



Lytham Town Council

Minutes - Extraordinary Council Meeting - Monday 14th September 2026

Minutes of the Council Meeting held:

Monday 14th September 2026, at 10:00am at Lytham Institute, 27 Clifton St, Lytham, FY8 5EP

Present: Councillors Suzanne Bramall (Chair), Mark Bamforth (Vice-Chair), Edward Cook, Hilary Warburton, Cath Powell, Kelly Farrington, Amy Barnes, Simon Newell & Brenda Blackshaw. Cllr Aitken arrived at 10:41am.

Apologies received: Cllr Anne Aitken would be arriving late to the meeting

Officers: Clerk / RFO

Members of the Public: 2 members of the public were present in total at the start of the meeting.

No.	Agenda Item
PROCEDURAL MATTERS	
1.	Welcome, introduction, Audio Recording notice and Health & Safety. The meeting was audio recorded, and those in attendance were notified of this. The Clerk opened the meeting at 10:02am and confirmed that nine Members were present, with apologies received that Cllr Aitken would arrive later in the meeting. Two members of the public were also present. The Clerk confirmed that the agenda had been circulated on Wednesday 9th September 2026, in advance of the statutory 72-hour notice period, and that supporting documents had been circulated to Members in the preceding week.

	The Chair welcomed those present, including the members of the public, and noted that, as only two members of the public were in attendance, she proposed – subject to Members' agreement – to allow them to contribute at the appropriate point during discussion of relevant items, rather than reserving all public comment for item 8 (Public Participation). Members agreed to this approach.
2.	Declarations of Interest and Dispensations Cllr Blackshaw declared an interest in respect of item 4 (Christmas Lights Procurement), on the basis of a prior working relationship with Lightpool, arising from previous involvement in delivering Lytham's Christmas lights before this passed to the Lytham Business Partnership. She confirmed she had not worked with Lightpool for approximately the last three years. The Clerk advised that, as Cllr Blackshaw had no current personal, employment or financial connection to the company and had declared the interest openly, it was his assessment that this did not preclude her from participating in discussion or voting on the item, noting also that she had previously been tasked with leading the Council's engagement with Christmas lights matters. The Clerk confirmed the declaration, along with the earlier record of this connection noted in his previously circulated report (the interest not having required formal declaration at any prior meeting), would be reflected in the minutes. The Chair accepted this assessment. Clerk's Note - added 21/09/2026 whilst finalising draft minutes: For clarity and completeness of the public record, Cllr Blackshaw's declared interest has been considered against Fylde Council's adopted Code of Conduct for Members (effective 25 April 2022), which retains both the statutory Disclosable Pecuniary Interest (DPI) regime (Localism Act 2011, ss.29-34, and the Relevant Authorities (Disclosable Pecuniary Interests) Regulations 2012) and a locally adopted personal/prejudicial interest regime at Appendix 3 of the Code. No DPI arose, as none of the prescribed categories at Appendix 2 were engaged. A personal interest under Appendix 3, paragraph A3.1.1(i) of the Code arises only where a decision might reasonably be regarded as affecting the Member's own financial position or well-being, or that of a close associate. As Cllr Blackshaw confirmed she had had no financial or working relationship with Lightpool for approximately three years, no personal interest arose on the facts as declared, and accordingly no prejudicial interest issue fell to be considered. Cllr Blackshaw was therefore correctly entitled to participate in discussion and voting on this item, on the basis of the interest as declared.
3.	Approval of Minutes Not considered at this meeting, given the recent proximity of the Full Council meeting held on Wednesday 9th September 2026.

