part in creating some of the fantastic costumes seen during the council's annual carnival. Holding the workshops in the empty shops made them extremely accessible, offering a creative activity to people who would perhaps not normally seek it out, and also developing potential audiences for the carnival itself by promoting it in advance, and through inclusion. As a result, more people were involved in the carnival this year.

These examples illustrate the diversity of actions that are being targeted at both larger towns and smaller centres in rural areas. As *"Looking after our town centres"* highlighted, town centre partnerships including, where relevant, local town councils, business representatives, community organisations, and local service providers, offer a strong foundation on which to plan and implement strategies for keeping centres looking attractive for local people and visitors.

The Government is also providing support and advice in a range of other ways that can stimulate ideas for helping town centres of all sizes:

Arts Council England

Arts Council England has made available additional funding of up to £500,000 to support artists and arts organisations who wish to develop projects which animate spaces in town centres, including empty shops. The Arts Council intend this funding to target those areas in receipt of CLG funding to help them carry out artistic activities. Local authorities that choose to use some of this funding to promote arts-related uses in town centres are encouraged to work in partnership with artists and arts organisations who can apply for additional and complementary funding from the Arts Council. For further information about this funding through their Grants for the Arts programme please contact the Arts Council on 0845 300 6200 or see details on the website at www.artscouncil.org.uk/actiononrecession. Arts Council England will support local authorities, artists and arts organisations who wish to apply for additional and complementary funding. This funding will be targeted at arts projects which animate spaces in town centres, including empty shops. [Further information: contact The Arts Council on 0845 300 6200 or see details on the website at www.artscouncil.org.uk/actiononrecession.]

The Meanwhile Project

CLG is working with the Development Trusts Association to support the Meanwhile Project. This aims to work with landlords, local authorities and potential occupiers to bring empty town centre properties into meanwhile use, allowing local people and community groups to experiment with new projects and enterprises, thereby relieving the burden for landlords of an empty property, and supporting high streets by stimulating new footfall and users in the town centre. To find out more about what other town centres are doing to encourage "meanwhile" community uses of empty shops, have a look at the website at www.meanwhile.org.uk: +this showcases meanwhile projects of all kinds and provides a link to the meanwhile network where people can share experiences on uses, leases, insurance, rates and other issues. The Project also provides valuable technical help through a Meanwhile Manual, and other tools.

Model leasing instruments

Local authorities can do much to promote the temporary or meanwhile use of empty shops. They can encourage owners to make property available for temporary non-commercial use, or they could take a lease themselves and then let on to temporary end-users. **We are publishing guidance on suitable meanwhile leasing instruments on our website**, catering for both these scenarios. The model instruments have been specially drafted to give owners the confidence that they can get their properties back for normal commercial use once the property market revives, while getting their basic costs covered.

Flexible planning – local development orders

Via the Planning Advisory Service the Government is providing financial support to five authorities in the process of making **Local Development Orders** (LDOs). These provide a blanket local grant of planning permission for certain development in certain areas specified by the local authority. Two of the pilots, in Wycombe and Hertsmere, are looking to facilitate town centre regeneration by allowing flexibility of property use. The Government intends to support up to seven further LDOs in a second round of pilots which, it is expected, will be announced in early 2010.

Commission for Rural Communities – market towns retail recession work

A few store closures in a small town can have a large impact on the appearance and vitality of the high street, which can have important knock-on effects for its sustainability as a place, particularly in rural areas. Smaller towns may have existing community partnerships in place involving local retailers, the town and parish council, and business and community stakeholders. Many may regularly monitor the health of their retail sector, employ a town centre manager or local volunteers, be part of a regional market town partnership or have previously participated in the Market Towns Initiative. Some may have conducted a “Market Towns Healthcheck” to provide a basis for agreeing practical schemes for delivering improvement to local town centres.

Further advice on good practice in helping small towns combat the effects of the recession can be obtained from regional development agencies, local town councils and community partnerships, or Action for Market Towns – the national membership body which aims to maintain the vitality and viability of small towns. Web resources include South East Rural Towns Partnership’s website <http://www.setowns.org.uk/>, and the “Prosperous Place” section of the Action for Market Towns website www.towns.org.uk.

The Learning Revolution White Paper

The Government set out its ambition to increase the number of spaces available for learning alongside other informal adult learning commitments in *The Learning Revolution White Paper* (www.bis.gov.uk/learningrevolution), published March 2009. From 2011-12, local authorities will be invited to take the lead role in planning and funding this kind of learning to meet the needs of local people, supported by funding from the Skills Funding Agency.

Empty shops provide an ideal setting for learning. Some of the 317 projects funded through the BIS £20 million Transformation Fund for informal learning (<http://www.transformationfund.org.uk>) have seized the opportunity to hold exhibitions, creative workshops and computer classes in vacant retail premises. These projects are bringing shop front learning right into the High Street and making learning more accessible to local communities – with day, twilight and weekend activities. BIS is also supporting learning champion schemes across the country so that learning opportunities reach all communities and not just the people who have already caught the learning bug.

Sharing good practice

We would encourage local authorities to share the creative approaches that they are developing for boosting their town centres. We therefore propose to hold an event in late January or early February that will give local authorities receiving CLG’s funding an opportunity to showcase some of the approaches they are developing. If your authority is interested in participating in this event, please contact Rachel Edwards at the email address below: rachel.edwards@communities.gsi.gov.uk.



**Targeted Intervention Project
19 January 2010**

Report of Corporate Director (Regeneration)

PURPOSE OF REPORT			
To inform members about the progress towards securing Supporting People Programme Funding for the Targeted Intervention Project, to seek approval to accept £49,800 external funding for the project and to proceed with project implementation.			
Key Decision	X	Non-Key Decision	Referral from Cabinet Member
Date Included in Forward Plan		7th December 2009	
This report is public			

RECOMMENDATIONS OF COUNCILLORS BRYNING AND FLETCHER

- (1) That the offer of £49,800 Supporting People Programme Funding for the Targeted Intervention Project be accepted and that the General Fund Revenue Budget be updated accordingly to reflect the additional expenditure and grant funding.
- (2) That officers be authorised to implement the Project

1.0 Introduction

- 1.1 On the 19th February 2008 members supported and approved the applications to Lancashire Supporting People Commissioning Body for funding for a Targeted Intervention Project.
- 1.2 In 2006 the Supporting People Commissioning Board (on which the City Council is represented) completed a service review programme. It was then in a position to commission new services in line with its strategic priorities and decide that its first priority was to look at existing services across the County that were eligible for Supporting People funding and that might be at risk of closure or service level reduction without funding from the programme. In January 2008 two separate bids were submitted by the city council, one in respect of the Vulnerable Households Project and one relating to the Targeted Intervention Project (TIP). The Vulnerable Households bid was approved in June 2008 and this project is currently being implemented, alongside the Lancaster & Morecambe Worklessness Pilot project, by

the Integrated Support Projects Team. Although LDLSP funding for the Integrated Support Projects Team has been confirmed to the end of 2010/11, the continuation of Supporting People funds for the Vulnerable Households Project has only been confirmed until 31st March 2010 and its continuation is still subject to ongoing discussion with County.

- 1.3 The Supporting People commissioning Board met in May 2008 and decided in principle to commission a service in the Lancaster District and other parts of Lancashire to provide proactive targeted support to vulnerable and disengaged people based on the model bid TIP put forward by Lancaster City Council for tenants living in private rented and social housing sector.
- 1.4 Further discussions have taken place in relation to the Targeted Intervention Project bid, and in July 2009 the city council received verbal confirmation that the bid had been successful. There has been a significant delay due to the Head of Supporting People having to submit a report to County Council which would agree to waive standing orders to allow funding for the project to go ahead without the need to go out to tender. Following a recent meeting the County Council gave approval to waive standing orders and gave formal approval to fund the TIP for one year from the date of receipt of funding.

2.0 The Integrated Support Team

- 2.1 The team has an excellent track record in engaging socially excluded people in some of the worst performing neighbourhoods in the district and, as noted above, is currently delivering the Lancaster & Morecambe Worklessness Pilot Project, funded by the Lancaster District Local Strategic Partnership to March 2011 with the Vulnerable Households project, also funded through the Supporting People programme, to March 2010. The team have achieved success in preventing homelessness, reducing incidents of anti-social behaviour, helping people into work and engaging clients with mainstream services. It has also demonstrated a clear need to provide targeted outreach to take the support to those who fall outside mainstream services or who don't traditionally engage with services. The new service to be delivered through the Targeted Intervention Project will complement these existing services and will build on the Team's expertise in engaging hard-to-reach individuals and families.
- 2.2 It is anticipated the additional £49,800 funding will create capacity for two temporary members of staff for a 12 month period from March/April 2010 who will deliver intensive outreach support with a number of the most vulnerable or "high demand" single households across the district. Sanctions and incentives will be used to encourage change, and support provided over a period of months (or for as long as necessary) to enable those involved to sustain this change. The key workers act as a single point of contact and co-ordinate the services which need to engage with the individual. This offers an alternative solution to deal with antisocial behaviour and problematic tenants. By gaining the confidence and trust of the client this intensive support involves working with people to secure their commitment to change, to sustain tenancies and prevent eviction and problems being moved on to another area.
- 2.3 As mentioned previously, the continuation of the Vulnerable Household Project after March 2010 is still subject to further Supporting People funding being confirmed. If

this project could not continue there is potential for the Project Officer to transfer over to the Targeted Intervention Project instead (to be based with the Integrated Support Team), allowing the Council to retain the skills and knowledge of the existing postholder. Alternatively, if the Vulnerable Housing Project is awarded further funding after March 2010, the Integrated Support Project Team Manager proposes to recruit two new members of staff to the project for the 12 month period.

3.0 Details of Consultation

- 3.1 The development and operation of the project have been subject to detailed consultation with partners and stakeholders. The Integrated Support Team is actively supported by various statutory and voluntary partners working within the district to address social issues. The details of this report have not however been specifically subject to consultation.

4.0 Options and Options Analysis

- 4.1 **Option 1 – Accept the external funding offer of £49,800 from the Supporting People Programme and seek to implement the project, from within existing staff resources, where possible.**

Accepting the funding will create new employment opportunities and could enable the transfer of an existing project officer over to one of the new posts, if funding is not secured into 2010/11 for the Vulnerable Households Project. It will also add value to the Worklessness Project working along side to support the offer made to target the adult working population claiming out of work benefits in our most deprived wards within the district.

- 4.2 **Option 2 – Reject The Funding Offer**

This would result in a lost opportunity to deliver the project and the associated benefits as identified within the report.

5.0 Officer Preferred Option (and comments)

- 5.1 **Option 1 – Accept the external funding offer of £49,800 from the Supporting People Programme and seek to implement the project, from within existing staff resources, where possible.**

This will allow the recruitment of 2 temporary, full time posts creating new employment opportunities to deliver support to 30 households with a view to engaging households with the Worklessness Project if appropriate over the 12 month funding period.

6.0 Conclusion

- 6.1 There is a real opportunity to extend the support services offered by the Integrated Support Team, and build on previous successful engagement within the community.

RELATIONSHIP TO POLICY FRAMEWORK

The project is aimed at the Council's statutory obligations towards homeless people and ensuring homelessness prevention. It supports the delivery and implementation of the Council's Housing Strategy and Homelessness Strategy as well as achieving Local Area Agreement Cross Cutting Priority Outcomes. The projects also links into the Sustainable Community Strategy.

CONCLUSION OF IMPACT ASSESSMENT

The project will bring a substantial contribution towards community safety as well as ensuring the rights of the individual's home. The project is targeted at those who are both vulnerable and socially excluded. The project also contributes to social cohesion and sustainable communities.

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

Option 1 – Accept the external funding offer of £48,900

The Integrated Supports team is currently made up of 3 posts, one of which is a permanent full time post and two which are full time but temporary until 31st March 2011. The Vulnerable Households Project employs one officer who is in a full time permanent post. All of the posts rely on external funding.

