	Metamorphosis of managed workspace into incubator capacity by provision of value added services 'Development of 'grow on' space to compliment existing incubation programmes. Development programme & networking opportunities for incubator managers. On going policy development, research & best practice dissemination.

Lead Partner	**Business Link for West Yorkshire**
Contact Name	**Andrew Brocklehurst**
Address	**Business Link for West Yorkshire** **Unit 4 Meadow Court** **Millshaw** **Leeds** **LS11 8LZ**
Telephone	**0113 383 7795**
Email	**andrew.brocklehurst@wyin.co.uk**
Other key Partners	**Partners** Chambers of Commerce: (Leeds, Bradford, Mid-Yorkshire) University incubators: (Universities of Huddersfield, Leeds, Bradford & Leeds Met. University) West Yorkshire Incubation Network UK Business Incubation (UKBI) Bradford, Leeds, Wakefield & Kirklees local authorities

Linkages Please describe how this project links to other activity either existing or proposed through the Investment plan.	**Existing YF Programmes:** West Yorkshire Ventures (900567) Young Business Growth Programme (900569) Social Enterprise (900685) Bradford BIC (900544)

Project Timetable	
Development starts	July 2005
Project Start Date	September 2005
Project Finish Date	March 2009
Project Duration	3 ½ years
Risks	Contingent projects not progressing.

Outputs	
Jobs created	374
Jobs safeguarded	3
Businesses assisted	104 (assist) 215 (created)
Learning opportunities	49
Brownfield Land Reclaimed	Help to facilitate 18,000 sq ft of renovated mill building
Private Sector Investment	Included in table below
Land unlocked for development	n/a
Greenhouse gas reduction	n/a
Other –please specify	28 work placements

Impact	
Please describe other impacts the project will deliver	Increase of incubator capacity throughout West Yorkshire

Funding	2004/5	2005/6	2006/7	2007/8	2008/9	**Total**
Yorkshire Forward		1,106,266	859,920	1,132,220	815,740	**3,914,146**
EU Funds		58,235	52,105	21,455		**131,795**
Public sector match		167,668	167,668	173,798	24,520	**533,654**
HEIF		212,098				**212,098**
Rental income (PrSM)		26,482	61,300	86,433	109,114	**283,329**
Private sector match		44, 136	107,275	144,055	165,510	**416,840**
Total Cost		**1,570,749**	**1,248,268**	**1,557,961**	**1,114,884**	**5,491,862**

John Illingworth

06/01/2006 10:50

To: Ian Walton/CED/LCC@Leeds_City_Council
cc: Mark Turnbull/CED/LCC@Leeds_City_Council, Nicole Jackson/CED/LCC@Leeds_City_Council, Paul Brook/DVD/LCC@Leeds_City_Council, Stuart
Subject: Re: Access to Information Appeal

Dear Ian and others,

The date and time are OK for me.

The list of papers is central to the issue. One of my reasons for asking to see these documents was the growing suspicion in my mind that these papers did not exist, and that the Development Department was taking a highly risky, unresearched and virtually undocumented leap in the dark. Instead of acknowledging this situation (if it proves actually to be the case) the Department implied that various options had been explored, and that professional documentation existed but I could not have access to it. A labyrinthine referral procedure was introduced, which did not apply to any other elected member, whose principal effect was slow down any inquiries, and to obfuscate the Departmental response.

This is important because one of the arguments advanced by the Development Department for excluding proposals from ward members, local residents and the voluntary sector was that these groups could not produce fully costed and worked through alternative schemes. This assertion is implicit in the report to the Executive Board in December 2004, although the alternative proposals are not correctly described in this report. The Department simultaneously denied access to most of the background information that elected members and the voluntary sector would need in order to prepare such detailed alternative plans. The Departmental argument advanced to the Executive Board carries little weight if they were actually doing exactly what they accused the voluntary sector of doing, and embarking on a scheme without considering reasonable alternatives and without any clear idea of the likely outcome.

Throughout this entire business, right back to the time that I was a Lead Member, I have been concerned about the lack of documentation and detailed financial plans. I felt that figures were being "plucked from the air" and this now seems to be largely the case. I thought the Departmental proposals were unworkable, and said so. My doubts are acknowledged in the minutes. The lack of reasoned justification inevitably causes people to question whether the arguments advanced in support of the proposals were the real reasons, or whether there might be some additional, undocumented reasons for embarking on the scheme. It also crossed my mind, and I said this at the "call in" hearing, that there might be some undisclosed and wholly unacceptable "phase two" which would only be released after the Council was irrevocably committed to phase one, which subsequently got into financial difficulties. The Department strongly denied my suggestion, and this is recorded on the tapes.

I would like to incorporate this message into my written evidence to the Appeal hearing. I will add to it after I have seen the list of documents.

John Illingworth

Ian Walton

Ian Walton

06/01/2006 08:45

To: John Illingworth/MEM/LCC@Leeds_City_Council, Paul Brook/DVD/LCC@Leeds_City_Council
cc: Nicole Jackson/CED/LCC@Leeds_City_Council, Stuart Turnock/CED/LCC@Leeds_City_Council, Mark Turnbull/CED/LCC@Leeds_City_Council
Subject: Access to Information Appeal

Dear Councillor Illingworth/Paul Brook,
Arrangements have now been agreed for the Access to Information Appeal in relation to St Anne's Mills to be heard at 9.30 a.m. on 17th January. I have had some difficulty in securing this date, trust that it is acceptable, but please let me know as a matter of urgency if you have any difficulties.

I will be issuing a formal agenda sheet on Monday 9th January together with details of the appeals procedure. It would be helpful if this initial agenda could identify the documentation which is the subject of the appeal and it would seem appropriate, and I would be grateful if, Paul could provide this to me.
The main purpose of this message is to request that you both provide me with written submissions by Wednesday 11th January. On the one hand detailing the reasons as to why the information should be released and on the other the detailed reasons as to why access has been denied. Upon receipt of both submissions I will provide them to all parties involved in the appeal. This should give a clear starting point for the Panel, appellant and department at the hearing.
I trust that this message is clear and that the manner in which I propose to progress the matter is acceptable. If it is not then please let me know at the very earliest opportunity. Otherwise I look forward to receiving your submissions on the due date
Regards

Ian Walton
Principal Governance Officer
247 4350