	Brief agenda overview by Chair Noted for the record: the Chair proposed taking item 4 (Christmas Lights Procurement) later in the meeting to allow Cllr Aitken to join the discussion, with Members' agreement to proceed with the remaining items first. These minutes the actual running order of the numbered agenda items (1-3, 5-7, 4) in how the minutes are sequenced.
5.	Terms of Reference - Working Groups The Chair introduced this item, noting that Council was asked to receive and consider draft Terms of Reference for the Environment & Maintenance, Community Engagement, and Clerk Management Team Working Groups. The Clerk advised that he had not had sufficient time since the Full Council meeting on 9th September 2026 to finalise and cross-check all three documents and requested that the item be withdrawn and instead considered at the Full Council meeting on 14th October 2026, once the documents had been circulated to Members in advance. He noted that, as Members had not yet seen all three documents, it would not be appropriate to enter into detailed discussion at this meeting. The Chair agreed to the item being withdrawn on this basis.
6.	Risk Register To receive, note and consider the most recent review of the Risk Register for Lytham Town Council. The Clerk introduced the item, explaining that compiling and maintaining the Risk Register was his responsibility, but that it was for Council to review it periodically to demonstrate appropriate governance and satisfy itself that risks and mitigations were properly captured. He confirmed the current version had been circulated to Members on Friday and talked Members through the document by section: Governance, Financial, Data Security, Health & Safety, Community Engagement, Allotments and Assets, and Events. Key points raised in discussion of individual risks included: • Loss of Clerk (illness/injury) - Risk G1A: The Clerk had added this risk, given the Council's reliance on a single employee, assessed initially as high (likelihood 4, impact 5, raw score 16). Mitigations included adoption of the Training & Development Policy (considered later on the agenda), including continuity and succession planning provisions requiring the Clerk to maintain accessible records (e.g. system passwords, key contacts) with a nominated custodian, to enable continuity in the event of his incapacity. With mitigations applied, the residual risk was reduced to low. • Allotments (Mythop Road): The Clerk confirmed this remained a high-risk pending completion of the transfer, but would reduce to low once full information was received; an email exchange on this was ongoing. • Legal risk - asset transfer: Assessed as high pending appointment of an independent solicitor, reducing to low once appointed and the transfer properly managed. • Christmas Lights procurement and K6 telephone kiosks: Both added as new lines pending the Council's decisions on these matters. The Clerk confirmed initial research valued the three kiosks at approximately £10,000 for insurance purposes, and that he was in discussion with the Council's insurer, Zurich, to confirm cover and any premium implications in both unrestored and restored condition.

	• First Aid at Work: Risk reduced following First Aid training completed by the Clerk and Cllr Cook, now assessed as low as reasonably practicable. • Children's play areas: Cllr Powell queried why this risk was rated high given the Council currently holds no such assets. The Clerk confirmed this was included as a forward-looking placeholder only, noting the significant statutory inspection regime (weekly, monthly and annual inspections) that would apply should such assets ever be transferred to the Council, as seen in neighbouring parishes. • Community engagement / volunteering: The Clerk confirmed that any future volunteer-led events (citing the recent street planter hanging, supported by Cllr Cook) would be individually risk-assessed as they arose. • Removal of planters/banners: Cllr Cook raised the need to plan for future removal of planters and banners; the Clerk confirmed this work would be commissioned, either through contractors or further risk-assessed volunteer activity. • Financial - fraud/misappropriation: The Chair queried this risk. The Clerk confirmed this had been identified through the internal audit process, and that existing financial checks and controls reduced the risk to medium, assessed as low as reasonably practicable. • Cllr Cook queried the audit process; the Clerk confirmed the internal audit notice was published on the Council's website, and that a similar notice would be published following completion of the external audit, to be carried out by PKF Littlejohn, appointed nationally for small councils. • Cllr Farrington suggested a formatting improvement to the Risk Register, recommending that the initial and residual (post-mitigation) risk ratings be positioned adjacent to one another for ease of reference. The Clerk agreed to amend the format accordingly. Moved by: Cllr Bamforth. Seconded: Cllr Warburton RESOLVED: That Council agrees and adopts the Risk Register. Decision - Unanimously agreed
7.	Policies To receive and consider the following draft policies • Employment Policy • Training & Development Policy The Council received and considered two draft policies: the Employment Policy and the Training & Development Policy. The Clerk explained that the Employment Policy set out the Council's foundational employment framework, including matters such as additional voluntary pension contributions, acceptable behaviour, and the distinction between the roles and responsibilities of employees, Councillors, and volunteers. On the Training & Development Policy, the Clerk explained that, under the Scheme of Delegation, he was responsible for managing the Council's training plan. He noted the upcoming local elections could bring changes to Council membership, and that the policy was intended to plan ahead for induction and training needs of new Councillors, informing future budget considerations. He