Accepting this offer would create two additional full time, temporary posts in the Integrated Support Team for a 12 month period, which have been assessed at Grade 3 in the new pay structure.

If the Vulnerable Households Project was unable to continue into 2010/11 due to lack of external funding, the project officer could be transferred over to this new project on their existing SCP 25 which is at the top of Grade 3, at a total cost of £27,200 for the 12 month period, subject to being agreed with HR. The second post could then be recruited to at SCP 18 with a proposed cost of £21,600, giving a total of £48,800 which can be fully covered by the funding offered. This would not cover any associated running costs, however, which would need to be met from within existing Council resources or an alternative staffing structure be implemented to ensure that there is no additional impact on the Council's net resources.

Alternatively, if the Vulnerable Housing Project were to continue then both posts would be recruited to at SCP 18, giving total staffing costs of £43,200. In addition, if the postholders were to opt out of the Council Pension Scheme, these costs would be reduced and any remaining grant used to pay for Mileage, Mobile Phones, work related call charges, Lone Worker Monitoring and CRB Checks.

Option 2 – Refuse the funding offer

The decision to decline this funding offer could have implications for future bids for supporting people grant and other external funding sources, in particular for the ongoing support required to keep the existing Vulnerable Households post in situ. Also there would be a lost opportunity to add value to the Worklessness Project undertaken by the Integrated Support Team through integrated work between the two projects.

There is also an increased risk of redundancy if the Vulnerable Households Project funding did not continue after 31st March 2010 and the project officer could not be relocated to the Integrated Support Team. In this situation the Council would face potential redundancy costs

of £8.6k by the end of the 2009/10 financial year if not successfully redeployed elsewhere within the Council's other Services.

SECTION 151 OFFICER'S COMMENTS

The section 151 officer has been consulted and has no further comments.

LEGAL IMPLICATIONS

Legal Services have been consulted and have no further comments.

MONITORING OFFICER'S COMMENTS

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

BACKGROUND PAPERS

None

Contact Officer: Sharon Parkinson
Telephone: 01524 582325
E-mail: saparkinson@lancaster.gov.uk
Ref:

CABINET

Room Hire Review 19 January 2010

Report of Head of Property Services

PURPOSE OF REPORT			
This report reviews the process and charges for the hire of rooms and facilities in the Municipal buildings for the next financial year.			
Key Decision	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Non-Key Decision	<input type="checkbox"/>
		Referral from Cabinet Member	<input type="checkbox"/>
Date Included in Forward Plan		January 2010	
This report is public			

RECOMMENDATIONS OF COUNCILLOR THOMAS

- (1) That the revised charging format and room hire charges as set out in appendix A to the report be adopted.
- (2) To retain the 50% reduction in room hire charges for registered local charitable organisations (whose proceeds go to local charities) and local non profit making organisations and to extend the 50% reduction to all registered charities

1.0 Introduction

- 1.1 As part of the 2009/10 budget process a review of room hire was requested. As part of this review the current charges for room hire were to be examined to ensure that a break even position on bookings is achieved. It was anticipated at that time that this would require to achieve additional income of £10,000.
- 1.2 Whilst the income line for venue hire is clearly identifiable within the budget book, there are associated costs such as heat, light, rates, Performing Rights Society fees (PRS), cleaning, staffing, and administration that need to be factored in to any calculations. These have all been included in the costings provided within this report.
- 1.3 The operational use of the rooms available for hire takes precedence and income is a bonus to the council rather than leaving rooms empty whilst providing facilities for local organisations and businesses.

2.0 Proposal Details

2.1 Room Hire Charges

2.2 In March 2003 Cabinet approved the change in the room hire charge format from a morning, afternoon and evening basis to an hourly rate. This has proved popular with our hirers and it is proposed that no change be made to this format.

2.3 Room hire charges were last increased in April 2006 and it is proposed that an increase should now be made.

2.4 Room bookings for 2008/09 made an overall profit of £3,000.

2.5 The data collected from 2008/09 to review the room hire charges has been used with a view to revising the prices in a manner that, would address some of the issues mentioned below, ,but not discourage our hirers. The following areas were considered in the review:

2.6 Weekday rates

Where a hire charge is made even with a 50% discount these bookings never make a loss. This is largely due to the fact that there are no additional staff costs as staff are already on duty. The rates are set competitively to attract hirers and indeed our biggest surpluses come from these bookings.

2.7 Week day evening rates

Week day evening bookings, where the full hire charge is made, hardly ever make a loss. On the few occasions where a loss is made a discount on the room hire charge has generally been made. Any losses are relatively small.

2.8 Weekend rates

The current pricing structure is two tiered with a day rate and an evening rate which reflects the additional staff overtime costs incurred out of hours. This works successfully Monday to Friday for now there are no plans to change this format.

2.9 However, at the weekend this pricing structure becomes confusing as additional staff costs are added to the Monday to Friday charges.

2.10 To eliminate this confusion it is proposed to set a single weekend rate for day and evening hire charges for each of the rooms. This hire charge to be increased sufficiently to eliminate the losses currently made on weekend hire.

2.11 Registered local charitable organisations and local non profit making organisations

2.12 The current charging format allows for a 50% discount for registered local charitable organisations and local non profit making organisations and a 25% discount for registered non local charities. This was approved by the former Estates Service Group and confirmed by the former Finance and Resources Policy Committee in 1992 and was reaffirmed by Cabinet in July 2002.

2.13 To minimise the impact these increases may have on bookings by such organisations it is proposed to retain the 50% reduction in room hire charges for registered local charitable organisations (whose proceeds go to local charities) and local non profit making organisations as approved by Cabinet in July 2002.

2.14 Last year there were twenty-six bookings entitled to a 50% reduction in hire charges and only five bookings entitled to a 25% reduction. To further simplify the charging structure and reduce confusion it is proposed to extend the 50% reduction to all registered charitable organisations. The impact on income would be minimal. In 2008/09 the reduction in income would have been £200. For information, if the discounts were removed completely, the council's income would increase by £2,500..

2.15 Alternatively a single discount rate of 25% could be introduced. This would increase the Councils income by £2,600 provided that there was no adverse customer reaction.

2.16 Comparability of room hire charges

2.17 City Council Venues – for full comparison see Appendix B

2.18 Saturday evening commercial concert

Venue	Charge
Platform	£485
Dome	£495
LCC Ashton Hall	£390

Whilst the hire charge for the Ashton Hall is lower than the Platform and Dome this is due to Ashton Hall being a basic room hire without sophisticated sound and lighting systems that the other two venues offer.

2.19 Competing local venues – for full comparison see Appendix C

Venue	Charge	Function
Kings Arms Hotel	£18.75 per hour	Small meeting
LCC Committee Rooms A&B	£15.00 per hour	Small meeting
Lancaster University	£20.00 per hour	Large meeting
LCC Banqueting room	£20.00 per hour	Large meeting

There are variations in the hire charges on Appendix C, and some are considerably higher. These venues tend to be aiming for the conference type business and the charges reflect this. Others, like the Sun Hotel and the Borough, are lower as these often rely on the sale of refreshments and catering to boost income.

2.20 Performing Rights Society (PRS) Fees

2.21 The Ashton Hall is licensed by the PRS for the performance of live music. After each event a programme return of all works performed is sent to the PRS. From the information supplied on the programme they invoice the City Council for the fees due on the performance. The PRS use the fees to pay royalties due to the holders of the copyright for the works performed.

2.22 Currently the Council bears the cost of these fees, which were £1,300 in 2008/09, from its miscellaneous licences budget. The majority of these costs could also be recharged as part of the hiring agreement.

2.23 It is proposed that as these fees only apply to events where live music is performed the cost of the fees should be recharged to those hirers as an additional cost to the hire fee.

2.24 Repeat bookings

2.25 45% of the total income for 2008/09 came from just two hirers, the Tribunal Service (48 bookings) and The National Blood Service (9 bookings) To encourage these hirers, and to try to attract others like them, it is proposed to offer a 5% discount on room hire charges to anyone booking rooms on 5 or more occasions or for 3 or more consecutive days in a 12 month period.

2.26 Such a discount will also partly mitigate the increase in hire charges to these two hirers and as such reduce the likelihood of them looking elsewhere for accommodation.

2.27 Equipment hire

2.28 Currently charges are made for the hire of various items of equipment and the current charges are as follows:-

Facility	Charge	2008/09 income
Flip chart	£15 per day plus VAT	£105
OHP / screen	£20 per day plus VAT	£40
Multi media projector / screen	£100 per day plus VAT	£900
TV & Video	£15 per day plus VAT	£0
Portable dance floor	£80 per day plus VAT	£320
Stage blocks	£15 each per day plus VAT (maximum 6 blocks)	£270
	Total	£1635

These items are priced competitively and it is not proposed to increase the hire charge at this point

2.29 It is however proposed to add additional items to those available and make the following hire charges (inclusive of associated expenditure)

Glasses	£1.00 per 10 glasses
Cutlery	£1.00 per 10 items
90" x 90" table cloths	£5.00 per cloth

2.30 This will increase income by utilising otherwise unused equipment and will provide an extra facility for our hirers.

2.31 Proposed Room Hire Charges

2.32 Taking all the above in to account a revised schedule of charges as set out in appendix A is proposed. This gives a small increase in the weekday prices and to

weekday evening prices where the losses are relatively small and are mostly made by hirers entitled to a discount. A single weekend charge per room and more substantial increase is proposed for weekend lettings where losses are more frequently incurred.

2.33 The proposed room hire charges as set out in Appendix A have been applied to the 2008/09 room bookings to determine the affect on the cost of individual room bookings and room hire as a whole.

2.34 The new charges brought 97.3% of the fee paying events into surplus and increased the overall surplus to £9,500. In addition 173 out of 194 bookings incurred increases of less than £50 and out of these 105 bookings incurred increases of £25 or less. Therefore the impact of the proposed new charges should be minimal on the majority of our hirers.

3.0 Details of Consultation

3.1 This report relates to the Council's own fees and charges in the municipal buildings and therefore there has been no consultation on the content of this report.

4.0 Options and Options Analysis (including risk assessment)

4.1 Room hire charges

4.2 Option 1

That the hire charges be raised to the proposed level as detailed in the body of the report. This will ensure that the majority of fee paying events make a surplus and may potentially raise income by £6,500 (giving an overall surplus of £9,500 based on 2008/09 bookings), noting that this is separate from inflationary increases already applied during the 2010/11 Draft Budget Process, therefore the additional surplus over and above that already included in the 2010/11 Budget is actually £3,900.

4.3 The majority of hirers will only incur small increases in hire charges which it is hoped will not affect their choice of venue. Although any increase in charges will inevitably be unpopular and may result in some hirers seeking alternative venues which could reduce income.

4.4 Option 2

No change. This will be popular with hirers but will leave 13.5% of bookings where a hire charge is making a loss. It is envisaged that room hire would continue to make a small surplus.

4.5 Registered charitable organisations and local non profit making organisations

4.6 Option 1

Remove the 50% discount for registered local charitable organisations and local non profit making organisations and the 25% discount for non local registered charities. This would be extremely unpopular with these organisations and combined with the proposed increase in hire charges would have a detrimental effect on their events. This is likely to result in the cancellation of such events, adverse publicity and a loss of income.