Decision Item 58/2026

confirmed the policy also addressed succession planning, both for his own temporary absence and for the process to be followed in the event the Clerk left or was unable to continue in post.

In discussion:

- Cllr Farrington queried the likely impact on training support from Fylde Council in light of Local Government Reorganisation (LGR), given that induction processes had historically been largely delivered by Fylde. The Clerk confirmed this remained unclear, noting Fylde's own staffing pressures, but that budgeting for training via national and local associations (including SLCC) would allow the Council to fill any gaps, and that he had tasked himself with developing a formal induction plan for new Councillors as part of the policy.
- Cllr Warburton highlighted the value of the LALC pre-election preparation course she had attended, and suggested this be recommended (though not mandated) to prospective and new Councillors going forward.
- Cllr Powell queried whether parish council elections were proceeding as normal despite LGR; the Clerk confirmed they were, that the Council would formally dissolve at the end of March 2027, and that the term of office was expected to default back to four years rather than the previously proposed five-year term.
- Cllr Blackshaw queried when the pre-election "purdah" period would begin; the Clerk confirmed this would be end of March, and that further detail had been published via a news article on the Council's website. The Clerk clarified that purdah restricts new policy decisions but does not prevent the Council from continuing its existing business, including statutory year-end financial processes.

The Chair raised whether ongoing capacity and resourcing pressures at Fylde Council – cited repeatedly over the preceding twelve months as a reason for delayed responses to the Town Council – should be reflected as a distinct risk on the Risk Register, particularly given the prospect of these pressures increasing during the LGR transition. Cllr Powell agreed this had been a recurring source of frustration. The Clerk confirmed this could be considered as part of the next scheduled review of the Risk Register. Members discussed the Council's wider approach to engagement with Fylde Council, including differing views on the merits of a more assertive versus collaborative approach, and noted the value of engaging with other parish and town councils across Fylde to share experiences, including via the District Parish Liaison Forum and directly as Members. The Clerk confirmed he was separately establishing contact with peer Clerks across Fylde.

AGREED: That the risk relating to Fylde Council's capacity and resourcing pressures, and its potential impact on the Town Council's ability to progress matters requiring Fylde's input, be added to the Risk Register for consideration at its next review, to be brought to the Full Council meeting on 14th October 2026.

Moved by: Cllr Powell. **Seconded:** Cllr Blackshaw

RESOLVED: That Council agrees and adopts the Employment Policy and the Training & Development Policy, with effect from today's date.

Decision - Unanimously agreed

Decision Item 59/2026

4. Christmas Lights 2026 Procurement - Tender Process

The Chair moved this item forward from its position on the agenda to allow Cllr Aitken, on arrival, to take part in the discussion, and confirmed that the two members of the public present would be permitted to contribute to discussion of this item as it progressed, given the small numbers attending.

The Council received the report from the Clerk regarding the outcome of the tender process for the 2026 Christmas Lights procurement, resolved at the Full Council meeting of 29th July 2026.

The Clerk summarised the process undertaken. Tenders had been invited from three suppliers – MK Illuminations, Blachere Illuminations, and Lightpool – of which two, Blachere and Lightpool, had responded; MK Illuminations did not respond. The Clerk confirmed that, while the Council was obliged to invite tenders, there was no obligation on suppliers to respond.

Blachere's submission included the originally specified purchase option, together with two additional hire options which had not formed part of the original tender specification, arising from a site visit; the Clerk had accepted this additional information for the Council's consideration while noting it fell outside the tender's original terms.

The Clerk explained that a dedicated tender inbox had been created for the process, which he was unable to access before the closing date, in line with standard anti-corruption practice, and which he had opened in the presence of two witnesses, Cllr Bamforth and the Chair, the Monday before this meeting. At that point, only Blachere's submission had been identified. Lightpool's tender, though submitted on time, had been routed to a junk folder and was not discovered until the following morning. The Clerk confirmed that, on discovering this, he had notified the Chair and Vice-Chair, and that the panel's evaluation marking had subsequently been redone to include Lightpool's submission, with each assessor marking independently, albeit not simultaneously with the original exercise. The Clerk stated that, while he did not consider this to have compromised the integrity of the process, he wished it recorded transparently for completeness.

The Clerk further confirmed that Cllr Blackshaw's prior working relationship with Lightpool, referenced under item 2 (Declarations of Interest), had been documented within the report, and that, notwithstanding her role leading the Council's Christmas Lights working group, she had not been included as one of the three assessors, in the interests of fairness and transparency.

The Clerk explained the evaluation methodology: each of the three assessors marked submissions against five criteria, with a minimum "acceptable" score required in each category for an option to pass. The two hire-based options put forward by Blachere failed to meet the acceptable threshold on value for money, as they would result in no residual asset for the Council at the end of the contract period – contrary to what the Clerk understood to be the Council's original intention in commissioning the tender, namely to acquire an asset rather than a one-off hired display.

Accordingly, three options were presented for Council's consideration: Blachere's full purchase option; Lightpool's full purchase option; and a reduced Blachere purchase option excluding the three illuminated column wraps for Henry Street and Dicconson Terrace, reflecting a significant cost discrepancy between the two suppliers for that specific item (£660 per unit from Lightpool against £5,550 per unit from Blachere). The Clerk confirmed he had not had time to investigate the basis for this discrepancy in

detail and could not offer a definitive explanation, other than to note it might reflect differing specifications or differing profit margins across suppliers' product ranges.

Costs:

Blachere Option 1) £34,788.30 ex VAT

Lightpool Option 2) £47,081.00 ex VAT

The Clerk confirmed that, based on the assessors' average scores, Lightpool's submission scored most highly overall and most closely met the tender specification, particularly regarding bespoke banner design; Blachere, by contrast, could not offer a bespoke design within the Council's timeline and would require selection from an existing catalogue of designs.

However, as Clerk, his own recommendation was Blachere's purchase option, on value-for-money grounds, being approximately £12,000 cheaper than Lightpool's equivalent offer.

He stated that he could not, and should not, weigh the relative importance of a bespoke design to the town against that cost saving, as this was a decision properly for Council. He confirmed Lightpool had indicated they could still deliver a bespoke design within the required timeline if a decision were made promptly, and had provided illustrative visuals, including a design referencing the Windmill, during early discussions.

The Clerk confirmed the Council could afford any of the three options presented, even accounting for expenditure already committed elsewhere, and that his recommendation did not bind Council to a particular decision.

He also noted, for completeness, that a fourth option existed – namely, not to proceed with the purchase at all – though this had not been included in the written report.

He confirmed the report would be published in full following the meeting, in the interests of transparency regarding the use of public funds, and reiterated that his own recommendation was made without any personal interest in the outcome, and that the main risk to the Council was of failing to make a timely decision within the delivery timeline required for the 2026 season.