- 4.7 Option 2
Introduce a single discount rate of 25%. This would increase the Councils income by £2,600 but is likely to be unpopular with hirers who have previously enjoyed a 50% reduction. It may result in adverse publicity and some seeking an alternative venue or not holding their event at all.
- 4.8 Option 3
Extend the 50% discount to include all registered charities. This would have little impact on income, would simplify the charging format, and may attract other hirers which would ultimately increase income.
- 4.9 Option 4
No change. Retain the 50% discount for registered local charitable organisations and local non profit making organisations and the 25% discount for non local registered charities.
- 4.10 Performing Rights Society (PRS) Fees
- 4.11 Option 1
Recharge the hirers incurring fees under the PRS music licence the actual cost of those fees. This would be a saving for the Council and only the hirers incurring the charges would be affected.
- 4.12 Option 2
No change. Lancaster City Council continues to pay the fees incurred by hirers due under the PRS music licence. These fees are specifically for music performed and are incurred by only a few hirers. Continuing to pay the fees would be popular with these hirers but at a cost to the Council.
- 4.13 Repeat bookings
- 4.14 Option 1
Introduce a 5% discount on room hire charges to anyone booking rooms on 5 or more occasions or for 3 or more consecutive days in a 12 month period. This may encourage repeat bookings from hirers and will encourage existing hirers who use our rooms regularly to continue to do so.
- 4.15 Option 2
No change. This may result in the loss of one or both of our most profitable hirers if the proposed charges are approved. Whilst the increase on each booking is relatively small it becomes a significant amount when multiplied over many bookings.
- 4.16 Equipment hire
- 4.17 Option 1
Introduce the suggested charge for hire of glassware, cutlery and tablecloths. The City Council owns these items and they are currently used only for in house events. It would seem sensible to make them available for hire and raise some additional income from their use.
- 4.18 Option 2
No change – the items would be retained for council use only.

5.0 Officer Preferred Option (and comments)

5.1 Room hire charges

5.2 The preferred option is option 1 (4.2 above) to raise the room hire charges to the proposed level set out in appendix A. This will increase income from room hire whilst not imposing big increases in charges on our hirers.

5.3 Registered charitable organisations and local non profit making organisations

5.4 The preferred option is option 3 (4.8 above) to extend the 50% discount to include all registered charities. This would have little impact on income, would benefit charities, would simplify the charging format, and may attract other hirers which would ultimately increase income.

5.5 Performing Rights Society (PRS) Fees

5.6 The preferred option is Option 1 (4.11 above) to recharge the hirers incurring fees under the PRS music licence the actual cost of those fees. This would be a saving for the Council and only the hirers incurring the charges would be affected.

5.7 Repeat bookings

5.8 The preferred option is option 1 (4.14 above) to introduce a 5% discount on room hire charges to anyone booking rooms on 5 or more occasions or for 3 or more consecutive days in a 12 month period. This may encourage repeat bookings from hirers and will encourage existing hirers who use our rooms regularly to continue to do so.

5.9 Not doing this may result in the loss of one or both of our most profitable hirers if the proposed charges are approved. Whilst the increase on each booking is relatively small it becomes a significant amount when multiplied over many bookings.

5.10 The loss of either of these hirers would have a significant impact on the room hire income which could potentially decrease by up to 45%.

5.11 Equipment hire

5.12 The preferred option is option 1 (4.17 above) to introduce a hire charge for glassware, cutlery and table cloths. Currently these items are used only for City Council functions and meetings. It would seem sensible to make them available for hire and raise income from their use.

6.0 Conclusion

6.1 The introduction of the proposed new hire charges would benefit the City Council by increasing income whilst having a relatively minor impact on the majority of hirers.

6.2 Retaining the 50% discount for registered local charities and local non profit making organisations and further extending it to all registered charities will enable the City Council to support these organisations in their fund raising efforts and encourage use of the municipal buildings by these community groups.

- 6.3 Overall room hire does make a surplus and with the introduction of the proposed changes should continue to do so whilst at the same time simplifying the room booking procedure and charges.

RELATIONSHIP TO POLICY FRAMEWORK

There are no direct links to Council priorities. However, the Medium Term Corporate Property Strategy approved by Cabinet in November 2009 identifies the need for improved corporate management of assets and the need to deliver value for money.

CONCLUSION OF IMPACT ASSESSMENT

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

The ability to let space within the municipal buildings enables the council to meet the needs of certain sectors of the community who require space for meetings or events. The use of buildings out of normal working hours does allow for more intense use of the buildings but at the same time requires the use of heating and lighting etc which results in minor increases in carbon emissions.

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

The current draft general fund revenue budget for room hire is set out in the table below, however is still subject to the current budget process. As part of the 2010/11 revised budget process the income budgets have already been increased in line with general inflation (2010/11 0.75% and 1% thereafter). This should be taken into account when considering future years' charges. The table below also shows the impact of the proposed charges on current draft budgets:

	2010/11	2011/12	2012/13
Revised Budget (incl Inflation)	-33,800	-34,200	-34,600
Proposed Budget	-37,700	-38,100	-38,500
Surplus Unbudgeted Income	-3,900	-3,900	-3,900

The calculations for this report have been costed taking 2008/09 actual throughput as an average year. The 2009/10 draft revised budget was left at £31,200 as it was anticipated that unexpected ceiling repairs in Ashton Hall would have a detrimental impact on bookings. However, this has already been exceeded by £6,500 as at 31st December (period 9). Future years have been increased back to the original levels plus inflation.

The report highlights the intention to increase some charges and decrease others. This will simplify the charges whilst ensuring that the rates are competitive with local businesses.

Members need to be aware that in making this decision, then if they approve anything that does not meet the current draft budget assumptions as a minimum, i.e. inflationary

increases, then this will impact on the need to make savings in other areas of activity and would also need to be taken forward as a budget proposal, for consideration and approval by Council.

SECTION 151 OFFICER'S COMMENTS

Members are advised to consider any savings or growth proposals in context of their proposed priorities, relevant policy and the Council's financial prospects.

LEGAL IMPLICATIONS

There are no legal implications arising out of this report

MONITORING OFFICER'S COMMENTS

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

BACKGROUND PAPERS

Room Hire charges are attached

Contact Officer: Sheila Hall

Telephone: 01524 582512

E-mail: SAHall@lancaster.gov.uk

Ref: N/A

APPENDIX A**ROOM HIRE CHARGES****WEEKDAY RATES**
LANCASTER TOWN HALL

	2009/10	Proposed 2010/11	% change
	£. hourly	£.hourly	
<u>ASHTON HALL</u>			
9.00 a.m. to 6.00 p.m.	35.00	40.00	14.3%
6.00 p.m. to 12.00 a.m.	First hour 46.00	45.00	-2.2%
	Thereafter 40.00		12.5%
Extra Charge for Seating	100.00	Included in hire charge	
Erection of Tiered Seating	At cost + VAT	At cost + VAT	
Removal of Stage Extension	At cost + VAT	At cost + VAT	
Organ – playing, weekdays between 12 noon and 2.00 p.m.	-	-	
<u>BANQUETING ROOM</u>			
9.00 a.m. to 6.00 p.m.	17.00	20.00	17.6%
6.00 p.m. to 12.00 a.m.	First hour 26.00	30.00	15.4%
	Thereafter 20.00		50%
<u>RECEPTION ROOM</u>			
9.00 a.m. to 6.00 p.m.	15.00	18.00	20%
6.00 p.m. to 12.00 a.m.	First hour 23.00	25.00	21.7%
	Thereafter 17.00		47.1%
<u>BANQUETING SUITE</u>			
9.00 a.m. to 6.00 p.m.	32.00	35.00	9.4%
6.00 p.m. to 12.00 a.m.	37.00	40.00	8.1%
<u>COUNCIL CHAMBER</u>			
9.00 a.m. to 6.00 p.m.	14.00	15.00	7.1%
6.00 p.m. to 12.00 a.m.	First hour 23.00	25.00	8.7%
	Thereafter 17.00		47.1%
<u>COMMITTEE ROOMS "A" and "B"</u>			
9.00 a.m. to 6.00 p.m.	13.00	15.00	15.4%
6.00 p.m. to 12.00 a.m.	First hour 23.00	25.00	8.7%
	Thereafter 17.00		47.1%

KITCHEN (with other rooms only)

For Beverages only (includes crockery)	44.00	44.00	0%
For Food and Beverages	115.00	115.00	0%

SUNDRY ADDITIONAL CHARGES

Use of any room after midnight, additional charge per hour or part thereof	76.00	After 6pm room hire rate	
Tuning of Piano	Hirer to Arrange	Hirer to Arrange	0%
Setting-up days required by hirer	Hourly rate as applicable	Hourly rate as applicable	0%
Tea/Coffee and Biscuits per Session	90p + VAT per head	90p + VAT per head	0%

WEEKDAY RATES
MORECAMBE TOWN HALL

	2009/10 £ Hourly	Proposed 2010/11 £. Hourly	% change
<u>COUNCIL CHAMBER</u>			
9.00 a.m. to 6.00 p.m.	14.00	15.00	7.14%
6.00 p.m. to 12.00 a.m.	First hour 23.00 Thereafter 17.00	25.00	8.69% 47.06%
Tea/Coffee and Biscuits per Session	90p + VAT per head	90p + VAT per head	0%

WEEKEND AND BANK HOLIDAY RATES

Saturday 9am to 6pm, the weekday rates plus	£. 2009/10 £4 per hour per member of staff
Saturday evenings from 6pm, weekday rates plus	No additional charges
Sunday 9am to 6pm, the weekday rates plus	£9 per hour per member of staff
Sunday evenings from 6pm, weekday rates plus	£4.50 per hour

LANCASTER TOWN HALL

**Proposed
2010/11
£. Hourly
65.00**

ASHTON HALL

Extra Charge for Seating	Included in hire charge
Erection of Tiered Seating	At cost + VAT
Removal of Stage Extension	At cost + VAT
Organ – playing, weekdays 12.30pm – 1.30pm	5.00 per session

BANQUETING ROOM

45.00

RECEPTION ROOM

35.00

<u>BANQUETING SUITE</u>	55.00
<u>COUNCIL CHAMBER</u>	30.00
<u>COMMITTEE ROOMS "A" and "B"</u>	30.00
<u>KITCHEN</u> (with other rooms only)	
For Beverages only (includes crockery)	44.00
For Food and Beverages	115.00

MORECAMBE TOWN HALL

**Proposed
2010/11
£. hourly**

<u>COUNCIL CHAMBER</u>	30.00
------------------------	-------

SUNDRY ADDITIONAL CHARGES

Use of any room after midnight, additional charge per hour or part thereof	Weekend hourly rate for room/s used
--	-------------------------------------

**LANCASTER TOWN HALL
CIVIL WEDDING CEREMONIES**

	£. 2009/10	Proposed 2010/11 £. Hourly	% change
Council Chamber – 2 hours	£266	£350	31.58%
Banqueting Suite – 2 hours	£325	£350	7.69%

**LANCASTER TOWN HALL
DISCOUNTS**

	£. 2009/10	Proposed 2010/11 £. Hourly
Registered local charitable organisations (whose proceeds go to local charities)	50%	50%
Registered non-local charitable organisations	25%	50%

Please note that when live music is performed, there is an additional fee payable to the Performing Rights Society. The amount of this fee will be added to the hire charge.

APPENDIX B**Hire Charges – City Council Venues**

The Platform	
Commercial Hire	
Mon. – Fri. Sat/Sun/Bank Holiday	£485 per 8 hour let day or evening
Charity Rate (Non Profit Making Organisations.)	
Mon. – Fri. Sat/Sun/Bank Holiday	£385 per 8 hour let day or evening

The Dome				
Commercial Hire				
Mon –Thur	9.00am- 12.30pm	1.00pm-5.00pm	6pm-11pm	After 11.00pm
	£76	£90	£350	£65
Fri,Sat,Sun & Bank Hols	£211	£215	£430	£65
Charity Hire				
Mon - Thur	£40	£45	£315	£40
Fri,Sat,Sun	£110	£175	£315	£40
Bank Hol			£430	

Citylab			
Mon - Fri	Per hour	Half day (4 Hours)	Full day (8 hours)
Ashton Room / Dalton Room	£15	£50	£90

APPENDIX C**Hire Charges – Local Competing Venues**

Venue	Room	Seats	Hourly Rate	Half Day	Full Day
Lancaster University	Large meeting room	120 Theatre style		£90	£160
	Small meeting room	30 theatre style		£60	£110
	The Great Hall	700 theatre style			£800
Lancaster House Hotel	Small meeting room	20 theatre style			£100
	Training room	90 theatre style			£410
	Large function room	200 theatre style			£585
The Kings Arms Hotel	Large Function room	100 theatre style		£300	£600
	Small meeting room	20 theatre style		£75	£150
The Borough	Small meeting room	25 theatre style 18 boardroom	£10 Day £15 Eve Fri/Sat Eve £25		
The Sun Hotel	Small meeting room	15 boardroom		£25	£50

CABINET

Museums Service

19th January 2010

Report of Corporate Director (Regeneration)

PURPOSE OF REPORT				
To consider savings options in respect of the Museums Service.				
Key Decision	X	Non-Key Decision		Referral from Cabinet Member
Date Included in Forward Plan		January 2010		
This report is public				

RECOMMENDATIONS OF COUNCILLOR JUNE ASHWORTH

1. To issue Lancashire County Council with 24 months notice to terminate the Museums Partnership Agreement from 1st April 2010 (i.e. to be implemented after 31 March 2012), and for officers of the City Council, over the ensuing period, to examine options of future service provision, whilst examining cost savings.
- 1.0 Introduction
 - 1.1 As part of the 2010/11 budget process, Officers have been asked to prepare a report on savings options in respect of the Museums Service.
 - 2.0 General
 - 2.1 The Museums Service in Lancaster has since 2003 been the subject of a Partnership Agreement between Lancashire County Council and Lancaster City Council. The establishment of the Museums Service Partnership Agreement came about as a result of Lancaster City Council budget deliberations for 2003/2004.
 - 2.2 Lancaster City Council funds the management of three of the five major museum's heritage attractions in Lancaster. The two not funded by the City Council are Lancaster Castle and the Judges' Lodgings Museum. The City Council own and have maintenance responsibilities, for Lancaster City Museum, Lancaster Maritime Museum and the Cottage Museum. All the collections prior to the Museums agreement and those collected on behalf of the City after that agreement, belong to Lancaster City Council. All Museum staff that previously worked for Lancaster City Council were transferred to Lancashire County Council in April 2003.

- 2.3 Lancaster City Museum is housed in the late 18th century Old Town Hall, a Grade II* listed building in the heart of the city centre, Market Square. It opened as the town's Museum and Art Gallery in 1923, and since then it has collected, housed and safeguarded Lancaster and Districts' historic past. Collections range from pre-history to the present day. These include Roman archaeology and the internationally significant tombstone recently found in and purchased for the City. The City Museum also houses the Quernmore Burial - containing the largest single piece of Dark Age material discovered in the country. Evidence of Lancaster's Golden Ages, the influential Georgian period as the town flourished and the Victorian industrialist entrepreneurs that established many of the landmarks of today are all on show. The Museum has an excellent collection of fine and decorative art collected over the decades on show. In the two ground floor galleries a programme of temporary exhibitions are staged, they are wide ranging from local artists and societies to commemorating significant events and anniversaries. The City Museum is open six days per week closing on Sunday. It has free admission to all and had nearly 47,000 visitors through its doors in 2008/09 season.
- 2.4 Since 1929 the King's Own Regiment collection has also been located within the City Museum. Not only a focal point for City pride it has become an international source of information for the many people tracing their family trees. There were 63,000 visits to the King's Own website last year.
- 2.5 Lancaster Maritime Museum is situated in two buildings on St George's Quay. The first, opened in 1985, is the very grand grade II* listed Custom House built to the designs of Richard Gillow in 1764. The award winning museum was an immediate success and expanded into two of the floors of the grade II listed adjoining warehouse. Displays explore Lancaster's maritime past from the riches of trade and Georgian splendour to its infamous involvement in the slave trade. The Museum looks at Morecambe Bay from ecology and natural history to inshore and sea fishing. Visitors can discover Morecambe in its heyday as tourists flocked to the seaside with the coming of the railways. The Maritime Museum is open 7 days a week and is free to local residents and charges £3 to non residents, £2 concessions and accompanied children are free. The Maritime Museum attracted over 16,000 visitors in the 2008/09 season.
- 2.6 The Cottage Museum is in a conservation area on Castle Hill overlooked by the imposing Castle gateway. The intriguing, small 18th century cottage is spread over five floors. An intimate glimpse of humble Victorian life is in stark contrast to the neighbouring Judges' Lodgings Museum. Very popular with schools, this tiny seasonal museum had over 3,600 paying visitors in the 2008/09 season. Admission charges are Adults £1, concessions 75p accompanied children free.
- 2.7 Since the Museums Partnership Agreement in 2003 the City and Maritime museums have achieved and maintained Museums Accreditation, the profession's recognised standard. The three sites have consistently achieved the upper quartile for its Best Value Performance Indicators. 66,575 people visited the Museums in person, 157,954 people used the Museum services, enquiries or website visits and 2,835 school children had educational visits.
- 2.8 The Museums Partnership Agreement is aligned to the City Council's corporate objectives, via an annual Service Level Agreement (SLA). See Appendix A attached.

3.0 Proposal details

- 3.1 The Draft 2010/11 total net revenue budget summary for the Museums Service is:-

£714,600, of which £545,300 is paid as a management fee to Lancashire County Council

[NOTE: Based on annual throughput figures of 66,675 people (08/09), and net total revenue expenditure of £714,600, the per capita subsidy of the Museums Service is £10:72. By comparison Salt Ayre Sports Centre's annual throughput of 384,387 people (08/09), at a net total revenue expenditure of £1,317,800 (of which only £671, 600 is "controllable") represents a per capita subsidy of £3:43.

Lancaster City Council's management fee represents approximately 1/3 of Lancashire County Council's Museum Service expenditure]

- 3.2 As previously stated within the report, the Museums Service, comprising;- City Museum (including King's Own Regimental collection), Maritime Museum, and Cottage Museum, has since 2003 been the subject of a Partnership Agreement between Lancashire County Council and Lancaster City Council. Lancaster City Council undertakes the "landlord" functions as the owners of the premises and collections, and Lancashire County Council manage and operate the services. The initial Agreement was for 10 years from 1st April 2003 until 31st March 2013.
- 3.3 It is a condition of the Partnership Agreement between Lancashire County Council and Lancaster City Council that either party gives a full twenty-four months notice of intent to terminate the above Agreement. In the event of terminating the Agreement between Lancashire County Council and Lancaster City Council in respect of the Museums Service, there would be additional operational (including HR) implications as well as the current landlord implications for Lancaster City Council.
- 3.4 Notwithstanding the Agreement referred to above, the City Council Head of Cultural Services has been in discussion with the County Council Museum Service to determine and examine potential saving options for the Museums Service in Lancaster. The County Council's preliminary response has been that there are no grounds for amending or terminating the Partnership Agreement within the terms of the originally agreed timescale i.e. 10 years from 2003.

4.0 Details of Consultation

- 4.1 This report was prepared following a request to officers, as part of the 2010/11 budget process, to prepare a report on savings options in respect of the Museum Service.

5.0 Options and Options Analysis (including risk assessment)

- 5.1 **Option A** - That Cabinet instruct officers to enter into formal negotiations with Lancashire County Council to review and revise the Museums Partnership agreement, with a view to the City Council securing on-going revenue reductions.

Notwithstanding the Agreement referred to above, the City Council Head of Cultural Services has already been involved in informal discussion with the County Council Museum Service to determine and examine potential saving options for the Museums Service in Lancaster. As previously stated, the County Council's preliminary response has been that there are no grounds for amending or terminating the Partnership Agreement within the terms of the originally agreed timescale i.e. 10 years from 2003.

Based on the above, it is unlikely that cost savings would accrue in 2010/11 or 2011/12.

- 5.2 Option B** - To retain the current level of Museums Services within the District, via the existing Partnership Agreement with Lancashire County Council.

There would be no financial savings to the City Council.

- 5.3 Option C** - To issue Lancashire County Council with twenty-four months notice from 1st April 2010, of Lancaster City Council termination of the Partnership Agreement (i.e. to be implemented after 31st March 2012), and for officers of the City Council over the ensuing period to examine options for bringing the Museums Service back into City Council operation, whilst also examining savings options

Based on the above, no cost savings would accrue in 2010/11 or 2011/12, but based on indicative savings options, as set out below, there may be budget reductions with effect from 2012/13.

Option	Estimated saving
Charge, non-residents, admission to the City Museum	£32,000
Close the Maritime Museum on Sundays	£13,500
Reduce museums to 5 day per week opening	£12,000
Operate Cottage Museum with "volunteers"	£4,800
Remove "acquisitions" budget	£3,000
Reduce administration establishment by 1 post	£23,600
Reduce central design establishment by 1 part-time post	£12,500

The projected savings (for illustration), if all were implemented would be in the region of £100,000 per annum. However, it must be noted that the options require more detailed appraisal and consideration of potential consequential issues, such as fewer admission numbers (therefore, failure to achieve income levels), and HR implications (TUPE transfer, redundancy), etc. It also has to be acknowledged that within the remaining period of the Museums Service Partnership Agreement, would require a negotiated agreement between the City and County Council on any or all of the above.

It may also be that there are other more radical options, including rationalising the number of museum buildings that the City Council operate/offer. Such options would also be considered further within the period of termination of the Partnership Agreement (i.e., 2010/11 and 2011/12).

Depending on Cabinet's view on the type of options put forward it is likely that the City Council would need to engage specialist advisors, in particular where there are ramifications in terms of Disposal and Curatorial issues, etc.

6.0 Officer Preferred Option (and comments)

- 6.1 Option C is the preferred officer option in that it both retains service provision whilst also offering potential savings.

7.0 Conclusion

- 7.1 The report raises significant issues in terms of determining Value -Vs- Cost in maintaining publically accessible cultural/museum service facilities within the District.

RELATIONSHIP TO POLICY FRAMEWORK

The Museums Service is 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

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 need to be carried out by Cultural Services in conjunction with Financial Services before any final decision is made, as part of the current budget process.

Option A

No cost savings can be achieved in 2010/11 or 2011/12 and may not be achievable in 2012/13 subject to whether County are prepared to re-negotiate terms during the current Partnership Agreement timeframe.

Option B

No cost savings would accrue during the existing 10 year Partnership Agreement timeframe.

Option C

Based only on the illustrative options in Option C, the projected potential savings from 2012/13 are estimated to be in the region of £100,000 per annum. However, these assumptions, and other possible options have not yet been verified by Lancaster City Council officers and would therefore need to be the subject of a thorough review and reported back to Cabinet prior to final approval/implementation of such changes. Nonetheless, a final decision to give notice to terminate the agreement could be taken by Cabinet. In budgetary terms, it would be assumed initially that the cost of the museums service would remain the same, until such time as further reports and decisions are taken regarding specific savings proposals.

SECTION 151 OFFICER’S COMMENTS

Members are advised to consider any proposals in context of their proposed priorities, relevant existing or emerging policy, and the Council’s financial prospects. In particular, this is to ensure that value for money is considered, as well as affordability.

LEGAL IMPLICATIONS

Legal have been consulted and have no further comments to make

MONITORING OFFICER'S COMMENTS	
The Monitoring Officer has been consulted and has no further comments.	
BACKGROUND PAPERS	Contact Officer: David Owen
N/A	Telephone: 01524 582820
	E-mail: downen@lancaster.gov.uk
	Ref: WDO/wdo/m/ms/190110

Appendix A

Alignment of the Museums Service to the City Council's Corporate objectives.

Safe and Healthy Communities

Through its many forms of interpretation, education and entertainment the Museums Service offers individuals a sense of belonging and wellbeing. Looking at the past, present and future of this area - and its people/communities – the Museum Service encourages a sense of ownership and civic pride.

Work has focussed on health and wellbeing in a number of ways and is easily available to residents of the Lancaster City Council area – the City Museum is free entry and the Maritime Museum is free to local residents. The small Cottage Museum has a very nominal entry charge. NB all paying Museums are free for accompanied children. All staff working with children and vulnerable adults are vetted via the CRB scheme to ensure that a safe and welcoming environment is provided for all museum users.

Exhibitions highlighting the environment:-

- Cycling Exhibition at the City Museum covered environmental issues and highlighted healthy living and lifestyle choices 24.01.2009 - 18.04.2009
- Waterlink: Lancaster Canal past, present and future - Maritime Museum 26.09.2009 – 25.01.2010
- Natural Curiosities – an exhibition on the wildlife of the county and its historical and contemporary study (touring exhibition originated by Lancashire County Museum Service)
- Tales of the River Bank (planned spring 2010 at Maritime Museum) – viewing the local environment through historic and recent fine art interpretations
- Worse Things Happen at Sea – an exhibition and a computer interactive highlighting the dangers of Morecambe Bay. (£3,500 Renaissance NW grant funding)
- M6:50 an exhibition marking the 50th Anniversary of the country's first motorway with many associated views on environmental impact

A number of sports, arts and heritage related projects are rolled out throughout the year, targeting specific user groups. These are intergenerational – building communication routes and enabling understanding and mutual respect to develop and grow – or single groups only. Specifically within the Lancaster City Council area these have included:-

- Romans in Lancaster – tying into the installation of the recently discovered and conserved Roman tombstone at the City Museum
- Cycling – events programme
- ABOLISHED? – schools and young people's projects around issues of slavery
- Young Roots – Morecambe based project with disadvantaged young people

The Museum Service's schools offer reinforces all the work around identity, heritage and community cohesion within the KS1- 3 range.

Support our local economy

The Museum Service plays a key role in the tourist economy of Lancaster and the District, offering a range of destinations and events/activities.

Visitors to the three Lancaster City Council funded Museums numbered 66,575 for the year 2008/09. Visitor figures - at this stage in the year - are 10% up on those of last year. Web "hits" on the King's Own, City, Maritime and Cottage Museums numbered 63,868.

Lancashire County Museum Service provides, through its Marketing team, a coherent marketing strategy for the heritage cluster in Lancaster – both City and County owned venues – and across the whole of the County. This offers mutual benefit and scope for drawing in audiences that are visiting other venues within the service. This cross marketing work is reinforced by the popular, promotional "Xplorer" ticket offered across all these venues.

The North West Development Agency identified Lancaster as a location where strategic development in heritage-related tourism infrastructure can stimulate economic growth and deliver regeneration benefits.

The Museum Service works widely with partners to deliver all its programmes. The Museum Service is a key player in the Heritage Weekend, Lancaster Unlocked and (most recent) St George's Day events providing venues and specialist knowledge to support both Museums' and the City's events and activities.

The District has developed an ambitious economic vision through a strong private/public partnership. The Vision for the District recognises the key role that tourism, heritage and culture plays in the future economic prosperity of the district. It highlights the potential to fully exploit the District's tourism and heritage assets as a key 'transformational project' for the local economy.

The Museum Service is represented on the Lancaster Cultural Heritage Strategy Steering Group commissioning a £60K Cultural Strategy for Lancaster.

"The Visitor Economy is worth over £270 million to the district, supporting over 4,500 jobs, with more than 4.8 million visits a year to our main visitor destinations of Morecambe, Lancaster and the rural areas. The industry also plays a key role in economic development and regeneration".

The strategic objectives are to develop the local tourism product, actively market the district, provide high quality visitor services and integrate local destination management to improve the visitor

Clean and Green Places

The Museum Service operates out of and cares for a number of significant and buildings for the history of the area:-

- City Museum Former Town Hall Grade II listed
- Maritime Museum Custom House Grade II *
- Maritime Museum Warehouses Grade II
- Cottage Museum in a Conservation Area

The Museum Service makes every effort to provide a positive presentation on clean and green places and understand the need to tackle anti-social behaviour swiftly and effectively. Some 25 years ago the Maritime Museum development was a catalyst for change and development on St George's Quay, bringing that area of the City into prominent view.

The Museum Service buildings do challenge the access and green agendas. However, the Museum Services is committed to energy efficiency and sustainability – operating as effectively and sympathetically as possible.

Support our local communities

The Museum Service work is centered within its local community. One of its key roles is to provide a context for contemporary life, reflecting the area's past (by collecting and caring for its material culture and communal history) and offering positive approaches for the future. The Museum Service encourages a sense of belonging, civic pride and opportunity.

To help with a sense of belonging, the Service offers an in-depth history of Lancaster and the District, local families, businesses and industries that have made the area what it is today. Temporary exhibition programme, weekly talks programme at the Lancaster venues and children/family activities programme regularly cover topics around community life (historic and contemporary), the local environment and health and wellbeing. The Museums Service cover all age groups from those at Children's Centres to those in care homes for the elderly.

Recent work and achievements include:-

- Local industrialist and philanthropist - Thomas Storey. Portrait (holding plans of Storey Institute) conserved and re-framed following appeal by Friends of Lancaster City Museum.
- Internationally significant Roman altar discovered in Lancaster purchased, on behalf of the City, with £75 K of Heritage Lottery funding by the Museum Service.
- Two portraits of Abraham and his wife Ellenor Rawlinson, a significant Lancaster merchant family, bought for the City's collections (at Lancaster Maritime Museum) with funding from the MLA/Victoria and Albert Museum Purchase Grant Fund and the National Art Collections Fund.
- Morecambe Super Swimming Stadium – silver presentation model purchased for the City's collections once again with grant aid from the MLA/Victoria and Albert Museum Purchase Grant Fund.
- Family history enquiries: 50,800 website visits and 1630 enquiries to the King's Own Regiment Museum alone give some indication of the impact of the interest in family history.
- Partnership work is always important to us. Most recently we staged an exhibition on the 150th Anniversary of Lancaster Cathedral in conjunction with colleagues at the Cathedral. Work has already begun with a wide range of partners – academic, arts, heritage and tourism – looking at how to commemorate the 400th Anniversary of the Pendle Witch Trials, at Lancaster, in 2012.

CABINET

**Review of Parking Fees and Charges 2010/11
19 January 2010**

Report of Corporate Director (Regeneration)

PURPOSE OF REPORT				
To consider the Annual Review of Parking Fees and Charges for 2010/11.				
Key Decision	X	Non-Key Decision		Referral from Cabinet Member
Date Included in Forward Plan		October 2009		
This report is public				

RECOMMENDATIONS OF COUNCILLOR THOMAS

- (1) To approve Option 3 for increased Pay and Display charges for 2010/11.
- (2) To make further representations to Lancashire County Council regarding increasing on-street pay and display charges for 2010/11 to maintain differential charges as outlined in paragraph 3.4 of this report.

1.0 Introduction

- 1.1 The City Council reviews parking fees and charges annually to meet its transportation policy and budget commitments. Cabinet has previously been advised that parking charges have provided a predictable stream of income but in recent years parking patterns and overall usage have become more difficult to predict following price increases, with both factors affecting the total income generated. The current economic recession is another factor that potentially affects parking usage and revenue.
- 1.2 This report provides background information on recent annual reviews of parking fees and charges, sets the policy context of the parking strategy, provides information on usage levels of car parks in the district, confirms the current financial position and includes options on how parking charges could be increased to meet the financial target that has been included in the 2010/11 Draft Budget.

2.0 Background Information

2.1 Parking Strategy and Policy Context

The strategy was approved in 2008 and should now form the policy context for the annual review of parking fees and charges. The strategy confirms the parking hierarchy of residents, closely followed by visitors, shoppers and local business needs and finally commuters. The strategy also includes various aims and objectives and a summary of the issues most relevant when considering this review is provided below:-

- Shifting the balance of use from long stay to short stay
- Charges should be used to encourage alternative modes of transport
- Charges should not undermine the vitality of other town centres
- Use parking charges as a demand management tool to support wider objectives
- Pricing policies to assist the reduction in commuter parking
- On-street parking charges set at a level to encourage the use of off-street car parks
- Set charges to maintain 85% occupancy at busy times in short stay car parks
- Use charges to deter long stays in short stay car parks
- Ensure local Chambers of Commerce and of Trade views are taken into account

2.2 Recent Annual Reviews of Fees and Charges and Charging Amendments

The following changes have been approved in recent years:

2006/07	
Short Stay	Up to 2 hours £1.50 to £1.60 Up to 3 hours £2.20 to £2.40 Coach parking £3.00 to £3.50
Permits	Increase all permits by 2.5%

December 2007 - Council approved free parking on Remembrance Sunday at the Bay Arena car park in Morecambe and Nelson Street car park in Lancaster.

2007/08	
Short Stay	Up to 1 hour 80p to 90p
Permits	Increase all permits by 30% Introduce a Morecambe only permit at £450.00 p.a.

2008/09	
Short Stay	Up to 2 hours £1.60 to £1.70* New Up to 4 hours at £3.20 Amend Over 3 hours to Over 4 hours & increase to £8.00 *Up to 2 hours reduced to £1.60 in June 2008
Permits	Increase all permits by 5%

September 2008 - Cabinet Member decision approved to extend free Christmas Parking to all car parks in Morecambe (previously only 3 car parks in Morecambe but all car parks in Lancaster)

2009/10	
All car parks	Up to 1 hour 90p to £1.00
Main long stay car parks	Up to 3 hours £2.00 to £2.20 Over 3 hours (Morecambe) £3.00 to £3.20 Up to 5 hours (Lancaster) £3.50 to £3.70
Permits	Introduction of 24-5 permits for all types of permit at 24-7 2008/09 prices, therefore no increased income. Increase all 24-7 permits by 5%

2.3 Current Usage Position

2.4 ***Pay and Display***

The following table shows the current usage position for the first 6 months of 2009 compared with 2008.

TICKET SALES APRIL - SEPTEMBER			
	2008	2009	%
<u>Short Stay</u>			
Up to 1 hour	292,292	277,171	-5.17
Up to 2 hours	188,499	190,393	1.00
Up to 3 hours	62,769	63,404	1.01
Up to 4 hours	22,671	26,769	18.08
Over 3/4 hours	3,066	3,317	8.19
Evening Parking	36,115	35,481	-1.76
Sub Total	605,412	596,535	-1.47
<u>Long Stay</u>			
Up to 1 hour	56,768	59,283	4.43
Up to 3 hours	61,442	58,206	-5.27
Over 3 hours (Mcbe)	21,309	17,798	-16.48
Up to 5 hours (Lanc)	6,755	6,672	-1.23
Over 5 hours (Lanc)	2,465	2,794	13.35
Evening Parking	5,571	5,612	0.74
Back Brighton Terrace	1,213	2,021	66.61
Coaches SLG	254	245	-3.54
Coaches BBT/HV	48	31	-35.42
Up to 4 hours CR/HV/BB	16,029	20,630	28.70
Over 4 hours CR/HV/BB	2,177	2,743	26.00
Sub Total	174,031	176,035	1.15
Total	779,443	772,570	-0.88

The above table shows an overall reduction in usage of 0.88% compared to 2008 and this is considered to be satisfactory in the present economic climate. The introduction of the new Short Stay Up to 4 hour tariff in April 2008 has again proved popular with an increase in sales of 18%. Evening parking remains consistent and again this is fairly positive in the current climate.

The above usage resulted in a favourable variance of £10,000 at the end of September 2009. Income in October and November has been 5.35% and 7.70% above target, respectively and although there are a further 4 months remaining in the current financial where income could fluctuate, the indications at this stage are relatively positive.

2.5 **Permit Sales**

The following table shows a comparison on permit sales at the end of the last financial year compared with the end of September 2009.

PERMIT SALES AT 30TH SEPTEMBER 2009

PERMIT TYPE	ISSUED TO 31/03/2009	ISSUED AT 24/09/2009	%
Public Permits			
General Permits -			
7 day Lancaster and Morecambe	251	96	
5 day Lancaster and Morecambe	0	113	
7 day Morecambe	42	27	
5 day Morecambe	0	5	
Specific Permits -			
7 day Lancaster	37	28	
5 day Lancaster		1	
TOTAL	330	270	-18%
Member/Staff Permits			
General Permits -			
Members 7 day	22	22	
Members 5 day	0	2	
Staff 7 day	252	221	
Staff 5 day	0	19	
Specific Permits -			
Staff	6	6	
TOTAL	280	270	-4%

This above table shows a reduction of 18% in public permit sales and 4% in staff and member permits. 54% of the reduced Lancaster and Morecambe general permit customers have also opted to purchase 5 day permits that were sold at the 2008/09 7 day permit price. This resulted in an adverse variance of £47,000 at the end of September of which £43,300 has now been included in the 2009/10 Revised Budget.

2.6 Current Financial Position

The current 2010/11 Draft Budget outlined in the table below assumes the permit income will continue at a reduced level of £43,300 and this shortfall has been transferred onto the Fees heading from 2010/11 onwards. It is also assumed that the temporary VAT benefit currently included within 2009/10 does not continue in future years, i.e. rate reverts back to 17.5% from 15% from 1st January 2010. An

inflationary increase of 0.75% has been added in line with the Council's existing policy on fees and charges.

Heading	2009/10 Estimate	2009/10 Revised	2010/11 Estimate	Inflation Included
Fees	1,933,000	1,933,000	1,954,800	14,500
Evenings	69,600	71,000	71,500	500
Permits	272,300	229,000	230,700	1,700
TOTAL	2,274,900	2,233,000	2,257,000	16,700

The annual review therefore needs to consider options for covering a total increase of £60,000 arising from a reduction in permit income of £43,300 (to be recovered through Fees instead) and the additional inflationary increases of £16,700 across the three headings highlighted above.

3.0 Proposal Details

3.1 Pay and Display Charges

Nearly 80% of tickets sold are at Short Stay tariffs. 80% of tickets sold at Long Stay tariffs were affected by price increases in April 2009 and these are in bold and underlined in the table below. Short Stay tariffs therefore provide the greater opportunity for increased charges in 2010/11.

The following table illustrates the potential income that could be generated from various tariff increases:-

	Existing	10p increase	20p increase	30p increase	50p increase
Short Stay					
Up to 1 hour	<u>1.00</u>	45,000	90,000	135,000	180,000
Up to 2 hours	1.60	30,000	60,000	90,000	120,000
Up to 3 hours	2.40	9,500	19,000	28,500	38,000
Up to 4 hours	3.20	3,000	6,000	9,000	12,000
Over 4 hours	8.00	500	1,000	1,500	2,000
Evenings	1.00	5,000	10,000	15,000	20,000
Long Stay					
Up to 1 hour	<u>1.00</u>	7,000	14,000	21,000	28,000
Up to 3 hours	<u>2.20</u>	8,000	16,000	24,000	32,000
Over 3 hours (Morecambe)	<u>3.20</u>	2,400	4,800	7,200	9,600
Up to 5 hours (Lancaster)	<u>3.70</u>	900	1,800	2,700	3,600
Over 5 hours (Lancaster)	6.00	350	700	1,050	1,400
Evenings	1.00	800	1,600	2,400	3,800
Other Car Parks –					
Up to 4 hours*	0.80	1,500	3,000	4,500	6,000
Over 4 hours*	1.20	200	400	600	800
Up to 24 hrs**	0.50	200	400	600	800

The tariffs shown in bold and underlined were increased for 2009/10.

Please note the above figures allow for reduced sales due to customer resistance to tariff increases and overpayments.

* These tariffs are for Coastal Road and Battery Breakwater in Morecambe and Heysham Village car park.

** This tariff is for Back Brighton Terrace Car Park in Morecambe.

3.2 Parking Charges in Lancashire and Cumbria

Parking charges in other local authorities vary according to local traffic and parking policies. Current charges in nearby authorities are shown in the following table for comparative purposes. Parking charges at Marketgate and Parksafe in Lancaster, which are privately operated, are also shown for information.

City/Town	0-1	1-2	2-3	3-4	4-5	5-8	8-10
Marketgate	1.00	2.00	2.50	10.00	10.00	10.00	10.00
Parksafe	1.20	2.00	3.00	4.00	7.00	7.00	7.00
Carlisle	0.80	1.60	2.40	3.20	4.00	4.00	4.80
Barrow	0.90	1.80	2.70	3.50	4.50	4.50	4.50
Kendal	1.00	2.00	2.80	3.50	5.00	5.00	5.00
Blackpool	1.30	2.30	3.40	4.50	4.80	4.80	4.80
Preston – Avenham	1.20	1.50	2.20	3.10	3.70	3.70	3.70
Hill Street	-	2.20	3.20	4.60	9.00	9.00	9.00
Private	1.00	1.50	2.00	3.00	4.50	8.00	8.00
Lytham	-	1.80	2.30	2.80	3.80	3.80	3.80

Note: Short Stay tariffs up to 4 hours
Long Stay tariffs over 4 hours

3.3 Permit Charges

Although permits are sold at a substantial discount compared to the daily cost of parking there has been a noticeable reduction in permit sales this year. This is despite 7 day public permits only being increased by 5% last year and a new 5 day permit being introduced at the same price as last year's 7 day permit.

Customers are able to pay for their permits by Direct Debit and pro rata refunds are offered on unused months if customers decide they no longer require their permit. Permits are also transferable between vehicles. Sales of Specific Permits for a reserved space in Lancaster have also reduced with one of the three car parks being only 50% occupied.

From a parking strategy point of view the reduced uptake of permits is a sign that parking charge policies are being successful and that the prices now being charged are encouraging commuters to consider other options for travelling to work. Some customers might be transferring to pay and display and this could be partly the reason for pay and display usage being sustained at last year's level. However, permit sales are more likely to be linked to the current economic climate as many companies look to reduce costs wherever possible.

The following table illustrates the additional income that could be generated but includes resistance factors as indicated.

PERMIT TYPE	2009/10 Gross Charge	Increase Resistance	2.50%	5%	10%	20%
			5%	10%	20%	30%
Public Permits	£		£	£	£	£
General Permits -		2009/10 Sold				
7 Day Lanc/Mcbe	810.00	96	1,600	3,000	5,500	10,200
5 Day Lanc/Mcbe	770.00	113	1,800	3,400	6,200	11,400
7 Day Morecambe	500.00	27	300	500	1,000	1,800
5 Day Morecambe	475.00	5	0	100	200	300
Specific Permits -						
7 day Lancaster	1,290.00	28	700	1,400	2,600	4,700
5 day Lancaster	1,230.00	1	0	0	100	200
SUB TOTAL			4,400	8,400	15,600	28,600
Members/Staff						
General Permits -						
Members 7 day	200.00	22	100	200	300	600
Members 5 day	190.00	2	0	0	0	100
Staff 7 day	200.00	221	900	1,700	3,100	5,800
Staff 5 day	190.00	19	100	100	300	500
Specific Permits -						
Specific	330.00	6	0	100	100	300
SUB TOTAL			1,100	2,100	3,800	7,300
OVERALL TOTAL			5,550	10,500	19,400	35,900

As previously indicated predicting the income that will be generated from price increases is proving very difficult and this is particularly relevant to permit sales. The table provides examples of the reduced sales that might be experienced over a range of potential increased charges. However, these resistance factors are for illustrative purposes only and the actual permit sales resulting from any price increases could be different from those assumed in the above table.

This report therefore does not include any proposals for increasing permit charges for 2010/11.

3.4 On-Street Pay and Display Charges

Last year's Annual Review of Parking Fees and Charges approved increases in the Up to 1 hour tariff on all car parks from 0.90p to £1.00. This resulted in Cabinet also approving a recommendation to confirm that the City Council recommended that Lancashire County Council increases the Lancaster on-street pay and display charges for 2008/09 in order to maintain differential charging. This was to ensure that on-street charges were higher than off-street charges to reduce on-street traffic circulation looking for parking places and to encourage greater use of off-street car parks.

This recommendation was passed to the County Council but the charges were never increased due to concerns about the economic climate. Officers have been making representations to County Council officers regarding this issue and it is understood

that the matter is being investigated. This report therefore includes a specific recommendation for further representations to be made to the County Council.

For information, the proposed increased charges are again shown in the following table:

Charges	Current	Recommended
Tariff 1 Castle Hill (spaces for TIC)	Up to ½ hour – 50p	Up to ½ hour – 60p
Tariff 2 e.g. Dalton Square/ Church Street	Up to ½ hour – 50p Up to 1 hour - £1.00	Up to ½ hour – 60p Up to 1 hour - £1.20
Tariff 3 e.g. Robert street/ Quarry Road	Up to 1 hour - £1.00	Up to 1 hour - £1.20
Tariff 4 e.g. High Street/ Queen Street	Up to 1 hour - £1.00 Up to 2 hours - £2.00	Up to 1 hour - £1.20 Up to 2 hours - £2.00 (No change)

4.0 Details of Consultation

The local Chambers of Commerce and of Trade and Morecambe Town Council have been consulted over the pay and display options included in the report and their comments will be made available at the meeting.

On-Street pay and display charges are the responsibility of Lancashire County Council and discussions have already been held with County Council officers over last year's recommendations not being implemented and the potential impact this has on traffic management issues in Lancaster city centre.

5.0 Options and Options Analysis (including risk assessment)

The following options for pay and display have been put forward for consideration and should be considered along with all the background information included in this report.

5.1 Option 1

This option is not to implement any parking fees and charge increases in 2010/11.

The annual review of parking fees and charges is an opportunity for the City Council to review parking charges inline with budgetary commitments and the aims and objectives of the parking strategy. The revenue from parking is an important source of revenue for the Council and it assists with maintaining and continuing to improve the parking service that is provided. Although parking usage and pay and display income has been fairly positive in the present economic climate there is no evidence to suggest that usage and income would increase as a result of not increasing parking fees and charges. This option therefore does not meet the budgetary commitment included in the 2010/11 Draft Budget.

In terms of the budgetary position within the off-street parking service, reductions in excess of £60k have already been included in the 2010/11 draft budget through a combination of efficiency savings and the new CPE arrangements previously approved by Cabinet. Funding the shortfall from the remaining off-street parking budgets is likely to result in no reactive or planned maintenance or minor improvements being carried out during 2010/11 on the 2,900 spaces that are provided on 43 car parks throughout the district, for which there is currently a combined budget totalling £61.4K. This is contrary to the parking strategy that includes an objective to provide a high quality service through a number of objectives that can only be delivered through the proactive management of maintenance budgets. This will also have health and safety implications and increase the risk of accidents and personal injury claims arising from not being able to respond to reported faults and the twice yearly condition assessments that are undertaken. It is not possible to quantify the cost of any additional claims but these could have the potential for exceeding the required budget shortfall/maintenance savings.

It is therefore likely that this option would result in the revenue shortfall having to be met from another Service or function of the Council. As it falls outside of the current budget framework, if taken forward this option would need to form part of Cabinet's budget proposals, for subsequent consideration and approval by Council.

5.2 Option 2

This option is aimed primarily at achieving the budgetary target that has been included in the 2010/11 Draft Budget whilst being consistent with the aims of the Parking Strategy.

Short Stay Car Parks	Current Tariff	Proposed Tariff	Additional Income
Increase Up to 2 hour tariff	£1.60	£1.80	£60,000

This option achieves the budgetary commitment with estimated additional income of £60,000. This option only increases one pay and display tariff and minimises the increases to local parking charges and reduces the risk of adverse customer resistance. The Short Stay up to 2 hour tariff has not been increased since 2006/07 although it was increased briefly to £1.70 in April and May 2008. This supports the parking strategy's hierarchy of firstly residents closely followed by visitors, shoppers and local businesses. This increase is not considered to be detrimental to the strategy's aim of maintaining 85% occupancy at busy times in short stay car parks.

5.3 Option 3

This option is aimed at exceeding the budgetary target that has been included in the 2010/11 Draft Budget whilst still being consistent with the aims of the Parking Strategy.

Short Stay Car Parks	Current Tariff	Proposed Tariff	Additional Income
Increase Up to 2 hour tariff	£1.60	£1.80	£60,000
Increase Up to 3 hour tariff	£2.40	£2.50	£9,500

This option exceeds the budgetary commitment with estimated additional income of £9,500. This option limits the proposed increases to two pay and display tariffs with the additional Short Stay Up to 3 hour tariff that has not been increased since 2006/07, some 4 years ago. This option has a slightly increased risk of customer resistance but this has already been taken into account in the potential income table highlighted in paragraph 3.1.

Again this option is not considered to be detrimental to achieving the parking strategy's aim of maintaining 85% occupancy at busy times in short stay car parks. It is logical that short stay tariffs will have to be increased periodically but increasing two tariffs once in 4 years recognises the importance of the parking hierarchy that gives priority to residents closely followed by shoppers, visitors and local businesses.

6.0 Officer Preferred Option (and comments)

The officer preferred option is Option 3 as this exceeds the budgetary commitment, limits the number of pay and display price increases and inherent risks whilst also still being consistent with the aims and objectives of the parking strategy.

RELATIONSHIP TO POLICY FRAMEWORK

Corporate Plan 2009/10 –

Off-street parking contributes to the Medium term Objective of ensuring a strategic approach to economic development and regeneration and the key corporate health performance indicator of keeping the City Council's element of Council Tax increases to acceptable levels. The level of funding for maintenance and improvements also allows off-street parking to contribute to making our district an even safer place by reducing crime and anti-social behaviour through various initiatives with partners and stakeholders.

District Parking Strategy Aim 5 -

To set parking charges to meet the Council's transportation policy objectives and budget commitments.

CONCLUSION OF IMPACT ASSESSMENT

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

Direct links with the Lancaster District Local Strategic Partnership (LSP) – Travel and Access and indirect links with Using Resources Wisely and Economy and Work. Off-street and on-street parking charges can contribute to community safety in terms of road safety. Also the off-street parking service is involved with various vehicle and personal security initiatives with partners and stakeholders.

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

The financial consequences and risks associated with parking income are included in this report and have also been reported in previous reviews. Inflationary increases totalling £16,700 and reduced permit income of £43,300 arising in 2009/10 have been included as part of the 2010/11 Budget Process. The increase in the standard VAT rate from 15% to 17.5% from 1st January 2010 recently confirmed by the Chancellor of the Exchequer has also been taken into account in preparing the 2010/11 Draft Budget.

With Option 1 there is no evidence to suggest that car park usage would increase and there is a very strong possibility that income would be very similar to 2009/10, therefore not meeting the budget commitment included in the current 2010/11 Draft Budget. In addition expenditure budgets contained within the 2010/11 Draft Budget already includes recurring savings in excess of £60K (through a combination of efficiency savings and the new CPE arrangements implemented in early September 2009), thereby reducing further flexibility to meet the current target through alternative means other than increasing tariffs as outlined in options 2 and 3. With the other 2 options it should be noted that these estimates carry an inherent risk due to various assumptions regarding resistance factors and any differing trend will inevitably impact on the actual income raised.

Options Summary

	Option 1	Option 2	Option 3
Budgetary Requirement (Inflation/Permit Shortfall)	(60,000)	(60,000)	(60,000)
Pay & Display Income	-	(60,000)	(69,500)
Total Budget Shortfall/(Surplus)	60,000	-	(9,500)

As the table suggests, Option 1 will not meet the budgetary requirement and members need to be aware that approving this option will impact on the need to make more savings or generate further additional income in other areas of activity. As it falls outside of the budget, Cabinet could not adopt this option without it forming part of the budget proposals, for final approval by Council.

Option 2 will meet the budgetary requirement and limits increases to one pay and display tariff. Option 3 adds a second pay and display tariff increase and is estimated to exceed the current draft budgetary requirement by £9,500.

The implementation of increased on-street pay and display charges by the County Council is primarily a traffic management issue and although this should encourage greater use of car parks it is not possible to quantify this in financial terms.

SECTION 151 OFFICER'S COMMENTS

Members are advised to consider any savings or growth proposals in context of their proposed priorities, relevant existing or emerging policy, and the Council's financial prospects.

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.

BACKGROUND PAPERS

Property Services Working File
2010/11 Draft Budget

Contact Officer:

David Hopwood

Telephone: 01524 582817

E-mail: dhopwood@lancaster.gov.uk

Ref:

CABINET

**Roman Bath House & Vicarage Field, Lancaster
19 January 2010**

Report of Corporate Director (Regeneration)

PURPOSE OF REPORT			
To advise cabinet on the condition of the Roman Bath House and surrounding land and to seek future funding to improve and maintain that condition.			
Key Decision	X	Non-Key Decision	Referral from Cabinet Member
			X
Date Included in Forward Plan		January 2010	
This report is public			

RECOMMENDATIONS OF COUNCILLOR THOMAS

- (1) That cabinet consider the proposals to improve the maintenance of the Roman Bath House and surrounding land in the light of emerging priorities of improving the cultural heritage of the district.
- (2) If cabinet approve proposals to improve the maintenance proposals as in recommendation (1) a general fund revenue growth bid for funding will need to be included in the current budget process for an amount of £17,700 in 2010/11 and £2,000 per annum in subsequent years.

1.0 Introduction

- 1.1 Roman Bath House and Vicarage Field are situated to the north of Lancaster Castle and Priory Church. The land was part of the historic vicarage glebe lands and was sold to the Borough of Lancaster c.1948 by the Priory Church. The site is a Scheduled Monument no. 34987 comprising of 'Part of a Roman fort and its associated vicus (civilian settlement) and remains of a pre-Conquest monastery and a Benedictine priory on Castle Hill'.
- 1.2 Salvage excavations on the eastern part of the Mitre Yard site in 1973 revealed the remains of a hypocausted, stone-built structure of at least two structural phases. Few details could be salvaged, but a second-century and/or later date seems likely. In view of the building's character, and its proximity to the eastern defences of the early Roman forts, it has been interpreted as a military bath house, presumably associated with either the second fort of the first half of the second century AD, and/or the putative third fort of the later 2nd to 3rd century. There is a complex

sequence of buildings in this area, and it is conceivable, though it cannot be proven, that this was the bath house that is recorded on an inscription as having been rebuilt c AD 262-266 after it had collapsed through age. There were indications that the building had replaced one or more timber structures on the same site. The extant section of the 'wery wall' is a part of a bastion that formed part of the roman fort constructed c.330AD.

- 1.3 The Bath House is showing signs of some deterioration to the remaining structure as is the adjoining wery wall. The protective fencing that surrounds the Bath House is in poor condition as is the interpretive signboard which has been badly vandalised. These issues were raised initially by the Young Archaeologists Club who have been assisting with the cleaning and minor maintenance of the site.
- 1.4 The surrounding land is now in very poor condition. It is deteriorating into scrubland with very long grass, self set saplings are thriving as is Japanese knotweed whilst many mature trees need maintenance to improve the area and the amount of light that is available at the Bath House. Only minimal maintenance is now carried out consisting of 16 cuts during the annual growing season within the Bath House fenced area only.
- 1.5 As a result, English Heritage has identified the property on their Heritage at risk register. The entry in the 2009 North West heritage at risk register states that the condition is generally satisfactory but with minor localised problems. The principal vulnerability is shrub / tree growth. The trend in condition is described as declining.
- 1.6 As emerging council priorities lead towards improving the cultural heritage offer of the district, the condition of one of the main attractions can only detract from this and be counter productive.

2.0 Proposal Details

- 2.1 A number of surveys have been carried out which have identified that the following work is required (individual estimates are identified):
 - The felling of sycamore and elderberry trees together with some crown raising works to prevent overhanging and to open up views of the site; removal and treatment of Japanese knotweed; weekly mowing of Vicarage Field during the growing season (which will have a significant impact on reducing knotweed); regular mowing of adjoining Castle Hill areas to prevent the establishment of scrubland (£3500)
 - Maintenance works to the fencing surrounding the Bath House (£2,900)
 - Replace the interpretive signage (£800)
 - Consolidate the fabric of the Bath House and wery wall (£10,500)
- 2.2 The estimated cost of these works would be approximately £17,700 in 2010/11. In future years this amount should reduce to £2000 per annum for grounds maintenance (estimated at £1,700) and any minor works that would be necessary to maintain signs, fencing etc. (estimated at £300). It is anticipated that should there be a greater promotion of the area as a result of the council's emerging priorities that this would bring more people to site which would help with a degree of self policing and thereby reducing the need to maintain the different elements because of vandalism or misuse.

- 2.3 The proposals would require a reversal of the council's existing "policy" for the area which is one of limited maintenance as a result of budget reductions in previous years.

3.0 Details of Consultation

- 3.1 This report has been prepared with the assistance of those council services which have an input to the maintenance of the area. In addition the discussions have involved the council's conservation officer, the County Council's museum and archaeological staff. Initial discussion has been held with representatives of English Heritage
- 3.2 Ward councillors have been consulted and raised concerns that the proposed maintenance regime on Vicarage Field in particular would be detrimental to the wildlife amenity of the area if for example the grass was cut too frequently and to a low level. Grounds Maintenance have agreed that 16 cuts a year would be applied to specific areas only and other parts of Vicarage Fields left as wild life havens.

4.0 Options and Options Analysis (including risk assessment)

- 4.1 Option 1 – That increased maintenance regimes to the Bath House and surrounding land are undertaken to ensure that the property would be of an appropriate standard to feature as one of the city's main historic attractions. This would require increased funding being made available and is a reversal of the council's previous views on the maintenance of the area. Despite increased funding for maintenance there remains a risk that because of the remote location of the site, there could still be some vandalism in the vicinity.
- 4.2 Option 2 – do nothing. This would result in the continued deterioration the site with council failing to meet the requirements that English Heritage place on the owners of monuments such as this. If the council is to improve promotion of the cultural heritage of the district, the current poor condition of one of the main attractions would detract from that and lead to public criticism. In addition there would be continued growth of species such as Japanese knotweed over areas of the site.

5.0 Officer Preferred Option (and comments)

- 5.1 Option 1 is preferred as this would lead to the consolidation and improvement of a major historic attraction in the district.

RELATIONSHIP TO POLICY FRAMEWORK

The Cabinet agreed at its meeting in November 2009 (minute no. 75) that for the purpose of forming the basis of the budget, the priorities for the revised corporate strategy for 2010-13 is to include Economic Regeneration supporting our local economy, with particular emphasis on heritage and cultural tourism for the District (City, Coast and Countryside) – to include creative industries and 'high end' employment too.

CONCLUSION OF IMPACT ASSESSMENT

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

If maintenance does not take place at the Roman Bath House and surrounding land, the historic assets would continue to be damaged by continued growth of vegetation in the area whilst the impact of lack of maintenance on the Roman Bath House structure would cause further deterioration impacting on the tourism potential of the area.

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

The history relating to budgets in respect of the Roman Bath House and Vicarage Field is set out in the report. No existing funding is in place to maintain these facilities other than £100 per annum for mowing within the Bath House fenced area only, yet heritage and cultural tourism is identified as a priority for the period 2010-13.

If members support option 1 the associated additional funding requirements of £17,700 in 2010/11 (£3,500 for grounds maintenance and £14,200 for general repairs and maintenance) and £2,000 per annum thereafter (£1,700 for grounds maintenance and £300 for general repairs and maintenance) will need to be treated as growth in the future years' budgets and therefore be considered further as part of the 2010/11 budget process.

SECTION 151 OFFICER'S COMMENTS

Members are advised to consider any growth proposals in context of their proposed priorities, relevant existing or emerging policy, and the Council's financial prospects. In particular, this is to ensure that value for money is considered, as well as affordability.

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.

BACKGROUND PAPERS

None

Contact Officer: Graham Cox
Telephone: 01524 582504
E-mail: gcox@lancaster.gov.uk
Ref: N/A

CABINET

**Cabinet Appointments to Outside Bodies
19 January 2010**

Report of Chief Executive

PURPOSE OF REPORT			
To consider the Cabinet appointment to the Local Government Association Coastal Issues Special Interest Group.			
Key Decision	<input type="checkbox"/>	Non-Key Decision	<input type="checkbox"/>
		Officer Referral	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Date Included in Forward Plan	N/A		
This report is public			

OFFICER RECOMMENDATION:

(1) That Cabinet considers its appointment to the Local Government Association Coastal Issues Special Interest Group.

1.0 Introduction

1.1 Members will recall that, at the meeting on 6 June 2009, Cabinet considered its appointments to Outside Bodies, Partnerships and Boards. Cabinet resolved to appoint Councillor Archer (Portfolio Holder for the Economy) to the LGA Coastal Issues Special Interest Group.

2.0 Proposal Details

2.1 It is appropriate for appointments to be closely aligned to cabinet responsibilities. The objectives in the terms of reference for the LGA Coastal Issues Special Interest Group (Appendix A) list environmental, as well as economic and social issues.

2.2 In order to better align appointments with Cabinet members' portfolios, Cabinet is therefore asked to consider whether Councillor Archer should remain as the appointed Cabinet Member to the LGA Coastal Issues Special Interests Group.

3.0 Options and Options Analysis (including risk assessment)

3.1 Option 1: To note existing arrangements and make no amendment to the representative on the LGA Coastal Issues Special Interests Group.

3.2 Option 2: To replace the Cabinet Member with responsibility for the Economy with the Cabinet Member with responsibility for the Environment to serve on the LGA Coastal Issues Special Interests Group.

3.3 Option 3: Another option as proposed by Cabinet.

4.0 Officer Preferred Option (and comments)

4.1 There is no officer preferred option, however, it is recommended that appointments to outside bodies be aligned as closely as possible to individual Cabinet Members' portfolios.

RELATIONSHIP TO POLICY FRAMEWORK

The 2009-12 Corporate Plan notes 'Leading our Communities' as one of Lancaster City Council's core values. Representation on outside bodies forms part of this Community Leadership role.

CONCLUSION OF IMPACT ASSESSMENT

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

Lack of appropriate representation on the LGA Coastal Issues Special Interest Group has the potential to impact on the coastal communities in the district.

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

There are no significant financial implications as a result of this report. Members appointed to outside bodies are entitled to travel expenses and these will be met from within existing budgets.

SECTION 151 OFFICER'S COMMENTS

Section 151 Officer has been consulted and has no comments

LEGAL IMPLICATIONS

There are no Legal implications arising directly from this Report.

MONITORING OFFICER'S COMMENTS

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

BACKGROUND PAPERS

Agenda and minutes of Cabinet meeting held on 2 June 2009

Contact Officer: David Watson

Telephone: 01524 582096

E-mail: dwatson@lancaster.gov.uk

Ref: Cabinet/Jan09

LGA Coastal Issues Special Interest Group
(Extract from Terms of Reference)

Objectives:

The Objectives of the Coastal Issues Special Interest Group ("the Group") are:

- To increase awareness and debate at a national and European Level of environmental, economic and social issues and concerns that directly affect or which may so affect coastal, estuarine and maritime communities;
- To act as a focus for liaison between local authorities and other bodies representing coastal, estuarine and maritime interests;
- To secure improved cross-departmental co-ordination with Government on coastal, estuarine and maritime issues with a view to ensuring consistency in policy and the provision of resources.
- To work in partnership with other organisations with complimentary aims.

CABINET

Reorganisation of the Facilities Management function 19 January 2010

Report of Corporate Director (Regeneration)

PURPOSE OF REPORT				
To seek approval from cabinet for a new corporate approach to Facilities Management across the Council.				
Key Decision	X	Non-Key Decision		Referral from Cabinet Member
Date Included in Forward Plan		January 2010		
This report is public, however the appendix is exempt from publication by virtue of paragraphs 1 and 2, of Schedule 12A of the Local Government Act 1972				

RECOMMENDATIONS OF COUNCILLOR THOMAS

- (1) That approval be given to the principles of a reorganisation of the facilities management function as set out in option 2, and that if such approval is agreed, a further report be presented to cabinet on the full implications of the proposals following discussions with the County Council regarding shared services.

1.0 Introduction

- 1.1 At the meeting of cabinet on 23 June 2009, it was resolved:

(1) That officers are instructed to prepare a draft specification for the provision of facilities management functions on behalf of the City Council.

(2) That energy management is given a high priority in order to facilitate the council's response to climate change and to reduce costs to the council.

- 1.2 Since the meeting, independent consultants, Cyril Sweett, have been appointed to consider the way forward and have reviewed the council's data, whilst interviewing staff and considering potential service providers.

2.0 Proposal Details

- 2.1 Attached at Appendix A is the report completed by Cyril Sweett. Part of their instruction was to make a presentation to cabinet of their findings and proposals for

the way forward, and arrangements have been made for Hugh Mulcahey to present these details to cabinet.

2.2 The report concludes:

- The internal team has a thorough working knowledge of the assets and is well placed to manage the provision of day-to-day repairs and maintenance and the provision of soft services. **Gap:** The efficiency of the provision of these services could be improved if there was clearer separation of hard and soft facilities management (FM) activities.
- Specialist activities such as Health and Safety and environmental performance management are conducted in-house, but staff do not have all the skills required to do this. This deflects team members from their core duties and poses risks to the Council. **Gap:** these services are best outsourced to third parties who have sufficient depth of resources and technical expertise.
- The capital works programme, including backlog maintenance and delivering more efficient accommodation have stalled. This is costing money and creating additional work for the in-house management team. **Gap:** Third party providers can deliver specialist real estate strategies for implementation. Other providers can deliver major programmes to fulfil in-house objectives.
- The Council's Technology Forge system is not being used to full extent. **Gap:** The Council needs to make data collection and inputting a higher priority and consider ways that better use of this system could produce savings to pay for ensuring that the system is populated with a wider range data and is kept up-to-date.

2.3 The main recommendations include:

- Implement the hard FM structure, including:
 - a. Restructure of internal property services team to separate hard and soft FM
 - b. Consideration of externalising other property services that were outside the scope of this review
- Develop a business case to evaluate the procurement of the bundles referred to in the report which includes:
 - a. Detailed costs and risks
 - b. Partnership structures
 - c. Procurement routes
- Enlist critical friend(s) to advise on the approach to strategic asset management
- Establish a dialogue with potential public sector partners to understand skills, overlaps and gaps so the potential for sharing services can be evaluated.

3.0 The Way Forward

- 3.1 In respect of the wider issues of property management, the report comments about the potential to consider how to approach strategic asset management and to consider externalising other property services that were outside the scope of this review.

- 3.2 This approach is not considered to be appropriate for the city council as it results in segregation of the asset management function. Local authority good practice has resulted in the centralisation of the asset management function rather than to consider a silo approach. The council has gradually moved towards this position over a number of years and the recently approved Medium Term Corporate Property Strategy supports this. In addition the recent decision of the LSP to create a public sector assets group for Lancaster adds further support to retaining this approach so that all public sector bodies in the district can be fully advised on strategic property issues. It is therefore considered that the council retains a joined-up approach to its property services as a general principle.
- 3.3 The detail of a service structure would need further detailed consideration, as the proposals do result in the removal of the administrative support from within the service with the proposal to re-designate estates assistants to a more hands-on maintenance role. Whilst it is acknowledged that the maintenance function does need much greater resource, preferably at no additional cost, administrative support will still be necessary for all areas of the service.
- 3.4 To enable this to take place, it is suggested that there would need to be a greater integration of the sections of the service to utilise the skills of staff in different sections, and that a wider review of the structure of the service is therefore appropriate.
- 3.5 In considering how to procure the services as indicated in 2.3 above, the council could either consider outsourcing the work to a private sector partner or consider the shared service agenda which the government currently prefers.
- 3.6 As part of this agenda, the emphasis is on “place” where the move is towards all partners sharing services. This is supported by the recent LSP decision as referred to in 3.2 above. To promote this agenda, it is understood that there could be funding available from the government for which the partners could apply.
- 3.7 As part of the report, Cyril Sweett spoke to a number of service providers. This included the County Council who indicated that they could undertake all of the works that are included within the city council’s list of requirements.
- 3.8 The county council have also shown a willingness to promote the shared services agenda in Lancaster with the potential for the relocation of staff into the district. This would have an accommodation requirement and bearing in mind the city council’s approved policy of rationalising its property portfolio, government funding could be available to assist this process. In addition such funding could potentially also be used to contribute towards putting the shared service together.

4.0 Details of Consultation

- 4.1 Selected staff were interviewed as outlined in the report, whilst there have been discussions with potential service providers as outlined in the Cyril Sweett report to determine their ability to provide the service and their interest in doing so.

5.0 Options and Options Analysis (including risk assessment)

- 5.1 Option 1 – do nothing. This would result in the existing level of service provision being maintained. This will leave the Council at risk of failing to provide the most effective and efficient maintenance service and not achieving any progress in

implementing its carbon management policies. A full risk analysis of risks is provided on page 37 of the Cyril Sweett report.

5.2 Option 2 – to retain the hard (reactive maintenance) facilities management function in an efficient way would require some clarification of roles and reporting lines within the existing service and would allow the council to concentrate on those areas of work that it does best. This includes retaining the strategic/“client” function, soft (caretaking) facilities management functions, reactive maintenance and data management whilst it would also benefit from a wider review of the service to ensure that the most efficient use is made of available resources. All major works and planned maintenance would be outsourced as would any specialist and statutory roles including energy management, health and safety roles etc. It is suggested that the outsourcing arrangements should be in the form of a partnering arrangement with the County Council and that discussions should be held with the County Council to this effect and a further report be brought back to cabinet on the outcome of these discussions. A full risk analysis of risks is provided on page 37 of the Cyril Sweett report.

5.3 Option 3 – to outsource a fully managed service with the transfer of staff into an external managed service. This would result in retaining the strategy function and the soft facilities management services only. All major works, planned and reactive maintenance, data management and specialist and statutory roles would be outsourced. A full risk analysis of risks is provided on page 37 of the Cyril Sweett report.

6.0 Officer Preferred Option (and comments)

6.1 The officer preferred option is option 2.

RELATIONSHIP TO POLICY FRAMEWORK

There are no direct links to the Corporate Plan, but the provision of efficient and effective facilities management services underpin the provision of many services of the Council.

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

The provision of facilities management services affect the operation of all the Council’s buildings and therefore any future provider of these services will need to be conscious of the need to reflect sustainable practices in their work

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

There are no immediate financial implications arising from this report. If Members resolve to go with Option 2, Property Services will need to undertake further analysis/work in conjunction with Financial Services to determine the full financial and operational implications. The outcome of this will need to be included within the proposed arrangements and will be reported back to Cabinet before any formal contractual/partnership commitment is entered into with the County Council or a third party.

The report acknowledges also that there will be a need to consider the matter further in accordance with the Council's financial regulations and procurement rules.

SECTION 151 OFFICER'S COMMENTS

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

LEGAL IMPLICATIONS

There are no legal implications arising directly from this report.

MONITORING OFFICER'S COMMENTS

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

BACKGROUND PAPERS

Previous cabinet reports and minutes

Contact Officer: Graham Cox
Telephone: 01524 582504
E-mail: gcox@lancaster.gov.uk
Ref: N/A

By virtue of paragraph(s) 1, 2 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A
of the Local Government Act 1972.

Document is Restricted

By virtue of paragraph(s) 3 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A
of the Local Government Act 1972.

Document is Restricted

By virtue of paragraph(s) 3 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A
of the Local Government Act 1972.

Document is Restricted