Impact of Non-Decision

Cllr Newell asked what would happen to Christmas lighting in Lytham this year if Council did not reach agreement on a scheme. The Clerk confirmed, based on correspondence with Andrew Loynd at Fylde Council, that the existing Lytham Christmas light switch-on event would proceed regardless, as it had in previous years. The Chair clarified that the principal difference would be that the string lighting previously run along Clifton Street (attached post to post) would not be reinstated this year, as Fylde Council / Lancashire County Council had confirmed this method was no longer permitted on the new lamp posts; only fixtures suspended from

individual posts, such as the proposed illuminated banners, would be possible. The reason given for this restriction was not fully established during discussion, though Cllr Powell confirmed Fylde had been clear this was not permitted, and the Clerk noted his own prior understanding from Lancashire County Council was that lighting could not be strung across the carriageway.

Alternative: Lighting in Trees

Cllr Newell raised, having discussed with Cllr Warburton, whether trees along Clifton Street could instead be decorated with lighting, as seen effectively in Lytham Square. The Clerk confirmed this had not formed part of the tender specification, and noted the trees in question were not in Council ownership, raising permissions issues (potentially requiring agreement from Lancashire County Council and/or the private landowner). Cllr Newell disputed the premise that ownership was clearly established, referencing ongoing uncertainty (and potential legal action) regarding the ownership of highway trees in the town centre. Cllr Blackshaw and Cllr Powell both raised practical and safety concerns from previous experience of tree lighting on Clifton Street, including the cost and difficulty of removing lights for tree maintenance, and past incidents of lights becoming dislodged into the road in windy conditions, in contrast to more established, lower-risk tree lighting in Market Square.

Cost Comparison and Specification

Discussion covered the significant cost discrepancy between suppliers for the Henry Street/Dicconson Terrace column wraps (Lightpool: approximately £660 per unit; Blachere: approximately £5,500 per unit for three units, as previously clarified). Cllr Newell questioned whether the £35,000+ cost for banners represented good value given the physical scale of the product (banners of approximately 2.2m x 90cm). The Clerk acknowledged this was a fair observation.

Cllr Farrington sought clarification on the meaning of "bespoke" within the tender. The Clerk confirmed that a bespoke design meant Council could specify any design of its choosing (such as a design referencing the Windmill), rather than selecting from a fixed catalogue, and that Blachere had confirmed they could not deliver a bespoke design within the required timeline this year, though could do so for future years.

Councillor Preferences

Cllr Powell stated her preference for Lightpool, citing Lightpool's (Blackpool Illuminations') reputation, responsiveness (48-72 hour fault response), and relevant local expertise, while noting a reservation regarding general difficulty in making initial contact with the company. Cllr Blackshaw supported this view, citing her own long-standing working relationship with named Lightpool contacts and positive experience of their emergency response, and suggested advantages of continuity should Local Government Reorganisation (LGR) proceed. Cllr Barnes supported Lightpool on the basis of design quality and heritage sensitivity, noting the potential to build on this in future years, including eventual tree lighting.

Financing and Ongoing Costs

Cllr Cook queried whether the purchase could be financed over a longer period, and raised concerns regarding the ongoing costs of insurance, repairs, storage, and installation/de-installation in future years. The Clerk confirmed the Council had not explored loan

financing, that the intention was to fund the purchase in full within this year's budget (with VAT reclaimed), and that these ongoing cost elements were addressed within his report.

Cllr Farrington raised concerns that a bespoke design should not simply reproduce a generic Christmas design and questioned whether the intended designs justified the expenditure; the Clerk confirmed the illustrative visuals provided were indicative only, not final designs.

Discussion followed regarding the likely scale of future annual running costs (installation, de-installation, storage, and annual testing/certification), with the Clerk providing a working estimate of approximately £5,000 per year based on Lightpool's stated figures, noting that "free" storage was likely to be reflected elsewhere in pricing. Cllr Farrington emphasised the importance of Council understanding its likely ongoing financial commitment before proceeding, while confirming she was supportive of the scheme in principle.

Funding, Sponsorship and Grant Clarification

Considerable discussion took place regarding sponsorship and grant funding, and the relationship between the proposed new lighting and the existing lighting scheme run by Lytham Christmas/Lytham Business Partnership. Cllr Blackshaw referenced prior fundraising activity by local businesses, including a planned fundraising event at the Queen's Hotel, and past experience of a Fylde Council grant historically claimed by whichever organisation installed the town's Christmas lights. The Clerk confirmed, based on same-day email correspondence with Fylde Council officer Andrew Loynd, that as the Town Council was not organising the Christmas light switch-on event itself, any such grant would continue to be payable to Lytham Christmas/Lytham Business Partnership as the organiser of that event, and would not be payable to the Town Council in respect of the additional lighting being purchased. Cllr Bamforth confirmed he had separately sought clarification from Mr Loynd [Clerk Note: Cllr Bamforth left the meeting room for a few minutes to undertake a telephone conversation with Mr Loynd about this matter], who had indicated the grant would follow whoever formally installed and paid for "the" Christmas lights, and suggested written confirmation be sought. Members noted the need for clarity in writing from both Fylde Council and Lytham Business Partnership on this point, and agreed this represented a separate matter to be pursued outside of today's decision. Cllr Powell proposed, and Members agreed, that any potential grant funding be disregarded for the purposes of today's decision.

The Chair confirmed that, while Lytham Business Partnership had indicated in principle a willingness to hand over responsibility for the existing lighting scheme to the Town Council, this had not yet been confirmed in writing, and remained a separate matter for further discussion.

Public Participation (re Item 4)

A member of the public (Person A) raised a question regarding the ongoing costs and risk associated with owning versus hiring lighting assets, including the potential difficulty of finding a contractor willing to take on responsibility for maintaining previously-purchased stock in future tender rounds, and asked for clarification on storage arrangements and costs under each supplier. The Clerk confirmed that Blachere's quoted price included one year of storage at approximately £1,380, with costs potentially increasing in future years, while Lightpool's quotation included storage at no additional charge. The Clerk confirmed that both quotations

covered purchase, installation, maintenance while displayed, removal, and one year of storage, with future years' installation/removal costs to be determined via future tender or quotation processes.

Cllr Farrington noted that, in a commercial context, no responsible decision-maker would commit to a scheme with materially unknown future costs, and pressed for firmer estimates. The Clerk provided a working estimate of Blachere's likely year-two installation cost (approximately £1,500, based on a clearly itemised budget line within their tender), noting Lightpool's pricing was less transparently broken down.

Cllr Powell noted that ongoing costs of this nature applied regardless of which supplier or model the Council chose, citing precedent from Ansdell & Fairhaven Parish Council, whose approach and approximate storage costs (£180/month) the Chair had attempted, without full success, to establish as a comparator.

Deferral and Decision

Cllr Newell expressed the view that there were too many unresolved variables – including the future financial relationship with Fylde Council and Lytham Business Partnership, and the uncertain status of tree ownership – and proposed that a decision be deferred pending further information, whilst confirming he did not disagree in principle with the Council investing in enhanced town centre lighting.

Cllr Cook suggested directly approaching Lightpool informally to establish likely future-year costs; the Clerk advised strongly against this as inappropriate during an open tender process, and the Chair agreed.

Following extensive discussion, Cllr Powell proposed that Council had sufficient information to proceed to a vote, which was supported by Members present.

Resolutions

The Chair proposed the decision be taken in two stages: first, whether to proceed with procurement of Christmas lighting for 2026 at all; and, if resolved in the affirmative, which supplier to appoint.

Moved by: Cllr Powell. **Seconded:** Cllr Blackshaw

RESOLVED: That this Council resolves to purchase/procure Christmas lighting for 2026 in accordance with the tender process undertaken.

Decision - Resolved by majority

Decision Item 60/2026

Members voted:

For 7: AB/CP/BB/MB/AA/SB/KF.

Against 3: HW/SN/EC

The motion was carried.

No proposer came forward to nominate Blachere.

Moved by: Cllr Aitken. **Seconded:** Cllr Powell

RESOLVED: That this Council accepts the tender submission from Lightpool (Blackpool Illuminations) for the supply, installation, maintenance and one year's storage of Christmas lighting for 2026, at a cost of £47,081 (ex VAT).

Decision - Resolved by majority

Decision Item 61/2026

Members voted:

For 7: AB/CP/BB/MB/AA/SB/KF.

Against 1: HW

Abstention: SN/EC

(Cllr Newell, stated that he believed that on the basis that his vote against the first resolution made a vote either for or against the choice of supplier inconsistent with his position).

The motion was carried.

Next Steps

Following the vote, a member of the public (Person A) asked at what point Council would formally consider the ongoing costs of future reinstallation and the coordination of this scheme with the town's existing lighting arrangements. The Clerk confirmed that ongoing cost management would form part of his standard delivery planning, that Council would need to determine who would be involved in agreeing final banner designs, and that engagement with Lytham Business Partnership regarding the wider lighting arrangements was a separate matter to be picked up outside the immediate delivery timeline.

Members discussed and agreed that, for this year, the Council would not take on responsibility for the existing Christmas lighting currently managed by Lytham Business Partnership (including lighting in Lytham Square and on trees at Hastings Place), pending further clarity on the costs and liabilities involved, but that the Council would coordinate with Lytham Business Partnership to ensure a unified switch-on. The Clerk confirmed no such transfer would be taken on within the current financial year given budgetary constraints. Cllr Bamforth suggested planning for the 2027 scheme begin early in the new year, following removal of this year's display.

Clerk's Note:

For completeness of the public record, the Council's power to incur this expenditure is confirmed as follows.

Section 144(1)(a) of the Local Government Act 1972 empowers a local authority to encourage persons, by advertisement or otherwise, to visit its area for recreation purposes. Enhanced Christmas lighting in the town centre has consistently been treated by this and other local councils as falling within this power, on the basis that it serves to attract visitors and increase footfall, to the benefit of the local economy – a rationale reflected in the Council's own discussion of this item.

Council's decision to proceed with the purchase of Christmas lighting for 2026, and its appointment of Lightpool (Blackpool Illuminations) as supplier following a tender process conducted in accordance with the Council's Financial Regulations, was therefore lawfully made and within the Council's powers.

PUBLIC PARTICIPATION

8 Public Participation (Open Forum)

(Max 15 minutes, 3 minutes per speaker)

The Chair invited further questions from the public.

A member of the public, Person B, raised the Council's decision on the Christmas lights tender, and suggested it might be helpful for the Clerk to seek some form of written assurance or comfort from Lightpool regarding future pricing, given the Council's decision to accept their tender. The Clerk confirmed that, as Council had already resolved to accept the Lightpool tender, this could not be revisited, though the Chair confirmed there was no objection to raising the question informally as part of ongoing due diligence.

Person A then public sought clarification, following comments made at a previous meeting, on the distinction between a "parish plan" and the Town Council's own area of jurisdiction, noting he understood these to cover different areas. The Chair clarified that no such distinction in geographical coverage exists: the terms "parish council" and "town council" refer to the same type of authority, with a council entitled in law to elect to style itself a "town council" rather than a "parish council," and that Lytham Town Council had chosen to adopt the "town" designation to reflect the nature of the area. The Chair acknowledged that a previous comment suggesting a difference in coverage had been made in error.

FORWARD PLANNING	
15.	Date, Time & Location of Next Meeting Full Council Meeting: Wednesday 14 th October 2026 6:30pm Lytham Institute, 27 Clifton Street, Lytham, Lancashire, FY8 5EP
	The Chair thanked members of the public for attending Meeting Closed: 11:45am

The chair of this meeting believes that the minutes of the meeting of Lytham Town Council held on 14th September 2026 are a correct record and are confirmed as an accurate record of the proceedings.

Chair:

Date: