



SCRUTINY BOARD (CITY DEVELOPMENT)

Meeting to be held in Civic Hall, Leeds on
Tuesday, 13th October, 2009 at 10.00 am

A pre-meeting will take place for ALL Members of the Board
in a Committee Room at 9.30 am

MEMBERSHIP

Councillors

S Armitage	-	Cross Gates and Whinmoor;
C Beverley	-	Morley South;
R Downes	-	Otley and Yeadon;
T Grayshon	-	Morley South;
R Harington	-	Gipton and Harehills;
M Lobley	-	Roundhay;
T Murray	-	Garforth and Swillington;
A Ogilvie	-	Beeston and Holbeck;
R Pryke (Chair)	-	Burmantofts and Richmond Hill;
D Schofield	-	Temple Newsam;
S Smith	-	Rothwell;
N Taggart	-	Bramley and Stanningley;
G Wilkinson	-	Wetherby;

Please note: Certain or all items on this agenda may be recorded on tape

Agenda compiled by:
Stuart Robinson
Governance Services
Civic Hall
LEEDS LS1 1UR
Tel: 24 74360

Principal Scrutiny Adviser:
Richard Mills
Tel: 24 74557

A G E N D A

Item No	Ward/Equal Opportunities	Item Not Open		Page No
1			<p>APPEALS AGAINST REFUSAL OF INSPECTION OF DOCUMENTS</p> <p>To consider any appeals in accordance with Procedure Rule 25 of the Access to Information Rules (in the event of an Appeal the press and public will be excluded).</p> <p>(*In accordance with Procedure Rule 25, written notice of an appeal must be received by the Chief Democratic Services Officer at least 24 hours before the meeting)</p>	
2			<p>EXEMPT INFORMATION - POSSIBLE EXCLUSION OF THE PRESS AND PUBLIC</p> <p>1 To highlight reports or appendices which officers have identified as containing exempt information, and where officers consider that the public interest in maintaining the exemption outweighs the public interest in disclosing the information, for the reasons outlined in the report.</p> <p>2 To consider whether or not to accept the officers recommendation in respect of the above information.</p> <p>3 If so, to formally pass the following resolution:-</p> <p>RESOLVED – That the press and public be excluded from the meeting during consideration of the following parts of the agenda designated as containing exempt information on the grounds that it is likely, in view of the nature of the business to be transacted or the nature of the proceedings, that if members of the press and public were present there would be disclosure to them of exempt information, as follows:-</p> <p>No exempt items or information have been identified on the agenda</p>	

Item No	Ward/Equal Opportunities	Item Not Open		Page No
3			<p>LATE ITEMS</p> <p>To identify items which have been admitted to the agenda by the Chair for consideration.</p> <p>(The special circumstance shall be specified in the minutes.)</p>	
4			<p>DECLARATION OF INTERESTS</p> <p>To declare any personal/prejudicial interests for the purpose of Section 81(3) of the Local Government Act 2000 and paragraphs 8 to 12 of the Members' Code of Conduct.</p>	
5			<p>APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE</p>	
6			<p>MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETINGS</p> <p>To receive and approve the minutes of the previous meetings held on 1st September 2009 and 16th September 2009.</p>	1 - 20
7			<p>PROVISION OF SHARED SPACE AND SHARED SURFACE STREETS</p> <p>To consider a report of the Head of Scrutiny and Member Development on the review of the Street Design Guide and the provision of shared space and shared surface streets.</p>	21 - 58
8			<p>INQUIRY TO REVIEW THE METHOD BY WHICH PLANNING APPLICATIONS ARE PUBLICISED AND COMMUNITY INVOLVEMENT TAKES PLACE - DRAFT TERMS OF REFERENCE</p> <p>To consider a report of the Head of Scrutiny and Member Development on the proposed draft terms of reference in relation to an inquiry to review the method by which planning applications are publicised and community involvement takes place.</p>	59 - 66

Item No	Ward/Equal Opportunities	Item Not Open		Page No
9			<p>PERFORMANCE WORKING GROUP</p> <p>To consider a report of the Head of Scrutiny and Member Development on the targets set by the Board's Performance Working Group held on 2nd September 2009.</p>	67 - 78
10			<p>LEGIBLE LEEDS PROJECT</p> <p>To consider a report of the Director of City Development on the Legible Leeds Project.</p>	79 - 84
11			<p>WORK PROGRAMME</p> <p>To consider the attached report of the Head of Scrutiny and Member Development regarding the Board's work programme, together with a copy of the Forward Plan of Key Decisions pertaining to this Board's Terms of Reference and the latest Executive Board minutes.</p>	85 - 116
12			<p>DATE AND TIME OF NEXT MEETING</p> <p>To note that the next meeting of the Board will be held on Tuesday 10th November 2009 at 10.00am (Pre –Meeting for Board Members at 9.30am)</p>	

Agenda Item 6

SCRUTINY BOARD (CITY DEVELOPMENT)

TUESDAY, 1ST SEPTEMBER, 2009

PRESENT: Councillor R Pryke in the Chair

Councillors S Armitage, C Beverley,
R Downes, T Grayshon, R Harington,
M Lobley, T Murray, A Ogilvie, D Schofield,
S Smith and N Taggart

30 Chair's Opening Remarks

The Chair welcomed everyone to the September meeting of the Scrutiny Board (City Development). He also welcomed Councillor S Armitage to her first Board meeting.

31 Declaration of Interests

RESOLVED – The following personal interests were declared:-

- Councillor R Downes in his capacity as Chair of the West Yorkshire Integrated Transport Authority (Agenda Items 8 and 11) (Minutes 35 and 37 refer)
- Councillor R Pryke as a regular user of Roundhay Road (Agenda Item 11) (Minute 37 refers)

32 Apologies for Absence

An apology for absence was received on behalf of Councillor G Wilkinson.

33 Minutes of the Previous Meetings

RESOLVED – That the minutes of the previous meetings held on 7th July 2009 and 5th August 2009 be confirmed as a correct record.

34 Request for Scrutiny - Need for Cost Benefit Analysis - Proposed Designated BBQ Area on Woodhouse Moor

Referring to Minute 19 of the meeting held on 7th July 2009, the Head of Scrutiny and Member Development submitted a report on a request for scrutiny in relation to a need for a cost benefit analysis regarding a proposed designated BBQ area on Woodhouse Moor.

Appended to the report was a copy of a letter entitled 'Protect Woodhouse Moor' dated 15th July 2009 addressed to the Head of Scrutiny and Member Development on behalf of the North Hyde Park Neighbourhood Association; South Headingley Community Association; Marlborough Residents' Association and Friends of Woodhouse Moor.

The reason for the request for scrutiny was the alleged "failure by Parks and Countryside to include in its report of 8 October 2008, a cost benefit analysis to enable meaningful comparisons to be made between enforcing the existing

Draft minutes to be approved at the meeting
to be held on Tuesday 13th October 2009

byelaws on Woodhouse Moor, and Parks and Countryside's preferred option of designated barbecue areas".

In addition to the above document, a copy of the report of the Director of City Development submitted to the Executive Board meeting on 26th August 2009 entitled 'Woodhouse Moor Park Barbecue Use' was circulated as supporting information.

The following representatives were in attendance and responded to Members' queries and comments:-

Councillor J Procter, Executive Board Member for Leisure
Jean Dent, Director of City Development
Mike Kinnaird, Recreation Project Manager, City Development
Sue Buckle, South Headingley Community Association
Bill McKinnon, Friends of Woodhouse Moor

The Chair informed the Board that Councillor A Carter, Executive Member for Development and Regeneration was not available to attend today's meeting having had a prior engagement.

The Chair stated that there had been a request that the Executive Board on 26th August 2009 defer consideration of the City Development department's report on the designated barbecue area, pending the outcome of the Scrutiny Board's deliberations today, but the Executive Board Member for Leisure had refused.

The Board also further noted that a subsequent request for scrutiny regarding byelaws on Woodhouse Moor had been received by the Head of Scrutiny and Member Development.

The Chair invited the above attendees to provide relevant background information and to highlight key issues in relation to the request for scrutiny and Board Members sought clarification on the points raised.

In summary, specific reference was made to the following issues:-

- clarification of the proposed layout of the designated barbecue area *(The Executive Member for Leisure responded and outlined the proposals in relation to grass-crete, a cellular hard block concrete system which allowed grass to grow through and confirmed that such proposals would be discussed with the North West (Inner) Area Committee)*
- clarification as to whether the West Yorkshire Fire and Rescue Services had been consulted in relation to fire regulations *(The Executive Member for Leisure responded and confirmed that both the West Yorkshire Fire and Rescue Service and the West Yorkshire Police had been consulted on the proposals contained within the Executive Board report of 26th August 2009 meeting. He acknowledged*

- that more work would be undertaken by officers on the process of disposing of temporary barbecues)*

 - clarification of the date when the Parks Management Plan was adopted and became operative and whether there was a dedicated management team who looked after Woodhouse Moor
(The Executive Member for Leisure responded and confirmed that the Parks Management Plan was implemented in 2005. He briefly outlined the current management structure at Woodhouse Moor with specific reference to a post of a site based gardener who was supported by mobile teams)
 - clarification as to whether having a designated barbecue area in place would prevent other fires occurring on Woodhouse Moor
(The Executive Member for Leisure responded with specific reference to the benefits which the proposed designated barbeque area would have in terms of enabling more effective enforcement)
 - clarification as to whether the universities had been consulted on providing any extra resources for enforcement
(The Executive Member for Leisure responded and made reference to the Cultural Partnership network where discussions were ongoing in this regard)
 - clarification of the potential costs and benefits in relation to enforcing a whole ban of barbeques on Woodhouse Moor
 - clarification as to whether there would be an opportunity for constructive discussion between the Friends of Woodhouse Moor and the Council
(The Executive Member for Leisure responded and welcomed an early dialogue between the Council and Friends of Woodhouse Moor in relation to the current Parks Management Plan and the trial of the designated barbecue area on Woodhouse Moor. The point was made that £250k of Section 106 money was available to be spent on the park, and has so far been held up due to objections to all proposals by the Council from local community groups)
 - reference to photographs submitted to all Members of Council from the North Hyde Park Neighbourhood Association

The Chair then allowed Sue Buckle, Bill McKinnon and Councillor J Procter to sum up prior to the Board making a formal resolution on the request for scrutiny.

RESOLVED –

- a) That the content of the report and appendices be noted.
- b) That the request for scrutiny from the North Hyde Park Neighbourhoods Association, South Headingley Community Association, Marlborough Residents Association and Friends of Woodhouse Moor in relation to a need for a cost benefit analysis regarding the options available for a proposed designated barbecue area on Woodhouse Moor be refused.
- c) That a copy of the report on the outcome of the trial of a designated barbecue area on Woodhouse Moor be submitted to this Board for consideration in due course

- d) That this Board recommends that arrangements be made for a meeting between the Council (Parks and Countryside), Friends of Woodhouse Moor and other interested parties as soon as possible.
- e) That, in relation to a request for scrutiny in relation to the practices and procedures regarding the Park Byelaws on Woodhouse Moor, this matter be referred to the appropriate Scrutiny Board for consideration.

35 Climate Change Update

The Director of City Development submitted a progress report on climate change.

The following representatives were in attendance and responded to Members' queries and comments:-

Councillor J Monaghan, Executive Board Member for Environment and Neighbourhoods

Jean Dent, Director of City Development

Steve Speak, Chief Strategy and Policy Officer, City Development

Jon Andrews, EMAS Officer, City Development

Helen Miller, Principal Planning Officer, City Development

Peter Lynes, Group Manager, Energy Unit, City Development

At the request of the Chair, Councillor J Monaghan provided the Board with a brief overview of the action being taken within the authority regarding climate change, with specific reference to the following key issues:-

- officer support arrangements in relation to climate change
- Climate Change Strategy/Climate Change Partnership, including the inaugural meeting and composition
- a broad acknowledgement of the need to reduce carbon omissions by 80% by 2050 worldwide
- the need for the Board to support a more realistic target of reducing carbon omissions by 40% by 2020 throughout the city and within the Council in order to work towards the 2050 target

In summary, specific reference was made to the following issues:-

- the need for the Board to acknowledge a previous White Paper on climate change which recommended the Council taking a lead on the possibility of putting micro-generation into Council buildings, in particular the Civic Hall, in view of the flat roof space availability (*The Executive Member for Environment and Neighbourhoods responded and agreed to look into this issue but stressed the need to reduce omissions on a much wider scale across the city*)
- clarification of the amount of carbon dioxide produced in 2006 within the city and the reasons why total omissions had only declined by 1% in the past four years
- the need to recognise that it was the Council's partners who were responsible for the majority of emissions and for a better system to be

introduced to enable the Council to work strategically with those partners and to monitor and scrutinise progress
(The Director of City Development responded and outlined the major challenges facing the city in terms of reducing omissions. She stressed that tackling climate change was not just a linear strategy, and that a whole matrix of activity needed to be taken into account, including transport, planning and traffic policy)

- reference to the incentives and penalties use to reduce omissions (the 'carrot and stick' approach)
(The Director of City Development responded and provided the Board with a number of examples i.e. national schemes for home insulation and better public transport systems)
- the suggestion that the Council implement high occupancy vehicle lanes on every arterial road in Leeds; introduce work place charges on parking places in central Leeds to discourage people from commuting by car and consider implementing congestion charges
(The Director of City Development responded and informed the meeting that the funding for the Next Generation Transport (NGT) had now been secured. She also outlined the proposals in relation to a major piece of research being undertaken in Leeds, funded through the Transport Innovation Fund, on transport issues within the city)
- clarification of the process in relation to publishing a clear strategic framework with parts of the city zoned as suitable for different renewable energy technologies which would minimise the number of speculative or inappropriately located planning applications
(The Chief Strategy and Policy Officer responded and outlined the process via the Local Development Framework)
- the need for the Board to address low zero carbon energy and renewable energy, with a focus on large scale projects
- the suggestion that the Council trial solar energy panels on civic buildings to promote this technology to the citizens of Leeds and to businesses
- the need to encourage more car sharing within the business community in Leeds and to look at re-regulating the buses
- clarification as to whether there were any developments in the pipeline regarding the use of water as a means of generating electricity
(The Group Manager, Energy Unit responded and outlined the current proposals in relation to hydro-electricity)
- clarification as to why the department was experiencing increased applications from private developers for renewables, particularly for large scale wind projects
(The Chief Strategy and Policy Officer responded and outlined the provisions and priorities within the Regional Spatial Strategy)
- whether or not the 2.1% target for reductions from local authority operations was acceptable

RESOLVED –

- a) That the content of the report be noted.
- b) That this Board concentrates on the following key issues in relation to climate change in order of priority:-

Draft minutes to be approved at the meeting
to be held on Tuesday 13th October 2009

- evaluating options for installing LZC (Low/Zero Carbon) energy as part of the corporate estate, with a focus on small, medium and large scale projects
 - development of control processes to ensure that developments of over 10 dwellings or 1000 m² have at least 10% on-site LZC technologies
 - the appropriate delivery structure to ensure that LZC energy, particularly large grid connected or on-site in major regeneration areas, was delivered
- c) That, in relation to the item on progress in planning policy to strategically plan for large-scale grid renewables, this issue be discussed at a future meeting of the Board.

(Councillor N Taggart joined the meeting at 11.25 am during discussion of the above item)

36 Leeds Strategic Plan Performance Report for Quarter 1

The Head of Policy, Performance and Improvement submitted a report which provided a strategic overview of performance against those improvement priorities in the Leeds Strategic Plan (LSP) for Quarter 1 which related directly to City Development priorities. The report and appendices provided an overall assessment of progress against the improvement priorities relevant to the Board and, in addition, provided performance indicator (PI) information for the full National Indicator Set and locally agreed indicators that were appropriate. Performance indicator targets were included across the range of priorities in this area and highlighted areas of under-performance and/or concern in relation to improvement priorities and actions being taken to remedy matters.

The following officers were in attendance and responded to Members' queries and comments:-

Jean Dent, Director of City Development
 Phil Crabtree, Chief Planning Officer, City Development
 Paul Maney, Head of Policy, Performance and Improvement, City Development

The Chair invited Board Members to comment on those areas of under-performance and/or concern in relation to the improvement priorities.

In summary, specific reference was made to the following issues:-

- clarification of whether or not the department were aware of a letter sent by the Conservative Party to Conservative Councils requesting them to ignore local spatial strategy targets at the present time, and the effects this would have on this authority

(The Chief Planning Officer responded and informed the meeting that he was not aware of this correspondence. He outlined the current Regional Spatial Strategy objectives for the information of Board Members)

- (Ref PI NI LSP – TP1e) – clarification as to why the target was so low in relation to increasing the number of new customers on low incomes accessing credit union services
(The Director of City Development responded and informed the Board that the target reflected current difficulties being faced by the credit union. She was confident that it would achieve its target of 3,500 new customers for the total year)
- the need for a report on planning enforcement and whether there was a mechanism for achieving more Section 106 monies within the Council
(The Chief Planning Officer responded and informed the meeting that a report on planning enforcement would be submitted to the Board in the autumn. In relation to Section 106 monies, he outlined a number of incentives being offered to encourage house builders to get back into business on those brown-field locations which could result, in the short term, in the Council cutting back on their Section 106 aspirations)
- (Ref PI NI 157 – Majors) – the need for the Board to look at this target in more detail and to be supplied with a list of those major schemes and to address the reasons why some major planning applications had not been determined in time/on time
(The Chief Planning Officer briefly explained the reasons and protocol behind the major planning applications. Following discussions, it was agreed that a report would be submitted to the Board in six months time with a view to focussing on two major planning applications which had achieved the target, together with looking at two major planning applications which had not achieved the target, for whatever reason, to allow the Board to form a conclusion in this regard)
- (Ref PI NI LK1 215b) – the need to address this target with the aim of reducing the number of street lights which were switched on during daylight hours
(The Head of Policy, Performance and Improvement responded and outlined the historic delays between SEC and Yorkshire Electricity which were outside of the department's control. It was noted that there had been a considerable improvement in repairs to street lighting, but a number of contact problems still remained at this present time)

RESOLVED –

- a) That the content of the report and appendices be noted.
- b) That a report be brought back to the Board in six months time relating to the target (NI 157 – Majors)

(Councillor C Beverley left the meeting at 11.50 am during discussion of the above item)

(Councillor S Armitage left the meeting at 12.10 pm during discussion of the above item)

37 Traffic Congestion - Key Locations Update

The Director of City Development submitted a report on progress in relation to traffic congestion.

The following representatives were in attendance and responded to Members' queries and comments:-

Jean Dent, Director of City Development

Andrew Hall, Transport Strategy Manager, City Development

In summary, specific reference was made to the following issues:-

- concern that progress had not been made in relation to traffic pinch points in North Leeds and along the Ring Road and the need to make improvements to the area
(The Transport Strategy Manager responded and outlined the current Ring Road improvements presented to the Regional Transport Board)
- whether an HOV lane scheme was the best solution for inbound Roundhay Road traffic and for a highways officer to monitor the traffic flow in this area
(The Transport Strategy Manager responded and confirmed that this issue was being addressed. Discussions were continuing around bus lanes and on improving the flow of traffic. Public consultation would also take place on proposed road closures and parking)
- the need to build more railway stations within the city and to re-address the current piecemeal approach towards the future road network
(The Director of City Development responded and provided the meeting with an overview of the review of the Strategic Transport Plan for the city region with specific references to NGT for Leeds, Outer Ring Road, connections to the airport, importance of park and ride and the work on the Transport Innovation Fund (TIF))
- clarification as to whether any work had been undertaken following the recent announcement by Network Rail of their preference for a high speed rail link to Manchester, over the one to Yorkshire, and the possible impact this may have on housing and jobs
- the concern expressed over the reduction in the number of extra carriages being provided for the local rail network and the need to increase the number for this area, together with increased car parking at railway stations
- concern expressed over the fact that the inner ring road stage 7 did not appear to feature on the most popular satellite navigation maps, resulting in continuing congestion
(The Transport Strategy Manager responded and confirmed that there was a protocol whereby Highways communicated new schemes to the mapping companies. However, he acknowledged that more work was required in this area)
- the concern expressed about speeding in Temple Newsam ward, as a result of reduced congestion following the opening of the East Leeds Link Road

(The Transport Strategy Manager responded and confirmed that this issue was being monitored)

RESOLVED – That the content of the report be noted.

(Councillor N Taggart left the meeting at 12.40 pm at the conclusion of this item)

38 Playbuilder Initiative

The Head of Scrutiny and Member Development submitted a report on the Playbuilder Initiative.

Appended to the report was a copy of the report of the Director of Children's Services, submitted to the Executive Board on 17th June 2009, on the Playbuilder Initiative for the information of the meeting.

The following representatives were in attendance and responded to Members' queries and comments:-

Sally Threlfall, Chief Officer Early Years and Youth Services
Vicki Marsden, Strategic Play Officer

The Board noted that at the Executive Board meeting held on 26th August 2009, a decision had been taken to defer consideration of a capital programme update on this project.

Board Members were requested to identify any areas for scrutiny at today's meeting.

In summary, specific reference was made to the following issues:-

- clarification as to whether or not changes were apparent following the former Leisure Services department's intention to match play facilities with population resulting in more densely populated parts of the city receiving greater concentration of play areas
(The Strategic Play Officer responded and outlined the current strategy. It was noted that this new strategy did attempt to change this current arrangement)
- clarification as to whether the new mapping exercise looked at distance to playgrounds
(The Strategic Play Officer responded and confirmed that the mapping exercise did address this specific issue)
- the need for the Board to be supplied with a copy of the mapping exercise and the analysis
(The Chief Officer Early Years and Youth Services responded and agreed to email a copy to the Board's Principal Scrutiny Adviser for dissemination to Board Members)
- clarification of the life span of the equipment and informal play spaces to be installed

(The Chief Officer Early Years and Youth Services responded and confirmed that any equipment installed would be robust and previously tested)

- clarification of whether the department looked at other sources of funding to top up and support their programme i.e. Section 106 monies *(The Chief Officer Early Years and Youth Services responded and confirmed that most of the schemes in the Playbuilder Initiative did have some match funding from Section 106 or lottery schemes)*
- clarification of the revenue funding within other authorities
- clarification of when the consultation would be undertaken in relation to Harehills Park
(The Strategic Play Officer responded and outlined the current consultation arrangements)
- clarification of when the first Playbuilder scheme would open
(The Strategic Play Officer responded and confirmed that it would be undertaken within this quarter i.e. in the run up to Christmas, and she agreed to provide the Board with an update on further projects in March 2010)

RESOLVED –

- a) That the content of the report and appendices be noted.
- b) That a further update be provided on the Playbuilder Initiative to the Board in March 2010.

(Councillor M Lobley left the meeting at 12:45 pm during discussion of the above item)

39 Informal Visits by Scrutiny Board

The Head of Scrutiny and Member Development submitted a report in relation to Scrutiny Board visits.

RESOLVED – That the content of the report be noted.

40 Recommendation Tracking

The Head of Scrutiny and Member Development submitted a report on recommendation tracking.

The report provided Board Members with progress on implementing recommendations on the A660 corridor improvements.

The Board's Principal Scrutiny Adviser informed the meeting that in relation to the A660 statement, recommendations 1 and 2 were completed. However, in relation to recommendations 3 and 4, there was a need to bring back these to the Board as they were still outstanding.

RESOLVED –

- a) That the content of the report and appendices be noted.
- b) That, in relation to the A660 statement, recommendations 3 and 4 be brought to the Board in due course.

41 Work Programme, Executive Board Minutes and Forward Plan of Key Decisions

The Head of Scrutiny and Member Development submitted a report providing Members with a copy of the Board's current Work Programme. The Forward Plan of Key Decisions for the period 1st August 2009 to 30th November 2009 and the Executive Board Minutes of 22nd July 2009 were also attached to the report.

RESOLVED:-

- a) That the contents of the report and appendices be noted.
- b) That the Executive Board minutes of 22nd July 2009 and the Forward Plan of Key Decisions for the period 1st August to 30th November 2009 be noted.
- c) That the Board's Principal Scrutiny Adviser be requested to update the work programme to incorporate those updates requested at today's meeting.
- d) That, in relation to the rents issue at the City Market, the Director of City Development be requested to provide an email response on this issue to the Board.
- e) That the Board Members request for including City Centre management as part of the Performance Indicator data be discussed at the working group for performance of locally determined targets to be held on 2nd September 2009.

42 Date and Time of Next Meeting

Monday, 13th October 2009 at 10.00 am in the Civic Hall, Leeds
(Pre-meeting for Board Members at 9.30 am)

(The meeting concluded at 12:55 pm)

This page is intentionally left blank

SCRUTINY BOARD (CITY DEVELOPMENT)

WEDNESDAY, 16TH SEPTEMBER, 2009

PRESENT: Councillor R Pryke in the Chair

Councillors C Beverley, R Downes,
V Kendall, J Lewis, M Lyons, T Murray,
D Schofield, B Selby, S Smith, N Taggart
and G Wilkinson

43 Chair's Opening Remarks

The Chair welcomed everyone to the call-in meeting.

44 Apologies for Absence

Apologies for absence were submitted on behalf of Councillor S Armitage, T Grayshon, R Harington, M Lobley, and A Ogilvie.

The Board were informed that Councillor J Lewis was a substitute for Councillor S Armitage, Councillor M Lyons for Councillor R Harington, Councillor V Kendall for Councillor M Lobley and Councillor B Selby for Councillor A Ogilvie.

45 Call-In of Decision - Briefing Paper

The Head of Scrutiny and Member Development submitted a report regarding the procedural aspects of the call-in process.

Members were advised that the options available to the Board in respect of this particular called-in decision were:-

Option 1 – **Release the decision for implementation.** Having reviewed the decision, the Scrutiny Board (City Development) could decide to release it for implementation. If this option was chosen, the decision would be released for immediate implementation and the decision could not be called-in again.

Option 2 – **Recommend that the decision be reconsidered.** Having reviewed the decision, the Scrutiny Board (City Development) could recommend to the Director of City Development that the decision be reconsidered. If the Scrutiny Board (City Development) chose this option, a report would be submitted to the Director of City Development within 3 working days of this meeting. The Director of City Development would reconsider the decision and would publish the outcome of their deliberations on the delegated decision system. The decision could not be called-in again whether or not it was varied.

RESOLVED – That the report outlining the call-in procedures be noted.

46 Call-In of a Decision - Review of Executive Board Decision of 26th August 2009 - Minute 66 - Deputation to Council - North Hyde Park Residents' Association, South Headingley Community Association, and Friends of Woodhouse Moor regarding the Council's proposal to establish a barbecue area on Woodhouse Moor

The Head of Scrutiny and Member Development submitted a report, together with background papers, relating to a review of the Executive Board decision of 26th August 2009 in relation to a Deputation to Council from North Hyde Park Residents' Association, South Headingley Community Association and Friends of Woodhouse Moor, regarding the Council's proposal to establish a barbecue area on Woodhouse Moor.

Appended to the report were copies of the following documents for the information/comment of the meeting:-

- Copy of completed call-in request form
- Report of the Director of City Development – Executive Board- 26th August 2009 – Woodhouse Moor Park Barbecue Use
- Executive Board minutes of 26th August 2009

In addition to the above appendices, a copy of the following documents were circulated as supplementary information to assist the Board in their deliberations:-

- Call-in – Woodhouse Moor Park Barbecue Use – Management comments on underlying reasons for the requested Call-in
- Timeline of events relating to designated barbecue area on Woodhouse Moor from 2nd July 2008 – 1st September 2009

The decision had been called-in for review by Councillors J Illingworth and L Rhodes-Clayton on the following grounds:-

“There has been no public consultation about the currently recommended option (the trial area) and little indication of the size of this area, the surface treatment, or where exactly this area might be located.

The decision does not adequately balance the human rights of barbecue users against those of other users of the park, including disabled people.

It is not clear what the outcome will be, particularly as regards cellular concrete. A recent letter to residents says "no concrete" but it seems that likely that concrete will in fact be used. It is not clear how the exercise will be assessed, or how the park will be restored if the experiment is judged to have failed.

It is not clear what other options have been considered, or how this trial might impact upon other parks in Leeds.”

Draft minutes to be approved at the meeting
to be held on Tuesday, 13th October, 2009

Councillors J Illingworth and L Rhodes-Clayton attended the meeting to present evidence to the Board and respond to Members' questions and comments.

The following Executive Member, officers and witnesses (who had been called by the signatories of the Call-in to support the original justification for the decision having been called in) were in attendance:-

Councillor J Procter, Executive Member for Leisure
Sean Flesher, Acting Head of Parks and Countryside, City Development
Caroline Allen, Head of Development and Regulatory, Corporate Governance
Bill McKinnon, Friends of Woodhouse Moor
Anthony Green, North Hyde Park Association
Kathleen Mason, representing those suffering from Chronic obstructive pulmonary disease (COPD)

The Chair informed the meeting that Councillor J Illingworth had been provided with a copy of all of the consultation forms returned to the City Development department with confidential information removed. It was noted that a copy of these documents could be made available to the Board on request.

Prior to hearing the request for Call-In, the Chair requested Board Members to take an early view as to whether the consultation papers were relevant to the case or not and if they were, whether they wished to see the original questionnaires, including the confidential items.

Following a brief discussion, the Board agreed that the consultation papers were not relevant to the case, but noted that they could be made available upon request.

The Board then questioned Councillors Illingworth and Rhodes-Clayton, together with Councillor Procter, officers and witnesses at length on the evidence submitted.

In summary, the main points raised by Councillor Illingworth, Councillor Rhodes-Clayton and their witnesses were:-

- that in relation to the consultation documents and the methodology, the Council had, in their opinion, been inherently biased towards the option of a barbecue area
- the fact that there had been no public consultation about Option 3 which the Executive Board had introduced and approved. There were no details of the trial in relation to size of the area/surface treatment / location and markings.
- that, in their opinion, the decision of the Executive Board did not balance the human rights of barbecue users against those of other users of the park, including disabled people

- concern about whether the relevant Byelaws permit was being proposed
- that in their view it was not clear what the outcome would be regarding the proposed use of cellular concrete and how the trial would be assessed
- that it was not clear what other options had been considered and how the trial might impact upon other parks within the city
- the view that the use of grass-crete was not suitable for the proposed barbecue area
- the fact that people with breathing difficulties (in particular those who suffered from a condition known as Chronic Obstructive Pulmonary Disease (COPD)) would be excluded from using the parks facilities as a result of the smoke pollution
- the concern that a previous trial for a designated barbecue area on Woodhouse Moor had failed in 2006
- the need for the Council to consider the cost implications, together with adequate enforcement arrangements

As part of his presentation to the Board, Bill McKinnon circulated a number of photographs highlighting barbecue activity on Woodhouse Moor and the smoke pollution caused by such an activity for the information/comment of the meeting.

In explaining the reasons for the decision, Councillor Procter and officer made the following comments:-

- the fact that the report presented to Executive Board on 26th August 2009 outlined the results of a recent consultation exercise with local residents and stakeholders and following detailed discussions by the Board, Option 3 to trial a designated barbecue area on Woodhouse Moor was agreed
- that it was the view of the Executive Board and the Director of City Development that consideration of this issue has been open and transparent
- that it was the view of the Director of City Development that while the report did not make any specific reference to human rights issues, given the balance of views expressed throughout the consultation exercise, the trialling of a designated barbecue area could be seen as offering a pragmatic solution that balanced the rights of all park users
- that it was the view of Executive Board and the Director of City Development that while the report did not state explicitly how the trial would be assessed, or how the park would be restored if the trial was judged unsuccessful, it was considered that the most appropriate way to progress would be to implement Option 3 to trial a designated barbecue area
- the fact that this issue had been fully debated at the Scrutiny Board (City Development) meetings held on 7th July 2009 (Consultation process) and 1st September 2009 (Cost benefit analysis) and that the Board had resolved that the consultation process had been carried

out in a proper and through manner and that the request for a cost benefit analysis was refused

- a copy of the plan showing the proposals for a designated barbecue area had Option1 been accepted was tabled for information

The Chair then invited questions and comments from Board Members and, in summary, the main areas of discussion were:-

- a substitute Member referred to the Leeds City Council Byelaw for Pleasure Grounds, Public Walks and Open Spaces and expressed a number of concerns
(The Head of Development and Regulatory responded and confirmed that provision existed within the byelaws for the Council to move towards a designated trial area. The substitute Member stated he would write formally to her on the matters raised)
- reference to the photographic evidence circulated and the scale of the problem
- clarification of current barbecue activity on Woodhouse Moor and on how the byelaws would be enforced outside the designated area
(The Executive Board Member for Leisure responded and outlined the current activities and concerns, in particular around the increasing use of camp fires)
- reference to a previous debate at the North West (Inner) Area Committee where it was acknowledged that having a trial area would make it easier for the situation to be enforced.
- clarification as to why a previous trial undertaken in 2006 for a designated barbeque area on Woodhouse Moor had failed and on the success rate of other designated barbecue areas in Otley Chevin Park and the Wilderness, Wetherby
(The Acting Head of Parks and Countryside responded and outlined the basis of the trial scheme undertaken in 2006 which was not evaluated due to time constraints and opposition from community groups. The Board noted that in relation to Otley Chevin Park and the Wilderness, Wetherby the designated barbecue areas were working effectively with no complaints received from the public)
- clarification of how the designated barbecue area would be enforced, and the resource implications arising from this and whether the department was intending to extend similar trials to other parks
(The Executive Member for Leisure responded that enforcement would be carried out by the Parks Watch Service and acknowledged that this was a major resource commitment. He confirmed that, in view of the difficulties in imposing fines in this regard, it was not the intention to implement similar trials in other parts of the city)
- clarification of the budget set aside for enforcement
(The Executive Director for Leisure responded and confirmed that there was no designated sum of money set aside for enforcement. However, he confirmed that Parkswatch would consider deploying resources at the appropriate time)

- clarification as to why there was no specific mention of the size or location of the area (including materials, bins and signage) within the Executive Board report relating to Option 3
(*The Executive Member for Leisure responded and confirmed that as discussions were ongoing in this regard between officers and interested groups, a designated area had yet to be determined*))

Following this process, the Chair allowed the Call-In signatories and the witnesses to sum up.

On behalf of the Call-In signatories, Councillor J Illingworth highlighted the following issues:-

- that he wished to see a copy of the disability assessment for the proposals that had been undertaken by the department and referred to in the earlier discussions
- that, in his view, the public consultation had been inherently biased against those opposing the introduction of a designated barbecue area
- that, in his view, the proposals did not balance the human rights of those who wish to barbecue in the park and other users of the park
- that smoke pollution from barbecues was a major issue as it produced more pollution than a modern industrial incinerator

On behalf of the witnesses, Bill McKinnon stated that there was a need for the Council to be flexible in relation to this issue and for public consultation to take place prior to agreeing a preferred option.

In conclusion, the Chair thanked Councillor J Illingworth, Councillor L Rhodes-Clayton, together with Councillor J Procter, officers and witnesses, for their attendance and contribution to the call-in meeting.

RESOLVED –

- (a) That the report and information provided be noted.
- (b) That a copy of the disability assessment for the proposals be circulated to all Members of the Board and Councillors Illingworth and Rhodes-Clayton.

(Councillor N Taggart joined the meeting at 9.20am during discussions of the above item)

47 Outcome of Call-In

Following consideration of evidence presented to them, the Board passed the following resolution:-

RESOLVED – That the report of the Director of City Development on Woodhouse Moor Park Barbecue use previously considered at the Executive Board meeting on 26th August 2009 be immediately released for implementation.

(The meeting concluded at 11.05am)

This page is intentionally left blank



Originator: Richard Mills

Tel: 247 4557

Report of the Head of Scrutiny and Member Development

Scrutiny Board (City Development)

Date: 13th October 2009

Subject: Provision of Shared Space and Shared Surface Streets.

Electoral Wards Affected: All



Ward Members consulted
(referred to in report)

Specific Implications For:

Equality and Diversity

Community Cohesion

Narrowing the Gap

1.0 Introduction

- 1.1 The Board in June 2009 asked for an up date on the review of the Street Design Guide and the provision of shared space and shared surface streets within this supplementary planning document.
- 1.2 This follows consideration by the Board in 2008 of a request for scrutiny from a number of disabled groups expressing concern at proposals to extend the use of shared space and shared surface streets.

2.0 Executive Board Decision

- 2.1 The Executive Board on 26th August considered the attached report and appendices of the Director of City Development on the outcome of consultation on the Street Design Guide including further discussions following the attendance of the deputation to Council on 10th September 2008 on behalf of the National Federation of the Blind.
- 2.2 The Executive Board approved the Street Design Guide as a Supplementary Planning Document, subject to an amendment to paragraph 3.2.2.18 of the guide by deletion of the reference to 25 dwellings and replacement with reference to 10 dwellings and any subsequent associated references.

3.0 Recommendation

- 3.1 The Board is asked to comment upon and note the report of the Director of City Development and the decision of the Executive Board.

This page is intentionally left blank



Report of the Director of City Development

Report to: Executive Board

Date: 26 August 2009

Subject: Adoption of the Supplementary Planning Document of the Street Design Guide and Response to the Deputation of the National Federation of the Blind

Electoral Wards Affected:

All

Ward Members consulted (referred to in report)

Specific Implications For:

Equality and Diversity

Community Cohesion

Narrowing the Gap

Eligible for Call In

Not Eligible for Call In (Details contained in the report)

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

1. A new Street Design Guide has been prepared following the principles of the Government's recent publication, Manual for Streets and our own Neighbourhoods for Living which is supplementary planning guidance. The Street Design Guide ensures that the principles in Manual for Streets are applied to Leeds and used as a basis for new housing design and for adoption of the highway. Consultation on the document has now taken place and a report setting out the issues raised, and how these issues have been dealt with, has been produced.
2. One issue raised is the concerns of disabled people on the provision of shared space and shared surface streets.
3. After extensive consultations a solution has been reached which provides for a safe route through these areas when they serve through routes or cul-de-sacs serving over 25 dwellings and follows advice from the Guide Dogs for the Blind Association. The document has been amended accordingly. Shared surface streets are being restricted to use in residential schemes serving 25 dwellings or less in short culs-de-sac only.
4. The measures set out above address the concerns raised in the deputation of the National Federation of the Blind.

5. This report seeks approval for the adoption of the Street Design Guide as a Supplementary Planning Document. This SPD amplifies the UDP (Review) Policy T2 which has been saved as part of the LDF process.

1.0 Purpose Of This Report

- 1.1 The purpose of the report is to inform members of the outcome of the consultation on the Street Design Guide and to endorse the contents of the amended document. The report also seeks approval for the adoption of the Street Design Guide as a Supplementary Planning Document.

1.0 Background Information

- 2.1 The West Yorkshire Highway Design Guide was written in 1979 and adopted by Leeds City Council in 1986 as guidance on the design of residential streets. Since the publication of the HDG "Design Bulletin 32 - Design of Residential Streets" (1992) (DB32) and "Places Streets and Movement" (1998) have been published by the government. Most recently the "Manual for Streets" (2007) (MfS) has been produced by the government.
- 2.2 A requirement of MfS is that local authorities amend their existing guidance. A new design guide has therefore been produced which incorporates the appropriate principles in these documents and embraces "Neighbourhoods for Living", our own document produced in 2003. The draft document is called the "Street Design Guide" and as the new title suggests it puts emphasis on the road as a place rather than a highway, as set out in the new guidance. All new residential streets serving less than 200 dwellings will have a design speed of 20mph.
- 2.3 Shared surfaces have always been one of the options for the design of a street, the old guide restricting the use to a cul-de-sac serving a maximum of 25 dwellings. In the HDG the streets were known as 'access ways' and 'mews courts' as opposed to Shared Surfaces in the Street Design Guide.
- 2.4 'Places, Streets and Movement' allowed for through routes of up to 50 dwellings to be served off a shared surface, which was informally adopted by Leeds. Manual for Streets suggests that shared surfaces serving up to 100 vehicular movements in the busiest hour are acceptable, which is equivalent to approximately 120 houses or 200 apartments.
- 2.5 In the draft Street Design Guide it was determined that our own criteria for shared surfaces, 25 dwellings off culs-de-sac or 50 dwellings off through routes, was more appropriate, rather than the guidance in MfS. MfS does not give guidance for the provision of "Home Zones", which are similar to shared surfaces but are more irregular in shape and have a maximum speed of 10mph. It is proposed that these areas will be allowed to serve up to 120 dwelling or 200 apartments.
- 2.6 As the draft Street Design Guide was produced as a Supplementary Planning Document consultation was carried out following the requirements of the Statement of Community Involvement.
- 2.7 A number of comments have been received and a report setting out the various comments, and how each comment has been acted on, produced. The report is attached as **appendix A**

3.0 Main Issues

- 3.1 The Street Design Guide has been proposed to amplify the following saved policy of the adopted revised UDP:-
- Policy T2 (New developments should be served adequately by existing or programmed highways)
- 3.2 The main issue arising out of the consultation was the concern regarding 'shared surfaces', raised by a number of groups representing disabled people and in particular blind and partially sighted people, one group being the Alliance of Users and Carers. Their concern was that in a shared surface environment they felt vulnerable to being knocked down by other users. They requested that a designated safe route through a shared area is provided.
- 3.3 Research has been carried out by the Guide Dogs for the Blind Association in conjunction with University College London, to try and determine a suitable delineator to demarcate pedestrian paths in a shared space environment. Unfortunately the conclusion reached was that "whilst none of the delineators emerged as meeting the needs of both groups of users [blind and partially sighted people and wheelchair users] two were identified by the researchers as warranting further research..." As that report was only published recently no further information is available.
- 3.4 Another piece of research entitled 'Designing for Disabled People in Home Zones' has also been produced in conjunction with the Guide Dogs for the Blind Association. This sets out a number of recommendations for designing such areas.
- 3.5 In April 2009 the Department for Transport informed all highway authorities that they were embarking on a wide-ranging research project into Shared Space and requesting authorities to participate. A response has been forwarded that Leeds City Council is willing to be involved in this project. It is anticipated that it will last two years.
- 3.6 Several meetings have been held with the Alliance of Users and Carers to determine an acceptable solution. At a meeting held on 29 April 2008 an agreement was reached that resolved this issue. The proposal was that a shared surface could be provided on a cul-de-sac serving a maximum of 25 dwellings. Any shared surface serving a higher number of dwellings, either as a cul-de-sac or a through route, would have at least one designated safe route through the length of highway, the width being a minimum of 2.0. It was determined that the safe route be delineated by a kerb with an up-stand of 30mm and that at each end, and other appropriate locations, a flush kerb with tactile paving would be provided. The material used in the safe route would be of contrasting colour to the remaining surface. This area would be designated as a Shared Space as opposed to a Shared Surface.
- 3.7 A request for the safe route to be constructed of a material with a smooth surface, such as a bituminous material, as opposed to block paving, was made. However as this would defeat the overall objectives of providing a shared area, an area where a driver would recognise that he was in a location different to a normal highway, this proposal was not accepted.
- 3.8 A further request was that a delineation feature be provided at the back of the footway, such as a garden wall or an edging raised to a height of 30mm was also made. As this would depend on the proposed development this has been

incorporated within the Street Design Guide as a further consideration when dealing with any proposal. The minutes of the meeting are attached as **appendix B**.

- 3.9 It was also agreed that when designing Home Zones the recommendations within Designing for the Disabled in Home Zones would be followed.
- 3.10 Following this agreement further representation has been made by letter on 29 May 2008, attached as **appendix C**. The letter is from the same association stating that they now feel that they did not reach a satisfactory solution and further research should be undertaken before they can agree to any proposals.
- 3.11 At the request of this Board further discussions have taken place with the Alliance of Users and Carers which has also involved a number of Members. Further to that meeting a Member/officer meeting has been held at which it was determined that the Council would invite Mr Tom Pey, Director of Development Guide Dogs for the Blind Association, to a meeting with Members and officers. Also invited to that meeting would be representatives from the Department for Transport and from the Alliance of Users and Carers.
- 3.12 The Member/officer meeting also determined that, as an interim measure, the solution set out above would be used in the Street Design Guide, until the findings from the on-going research being carried out by the DfT has concluded. The Street Design Guide would then be amended to incorporate the finding of the research.
- 3.13 This proposal was then put to the Alliance of Users and Carers on 27 July 2009 who were fully supportive of the proposal for a meeting with members. They were made aware that in the interim the agreement that was reached in April 2008, but later retracted, would be used as an interim policy within the Street Design Guide, and would be amended to reflect the outcome of any future research. They requested that included in this report was their strong preference for a 100mm kerb up-stand, as opposed to 30mm, and that the length of a cul-de-sac of up to 100 metres for a shared surface is too long. However these issues will remain as unresolved concerns until the research has been concluded.
- 3.14 In addition to the above objections a deputation was submitted to the Council, by the National Federation of the Blind, outlining concerns with the provision of Shared Spaces and requesting that such areas are not provided. The deputation was presented to the Full Council meeting on the 10 September 2008 where it was resolved that the matter should be considered by the Executive Board on 5 November 2008. Although a report was prepared for that committee the item was deferred until further discussions had taken place, as set out above.
- 3.15 The concerns raised in the submitted deputation are the same as those raised by the Alliance of Users and Carers, that is, that *“Shared Space has very serious implications for the health, choices, independence and mobility of disabled people...”* However the title of the deputation is “Say no to Shared Spaces”. This does conflict with the advice given by The Guide Dogs for the Blind Association in their document entitled “Shared Surface Street Design Research Project”. In the forward to that document it states *“At the heart of the issue is the need to distinguish between Shared Space and Shared Surfaces. The former can be successful in meeting everyone’s needs provided that physical ‘clues’ including kerbs and tactile surfaces are retained....”*
- 3.16 The proposals set out above address this issue by the provision of kerbs and tactile paving, when appropriate, within shared areas. It is considered that these provisions provide a safe and defined route for disabled people through a Shared Space.

3.17 Copies of the Street Design Guide document have been circulated to Board Members for consideration and can be obtained from the clerk named on the front of the agenda.

4.0 Compliance with the Regulations

4.1 In accordance with the statutory regulations and the Leeds City Council SPD Production Procedural Requirements, the following documents/statements have been prepared and cleared by Legal and Democratic Services:-

- Adoption Statement
- Sustainability Statement
- Statement confirming compliance with SCI

(all attached as **appendix D**)

5.0 Conclusions

5.1 The draft Street Design Guide follows the principles of Government guidance set out in the recently published Manual for Streets.

5.2 Objections to the provision of Shared Surface have been received from groups representing disabled people.

5.3 A solution with the objectors was initially reached which provides for a safe route through shared areas which are either on through routes or serving developments of over 25 dwellings. This agreement was later rescinded by letter dated 29 May 2008. However further discussions have taken place with the objectors and, as an interim measure the solution is acceptable whilst further research is carried out, the finding of which will be incorporated within the Street Design Guide.

5.4 In addition the document is a Supplementary Planning Document and thus subject to monitoring and therefore Shared Surfaces built during the intervening period will also be monitored to determine if the provisions are adequate or require revising.

6.0 Recommendations

6.1 That the Executive Board approves the Street Design Guide, as now drafted, as a Supplementary Planning Document.

7.0 Background Papers

- Neighbourhoods for Living – A guide for residential design in Leeds, December 2003
- Manual for Street, Department of Transport, 2007
- Testing proposed delineators to demarcate pedestrian paths in a shared space environment
- Designing for Disabled People in Home Zones

This page is intentionally left blank

Consultation Report

Appendix A

RESPONDENT	COMMENT	RESPONSE	ACTION
Alan Baxter and Associates	Road safety audit should be part of street quality audit (2.9)	Quality audits will have an overarching control over all audits	Reword document
	Level of development served off street type shouldn't be limited (3.2.1.4 – 3.2.1.5)	Rewrite to relate development to traffic flows. Also to state that this does not apply to distributor roads.	Reword document
	Width of bus routes should not be set at 6.75m (3.2.2.12 iv)	Discussed with Metro who require 6.75m, but will discuss reduction on site specific basis.	No action
	Anticipated speed as opposed to design speed should be used for forward visibility (3.2.2.12 vii)	Design speed already reduced as well as centreline radius. Safety concerns with further reductions.	No action
	There should not be a minimum centreline radii (3.2.2.12 viii)	Speed control bends allow for further reduction in centreline radius. (3.3.4 [ii])	No action
	Reversing from private drive onto a type 1 street should be allowed (3.2.2.12 ix)	Type 1 streets have higher level of pedestrian movement. A number of personal injury accidents occur in this situation	No action
	Verges should not be a requirement on type 1 streets (3.2.2.14)	The aspiration is to increase street environment, therefore verges should remain a requirement	No action
	There should be flexibility on shared surfaces with no minimum width (3.2.2.21 iv)	The minimum width is necessary to retain vehicle access whilst allowing access to service trench.	Amend wording to provide reason
	There should be a flexible approach to forward visibility (3.2.2.33)	The document does allow for reduced visibility	No action
	DMRB should not be used for streets not covered by this document(3.2.2.36)	There is no other guidance for design. A standard has to be provided	No action
	Higher quality materials should be used on adopted streets (3.2.3.3)	High quality materials are acceptable on adopted streets; however there are cost implications that could restrict the use without	Amend wording to reflect this

RESPONDENT	COMMENT	RESPONSE	ACTION
		commuted sums.	
	Central features such as roundabouts should be allowed (3.3.5)	Roundabouts are an acceptable feature except as a traffic calming feature.	Amend wording
	Gradients greater than 5% should be allowed due to the topography of Leeds(3.4.1 – 3.4.2)	Any gradient greater than 5% is classed as a ramp. The 5% is a government standard.	No action
	The K values proposed are unnecessary (3.4.8)	K values are necessary to prevent vehicles from grounding as well as comfort	No action
	Parking bays should be allowed within sightlines (3.5.21)	With the very short visibility splays proposed they should be protected	No action
	Crossroads should be allowed for speeds of 20mph (3.5.26)	They are allowed	Amend table to confirm this
	Garages should be allowed without drives (3.9.20)	To prevent garage doors overhanging footway the garage is required to be set back 1m.	Alter 3.9.22 to have a 1m strip behind back of highway if drives are not provided.
	The pedestrian inter-visibility is too great (3.9.21)	2x2m is considered that absolute minimum. Most cars are reversing out of drives.	No action
	Carriageway widening is not necessary (3.10.9)	It is considered that widening on bends is required but the table requires to be revised to cater for the appropriate radii	Amend table
	The emphasis is on through routes not cul-de-sac hence down play turning heads (3.10.10 – 3.10.15)	Culs-de-sac will be provided where appropriate and therefore turning heads still necessary although emphasis on through routes	No action
	Large areas of landscaping should be adopted (3.12.3)	The highway authority will not adopt large landscaping areas.	No action
	Location of street lighting should be considered early in process (3.13.1)	Agreed the statement says exactly that.	No action

RESPONDENT	COMMENT	RESPONSE	ACTION
	Type I streets should be designed to 20mph to reduce the number of signs (3.17.4)	If the actual speed of the street could be maintained at 20mph this would be acceptable. However to-date this has not been achieved	No action
	Do features within a 30mph zone require signing if provided from new	Yes as required by TSRGD	No action
Bryan G Hall	No specific reference for objection other than the guide is too restrictive and does not follow the principles of MfS	Cannot address the comments raised in this letter as no direct comment or any proposals are provided. The consultants do not agree with the whole document as written.	No action
Calderdale Council	Parking provision proposed is not in line with PPG13 (P59 footnote)	The proposals accord with the inspectors decision on the revised UDP	No action
	Better consideration of sustainable drainage systems required.	The guidance on sustainable drainage is considered appropriate	No action
Leeds Civic Trust	Do not want a hierarchy of streets (3.2.2.8) (Q1)	Developers need advice on what to construct. The way forward is to provide alternative, hence there has to be various 'types' of street.	No action
	Does not want specific criteria as set out in tables (Q3 & Q4)	Developer has to be provided with guidance.	No action
	Speed restraints are not required if they are well laid out. (Q5)	Advice on restraints is provided to assist designers to achieve speed control.	No action
	Suggests very tight radii to control speed (Q6)	Tight radii are proposed.	No action
	Requests more flexibility in junction	Following meeting with LCT they	No action

RESPONDENT	COMMENT	RESPONSE	ACTION
	spaces (Q7)	have retracted this comment.	
	Prefers method 1 for car parking	Noted	
	Requests that 'dry laid clay bricks' to list of approved materials	Clay bricks do not meet the required skid resistance	No action
	The guide is not flexible and does not reflect MfS	The guide provides adequate flexibility for developers to provide a range of varied layouts	No action
	The document is old fashioned	Noted	
METRO	Reference to SPD Developer Contribution should be made (2.9)	Agreed	Amend document
	Refer to travel plan SPD (2.9 iv)	Agreed	Amend document
	Adjacent development should be considered to allow possibility of bus routes (3.2.2.6)	Agreed	
	Only horizontal traffic calming measures on bus routes (3.3)	Vertical calming can be used on bus routes subject to dimensions. See below	No action
	Minimum length of speed table to be 6m (3.3.4 iv)	Agreed	Amend document
	Minimum use of guardrail (3.6.17)	Agreed	Amend document
	Reference to SPDs (3.16)	Agreed	Amend document
	Metro to be consulted on proposals that affect bus stops (3.16)	As set out in 3.16	No action
	Add addition wording 'on the matters below' (3.16.2)	Agreed	Amend document
	SPD para requires up-dating (3.16.10)	Agreed	Amend document
Sanderson Associates	Should use equation to calculate 'Y' distance (3.5.17)	Agreed to use equation on existing network	Amend document
	High number of dwellings should be allowed for shared surfaces (3.2.2.21)	There is a major concern for the provision of shared surfaces. Subject to the provision of a safe	Amend document

RESPONDENT	COMMENT	RESPONSE	ACTION
		pedestrian route a higher level will be acceptable	
	There should be flexibility on shared surfaces with no minimum width (3.2.2.21 iv)	The minimum width is necessary to retain vehicle access whilst allowing access to service trench	No action
	Conflict between adoption procedures and appendix B (3.17.11)	Agreed	Amend the appropriate section
	Commuted sums on all materials not acceptable	Government are producing guidance on commuted sums. The wording within the document to be altered at allow for this.	Amend document
	The proposal that garages are equal to 0.5 space will result in more car parking/visual intrusion	Subject to a garage being of a certain size a garage will be counted as a space	Amend document
	National guidance should be referred to (1.12)	Add 'and national guidance'	Amend document
	Agrees with the flexible approach but considered document is too rigid [visibility/shared surfaces](2.5)	General supporting comment. Other issues dealt with elsewhere.	
	Shared surfaces require careful consideration of delineation of different functions needed to avoid patchwork effect (p18)	Delineation of areas has been agreed with the appropriate bodies	Amend document accordingly
	Concern raised about the removal of ransom strips (3.2.2.6)	Noted but will retain statement	No action
	Treatment of areas of margins outside c/way & margins unclear. Can length of shared surface street increase?(3.2.2.21)	Area outside c/way & margins would be private. The length of shared streets can be increased if a safe pedestrian route is provided	Amend document
	Contradiction between approach for type 3 & type 4 (p20 & 21)	Do not consider any contradiction.	No action
	The term private street is inappropriate in light of case law (3.2.3)	.The term private street is correct. However there is inconsistency with the section	Amend wording to address inconsistency in statement but the term 'private street' is

RESPONDENT	COMMENT	RESPONSE	ACTION
			correct
	Replace 'any gate' with 'where permitted, gates..' (3.2.3.6)	Agreed	Amend document
	The highway authority has no rights of adoption (3.2.4.717)	The highways authority considers that the appropriate way to ensure maintenance is to adopt the highway	No action
	There appears to be conflicting guidance on trees within the adopted highway (p31)	It is considered that no conflicting advice is given.	No action
	Do archways require 'height signs?' (p32)	If the highway underneath an archway is to be adopted then signage would be required. Guidance given in 3.4.5	No action
	Speed control bends diagram would be helpful (p32)	Diagram required.	Amend document
	Carriageway width – is this acceptable to the fire authority?(p32)	Fire brigade consulted and have not objected	no action
	Ramp gradient too shallow (3.3.4)	Amend gradient to 1:18	Amend document
	No advice given on roundabout/minis (3.3.5)	There is no need to repeat government guidance	No action
	Who will carry out the consultation (3.3.7)	The developer should undertake consultation and provide the appropriate correspondence to the LA. Amend the wording	Amend document
	Are K values necessary? (3.4.8)	K values are necessary to prevent vehicles from grounding as well as comfort	No action
	Will the authority accept traffic management measures to provide visibility splays where such facilities fit in with the general road environment?	Yes, if the proposals conform with existing traffic management measures	No action

RESPONDENT	COMMENT	RESPONSE	ACTION
	Who maintains areas adjacent to footpaths (3.6.1)	Site specific but could be adopted	No action
	Clarification on areas of parking that could be adopted (p60)	Site specific	
	The proposal is contrary to MfS (3.9.21)	The guidance is to clarify/amend MfS where appropriate as the MfS requires	No action
	Example of visitor parking does not work in practice. (3.9.30)	The example shown does work as noted on site	No action
	Turning head difficult to maintain (3.10.11)	Will amend the detail	Amend document
	Suggest MfS(p75) be used. [3.2.3.4] is worded differently (3.11.3)	agreed	Amend document
	Widths proposed differ from those given earlier (3.4.11)	Will amend	Amend document
	Max growth height should be 0.6 (3.12.8)	Agreed but will remove reference to walls for paragraph	Amend document
	How do the dimensions fit in a 3.1m road narrowing? (3.13.2)	Can be accommodated if public sewer is located out of carriageway	No action
Councillor Harrand	The provision of a raised white line be required for type 3 &4 streets	Considered as part of shared street debate	Amend document
Peter Barnett	Terminology of disabled people/elderly etc (2.6, 3.1.1)	Amend terminology if necessary	Amend document
	Para 2.8 slightly confusing	Para reads OK	No action
	Should refer to Leeds City Council Planning Services or LPA (2.9)	Amend para	Amend document
	2.9(ii) needs footnote/bibliographical ref to explain guidance on TA	Not required	No action
	Poor diagram 3.5.12	Agreed	Amend document
	Prefers method 1 simpler 3.9.9 etc	Noted	

RESPONDENT	COMMENT	RESPONSE	ACTION
Joint Highways Advisory Group	Tactile Paving – should add ‘the use of tactiles is to be considered based upon the issues of all road users and the likelihood of damage’	Not included	No action
Sport England	Raises a number of questions as to whether the guide addresses accessibility.	The answer to each question raised is ‘yes’	No action
Jacobs	Suggests that a sustainability appraisal be added to the list documents (2.9)	A sustainability appraisal is not required in planning terms.	No action
	Suggests 20mph on type 1 roads	If this can be achieved then it would be acceptable but a 30mph street is expected to be the norm.	No action
	Provision for cyclists on all routes	Cyclist would be expected to use the same space as others. Widening to provide a separate cycle lane would increase the speed of traffic.	No action
	Provision for public transport facilities (Qu.4)	Public transport facilities are encouraged where appropriate.	No action
	Speed restraints provided over distances that drivers find acceptable. Recommends changes in horizontal & vertical alignment and short cul-de-sac. Metro to agree calming measures (qu.5)	The provision of restraints is covered by a plethora of guidance which has to be followed. Metro have provided their own comments.	No action
	Recommends that visibility be in range of 1.05 – 2.0 (qu.6)	Add diagram or reference appropriate document	Amend document
	Junction spacing should be 30m [same side] and 15m [opposite side] on 100 – 300 dwellings. Not within 20m of junction with distributor road. (qu.7)	The guide allows for crossroads as per MfS. The 20m from distributor roads will be added.	Amend document

RESPONDENT	COMMENT	RESPONSE	ACTION
	Method 1 preferred	noted	
Morley Town Council	Concern at the high level of traffic for a home zone, suggests a lower level (3.2.2.8)	The guide follows government guidance	No action
	Requires two accesses for over 200 dwellings and preferred for over 100 dwelling (3.2.2.13)	This is already included within the guide.	No action
	States type 3 is lowest order to be adopted but contradicted with type 4 (3.2.2.18/3.2.2.32)	agreed	Amend document
	Supports the max of 5 off a private road. (3.2.3.1)		No action
	Does not support the use of speed tables (3.3.4)	These are necessary to control speeds below 20mph.	No action
	Does not support the reduction in sightlines (3.5)	The document is following government guidance on this issue.	No action
	Does not support the over provision of cycle facilities (3.7)	The document is following the LTP and government guidance.	No action
	Requires the provision of 2 spaces per dwelling no matter what size (3.9)	The document is following the current planning policy.	No action
	Para 3.9.32 is not logical	Reword the last sentence	Amend document
	Supports commitment to natural paving in conservation areas	Agreed	No action
Steve Gombocz	Figure 1 in appendix C requires reconfiguring for two boxes	Accept	Amend document
Sam Grimwood	Generally supportive of the document but provides comment on issues not covered by it. Suggests increase in trees within the highway	Provision of trees is supported and covered in the landscape section	No action

RESPONDENT	COMMENT	RESPONSE	ACTION
Alan Taylor	Suggests the document is called "Residential Street Design Guide"	The document covers industrial streets as well as residential streets.	No action
	The term 'mixed use' appears in a number of places but no definition (1.11)	??	
	The term 'local centre' is wrongly used and should be 'town/district centre' (3.9.12)	agreed	Amend document
	"S2 local centre" should be "S2 town/district centre" (p59)	agreed	Amend document
Brian Ablett	Wants 20mph speed limit on all roads	If this can be achieved then it would be acceptable but a 30mph street is expected to be the norm.	No action
	Requires street lighting to be efficient	This is controlled by the PFI project.	No action
	Requires the document to accord with the Nottingham Declaration	Transport policy is dealt with through LTP	No action
Yasin Raja	Add 'residential' to car parking guidelines (p58)	Agreed	Amend document
	Add ' to try and achieve aims and objectives of the car parking guidelines in the UDP and subsequent LDF's (3.9.9)	agreed	Amend document
	City centre 'core' average 0.6 (3.9.12)	agreed	Amend document
Jonathan Eyre	Concerned at lack of mention of recycled material in section 4	Materials covered in 'specification for highway works'	No action
	Requires the use of permeable pavement for car parking areas	Agreed	Amend document

RESPONDENT	COMMENT	RESPONSE	ACTION
	Should refer to the SPD on sustainable design and construction	Agreed	Amend document
Leeds Property Forum	The guide should provide more emphasis on place making	The guide is read in conjunction with Neighbourhoods for living which sets out the principles of place making	No action
	The document is negative (2.6)	Reword to put a positive slant on comment	Amend document
	Provide a distinction between guidance required for safety and these related to quality of place which could be more flexible	The carrying out of quality audits will address this issue	No action
	Type 1 is over restrictive (3.2.2.12)	It is considered that there is adequate flexibility within the document to allow designers to produce good designs	No action
	Design speeds outside schools should be 10mph	Government guidance is 20mph	No action
	Footways on type 2 should vary in width from 1.2 to 3.5 (3.2.2.17)	The minimum width of footways is 2.0m to cater for statutory undertakers' equipment.	No action
	Would like home zone standards without designation.	A home zone, and hence standards, are as designated in the Transport Act 2000	No action
	More flexibility in shared surface design	The provision of a safe pedestrian route will allow more flexibility	Amend document
	Agrees with speeds should be self enforcing but requires clear examples on how this can be achieved (3.3.2)	Speeds are self enforcing if designed is correct	No action
	Agrees with reduced visibility splays		No action
	Proposes method 1 but also	agreed	Amend document

RESPONDENT	COMMENT	RESPONSE	ACTION
	supports car ownership figures!! Suggests worked examples		
	Wants more interesting materials than just the standard pallet	Nothing was put forward as a suggestion. Willing to discuss alternative materials with developers.	No action
	Should be written in a positive language not negative and requires better illustrations and clear examples	Agreed	Amend document
Sue Speak	Supports method 1. Concern at distinction between owned/rented	noted	No action
Tim Parry	Concern at type 2 footway width for shared with cyclists is not wide enough. (3.2.2.17)	Propose 3.0m for shared footways.	Amend document
	Raises concern about a through route on shared surfaces (3.2.2.19)	The provision of a safe pedestrian route will allow more flexibility	Amend document
	Reword 3.2.4.1 to "...public transport stops, <i>housing and other nearby walking and cycle routes</i> "	Agreed	Amend document
	Diagram not correct (3.7.15)	Agreed	Amend document
	Dimensioned diagram not correct (3.7.15)	Agreed	Amend document
	3.2.2.1 it's should be its	Agreed	Amend document
	3.2.2.12 dependant should be dependent	Agreed	Amend document
	3.22.36/37/38/39 & 41 tolerance should be clearance/clear space/gap	agreed	Amend document
Magda Lezama	Suggests new words for para 4.3 & 6.2 of appendix E	agreed	Amend document

RESPONDENT	COMMENT	RESPONSE	ACTION
Andy Wheeler	Shared streets should be limited to 25 dwellings	Shared street criteria altered after extensive consultations	Amend document
John Wilson	Street lighting should have the ability to have lower levels of luminaries during low levels of pedestrian flow	This is governed by the PFI project.	No action
Andrew Smith	Section 3.11 – Emergency Access Para 3.11.4 should be expanded to mirror the comments in MfS (para 6.7.3)	agreed	Amend document
Members	Suggest para 3.2.3.2 be removed to conform with the original design guide	agreed	Amend document
Disabled Peoples groups including: An Alliance of Service Users and Carers, Leeds Involvement, British Retinitis Pigmentosa Society, Talking Newspaper for the Blind for Otley, The National Federation for the Blind, Access Committee for Leeds, RNIB Shire View Centre Leeds, Leeds Jewish Blind Society, Vision is not	General concern that the provision of Shared Space does not provide adequately for blind, partially sighted and disabled people	A solution to provide a safe route through shared streets of over 25 dwellings by means of a 2m wide area delineated by means of a 30 mm up-stand and appropriate designated crossing points has been included in the document. The recommendations of the document 'designing for disabled people in home zones' to be included in the document	Amend document

RESPONDENT	COMMENT	RESPONSE	ACTION
Essential, Leeds Society for Deaf and Blind People, Transport Access Group, Mrs Ruth Holder			

This page is intentionally left blank

**Alliance of Service Users and Carers
Shared Space Subgroup**

29th April 2008

Leeds Involvement Project

**Notes of a Shared Space Meeting with the Alliance Shared Space Sub
Group and Officers of Leeds City Council**

Present:

Barry Naylor, Mary Naylor, Alan Oldroyd, Joyce Rogers, Keith Spellman, Joy Fisher, Victor Jackson

Mike Darwin and Gillian McLeod – Leeds City Council Highways

In attendance:

Joseph Alderdice (LIP minute taker)

Mags Barrett (Reed Social Care) Personal Assistant

Meeting opened 10.30am

Keith accepted the invitation to chair the meeting and welcomed everyone. Introductions were made.

Mike offered an update. He has met with his counterparts in eight 'core cities', discussing the issue of Shared Space and different authorities' approaches to it. He reported that they are all going ahead with it, although two are looking at using contrasting paint.

Mike has also met with West Yorkshire's County Councils who are willing to have small cul de sacs made into shared space, with any other shared spaces having a designated route through for disabled people. This proposal was endorsed by the Highways Authority, taking into account recommendations from today's meeting and emerging publicity and guidance.

Mike referred to a Guide Dogs publication containing various design proposals for guidance paving, including kerbs of various shapes and sizes and raised painted lines. There is no consensus on what is the best design as yet, which Mike said is why he is here. Group members felt that, until a suitable delineation method was devised, no changes should be made to the existing pavement system. One member suggested that to do anything else would be a failure in their duty of care.

Gillian responded to this by stressing that they are compelled to follow Government proposals and that by consulting the group today they are considering their safety. Mike elaborated that he is formulating a policy which he is inviting the group's input on today. If he doesn't produce this policy, the development will be based on Government policy instead (without the group's input).

One member raised the practical issue of cane users requiring a minimum radius to swing their canes.

Mike talked about the designated area for pedestrians and the options for delineating it from the road, including kerbs and white lines.

It was asked how much opposition there is to the scheme in other cities. Mike had the impression that there was a similar level of opposition in other cities.

There was a discussion around Kensington High Street (a London Shared Space area), the various demarcations used and its improved safety record.

A number of group members accepted that there are times when traffic needs to use pedestrian areas in towns and cities, such as to make deliveries. However, it was stressed that to open up pedestrian areas to traffic around the clock in suburban areas is a different matter altogether.

Mike brought the discussion back to marking the border between pedestrian and traffic areas. He asked again for a recommendation to take back, since the research presented earlier hadn't reached a conclusion. He listed the options again. The border will not necessarily be marked between the pedestrian areas and gardens.

It was felt that the demarcation must clearly designate the area to motorists, yet no matter what the system is some people will always park illegally.

There was a general agreement that it would be best to have a strong colour contrast between the areas, complimenting a raised (30mm) kerb between them. It was also felt that there should be designated crossing areas at which the kerb is lowered, with tactile paving beside it.

It was felt that walls, gardens and kerbs acts as tactile landmarks for cane users and that to make areas uniform would be disorientating. A further issue was raised, of knowing where Shared Space ends and a busy main road might begin.

Various issues of garden walls, children's play areas and supervised play were raised. Mike explained that these issues were nothing to do with his work, or Shared Space.

The group recommended that the borders between pedestrian areas and the roads are mirrored by a border at the edges of gardens. Mike accepted that this would be useful, but argued that the edges of gardens are private property. He did offer to take the issue back for further discussion.

The group recommended that the paths are smooth, to contrast with the block paving on the road. Mike said that research has shown that having block paving in both areas causes drivers to slow down. Group members stressed that to navigate block paving with a cane can be quite painful. Mike made it clear that the issue of block paving was beyond negotiation.

There was a discussion around motorists obeying speed limits.

Concerns were expressed around maintaining block paving and the dangers of replacing them unevenly when private telecommunications companies dig them up. It was feared that such a tripping hazard would be the "cobblestones of the future". Mike reported again that block paving is the preferred option for other interested parties. He offered to take the group's concerns back, although he warned that it is overwhelmingly likely that block paving will be used. He offered the consolation that the policy is "not set in stone" and will be reviewed every two years.

Gillian offered the group opportunities to observe the first Shared Space projects in Leeds when they are completed.

There was a discussion around the lack of coordination between the various bodies that dig up highways. It was addressed in the Traffic Management Act, which gives the responsibility for maintenance to the Statutory Undertakers. It was felt that they regularly fail in these responsibilities.

Mike will ask his equivalents in other cities if they are willing to be contacted by group members interested in how Shared Space is progressing elsewhere. One group member warned against losing focus on Leeds.

The issue of training engineers on access rights and legislation was raised, along with the issue of penalising contractors for non-compliance. This is beyond Mike's remit.

There was a discussion around street contractors "cutting corners" and ill-placed street furniture. Mike reported that the intention is for all replacement street lighting to be installed at the back of the pavement if at all possible.

Mike will report the agreed demarcation design to the Planning Board and Highways. He thanked the group and was thanked in return. He is willing to be contacted at any time.

Mike and Gillian left at 12.00 noon.

This page is intentionally left blank

**"An Alliance of Service Users and Carers,
experts by experience, who work in
partnership to inform and influence health
and social care services"**



Thursday, 29 May 2008

Dear Mike

Thank you for meeting with members of the Alliance of Service Users and Carers on 29th April 2008, to discuss "Shared Space".

Unfortunately we feel that we did not reach a satisfactory conclusion at this meeting and we think we should have more knowledge of the area before it becomes instituted and not afterwards when it is too late. Can you confirm the exact specifications you will be applying?

To help us better understand the issues involved, we would like to see a copy of the criteria by which the council approach the present planning application for Shared Space Developments.

Regarding surfaces, we have concerns about the inner and outer saw lines. In particular your reference to the inner saw line, as we think this can be evidenced without infringing on private property. You mentioned that two metres should be clearly marked for pedestrian use, we would like more clarification on this, and for example does this mean one metre on either side?

Hence we feel if there is an area elsewhere in the country with the same or similar design features that it would be worthwhile for your department to sponsor a group to look at this.

As there were several points that we did not reach agreement on we reserve the right to challenge any plans or proposals that that are put forward and hope that you will be able to brief us on any new design features that would affect us.

Yours Sincerely

Barry Naylor
Alliance Working Group Member

CC. Councillors

K Wakefield
Richard Brett
Andrew Carter
Brenda Lancaster

D Coupar
P Harrand
Ralph Pyk

Leeds Involvement Project; Ground Floor, Unit 8 Gemini Park, Sheepscar
Way, Leeds, LS7 3JB

Tel: 0113 237 4508 Minicom: 237 4512: Fax: 0113 2374509

e-mail: belinda.connolly@leedsinvolvement.org.uk

Leeds Involvement Project; Ground Floor, Unit 8 Gemini Park, Sheepscar
Way, Leeds, LS7 3JB
Tel: 0113 237 4508 Minicom: 237 4512: Fax: 0113 2374509
e-mail: belinda.connolly@leedsinvolvement.org.uk

Statement Confirming Compliance with Statement of Community Involvement

National regulations governing the preparation of LDF plans requires a consultation period of 6 weeks and notification to be sent to those organisations who the Council considers will be interested in or affected by the proposals. It is also required that the documents be made available at public places and on the internet.

The consultation undertaken complied with the City Council's Statement of Community Involvement. Formal consultation on the Preferred Option was carried out for a 6 week period (commencing on the 14 September 2007), the 6 week consultation period was extended by 4 weeks to 23 November 2007 for groups representing disabled people to give them time to discuss the issues at convened meetings and prepare their responses.

Documents were made available on the LCC website and in hardcopy at the Leonardo Building, and at libraries and one-stop shop centres within Leeds District.

This page is intentionally left blank

**STREET DESIGN GUIDE
SUPPLEMENTARY PLANNING DOCUMENT (SPD)**

ADOPTION STATEMENT

The Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) for the Street Design Guide was adopted by Leeds City Council on 2 September 2008. The Street Design Guide provides guidance, in line with Council's "Neighbourhoods for Living" and the Government's "Manual for Street", for the design of residential, and other, streets.

Any person with sufficient interest in the decision to adopt the SPD may apply to the High Court for permission to apply for judicial review of that decision. Any such application must be made promptly and in any event not later than 3 months after the date on which the SPD was adopted.

The SPD, the Sustainability Appraisal, a statement summarising the main issues raised during the formal consultation period and how these were addressed in the SPD and a copy of this Adoption Statement can be viewed on the Council's website at www.leeds.gov.uk/ldf or at the Development Enquiry Centre, Development Department, Leonardo Building, 2 Rossington Street, Leeds, LS2 8HD (Monday – Friday, 8:30am – 5:00pm) (Wednesday 9:30am – 5:00pm).

This page is intentionally left blank



**STREET DESIGN GUIDE
SUPPLEMENTARY PLANNING DOCUMENT (SPD)**

SUSTAINABILITY STATEMENT

1.0 PURPOSE OF REPORT

- 1.1 A Sustainability Appraisal of the Draft Street Design Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) was undertaken by the City Council in September/ October 2007. This report summarises how the SPD has changed during the Sustainability Appraisal process, the reasons for choosing the adopted SPD and the measures decided regarding monitoring.

2.0 BACKGROUND TO THE STREET DESIGN GUIDE SPD

- 2.1 The SPD has been prepared by Leeds City Council to amplify policies in the existing adopted UDP that refer to detailed planning considerations of access, drainage, landscaping, parking and design and also to maximise highway safety. This SPD when approved will form part of the Local Development Framework (LDF) for Leeds.
- 2.2 The objective of the Street Design Guide SPD is to provide detailed guidance on how to create street designs which achieve high quality, accessible and safe residential and commercial places, and which facilitate sustainable travel and construction.

3.0 CONSULTATIONS

- 3.1 Consultation has been carried out during preparation of the SPD and sustainability appraisal as follows:
- Consultation on the Sustainability Appraisal Scoping Report in May 2006 with the Countryside Agency, English Nature, Environment Agency and English Heritage.
 - Consultation on the Draft SPD and Sustainability Appraisal report in September / October 2007 (extended to November for blind and partially sighted groups) with the above consultees and local councillors, parish councils, neighbouring local authorities, Government Office for Yorkshire, Metro, local planning and highway consultants and other interested parties. The Draft SPD and Sustainability Report were also published on the Leeds City Council website.
- 3.2 The comments received are reported in the representations statement along with the Leeds City Council response and proposed amendments to the SPD. The SPD has been amended in accordance with the representations statement.

4.0 REASONS FOR CHOOSING THE ADOPTED SPD

- 4.1 The Sustainability Appraisal considered the following options:
- the Do Nothing option (No SPD),
 - the SPD option

4.2 The SPD option was chosen as the preferred option as it was assessed as having a greater positive impact on a number of sustainability objectives than the no SPD option.

5.0 MONITORING

5.1 The purpose of monitoring is to assess the actual effects of the SPD compared with those predicted in the Sustainability Appraisal and to identify any unforeseen effects. The Sustainability Appraisal report sets out how the effects of the SPD will be monitored. This monitoring will be linked to monitoring activities undertaken for the LDF as a whole.

6.0 CONCLUSION

6.1 The Sustainability Appraisal of the Street Design Guide SPD indicated that the SPD will generally have positive or neutral impacts on sustainability.

6.2 The purpose of the Sustainability Appraisal was to ensure that social, environmental and economic considerations have been taken into account in developing the SPD. A review of the relevant plans and programmes revealed some of the objectives that the SPD needed to take on board and the baseline compilation helped to identify challenges and opportunities facing street design issues in Leeds. The Sustainability Appraisal process has also helped in comparing the SPD options and highlighting the benefits the new SPD will bring.

This page is intentionally left blank



Originator: Richard Mills

Tel: 247 4557

Report of the Head of Scrutiny and Member Development

Scrutiny Board (City Development)

Date: 13th October 2009

Subject: Inquiry to Review the Method by which Planning Applications are Publicised and Community Involvement takes place – Draft Terms of Reference

Electoral Wards Affected: All

Ward Members consulted
(referred to in report)

Specific Implications For:

Equality and Diversity
Community Cohesion
Narrowing the Gap

1.0 Introduction

1.1 The Board at its meeting in June 2009 agreed to carry out an inquiry to review the method by which planning applications are publicised and community involvement takes place.

1.2 A copy of the draft terms of reference is attached.

2.0 Views of the Director and Executive Member

2.1 The Scrutiny Board Procedure Rules require that, before embarking on an inquiry, the Board seeks and considers the views of the relevant Director and Executive Member. These views will need to be taken into account in finalising the terms of reference.

2.2 The Director of City Development and the Executive Member with portfolio responsibility for development and regeneration have been invited to comment on these terms of reference before the meeting today. Any comments received from them will be reported at today's meeting.

3.0 Recommendation

3.1 The Board is requested to agree the terms of reference for the inquiry having regard to any comments that may be received from the Director of City Development and Executive Board Member with portfolio responsibility for development and regeneration.

This page is intentionally left blank

Scrutiny Board (City Development)

Inquiry to Review the Method by which Planning Applications are Publicised and Community Involvement takes place

Draft Terms of Reference

1.0 Introduction

- 1.1 At the meeting in June 2009 Members agreed to carry out an inquiry to review the current practices by which planning applications are publicised and the way in which people are involved in the planning process.
- 1.2 In particular Members were keen to strengthen the methods by which all parties concerned or affected by a planning application feel engaged in the process but particularly those of individual residents.
- 1.3 Members also wished to identify the circumstances in which substantial additional publicity and consultation is justified for specific planning applications and how it is applied at the pre and post application stages.
- 1.4 The context of and drivers for the inquiry are that:
 - Strict limits and timescales within which planning authorities operate
 - The legal framework within which the planning system operates which prescribes how the process should work and how applications are dealt with. The government is committed to an ambitious planning reform agenda, which aims to speed up the planning system and increase the predictability of planning decisions. Changes include 'Planning for a Sustainable Future: White Paper', the 'Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act', changes to secondary legislation, reviews of planning policy guidance and a change in culture for the whole of the planning system.
 - Department of Communities and Local Government proposals to change planning legislation in relation to the publicising of planning applications giving local authorities a more proportionate, effective and local approach to publicity.
 - Local Government Association recent publication "Probity in Planning"
 - Work well underway in preparing a Charter for involving Parish and Town Councils in the planning process
 - The ways consultation responses are weighed against other planning considerations in making decisions
 - Members have their own experiences of the strengths and weaknesses of the current methods by which planning applications are publicised and consultation undertaken and potential areas for improvement.
 - There is a Central Government agenda promoting greater levels of engagement, including the recent publication of the Community Empowerment White Paper,

'Communities in Control', which will increase requirements for Councils to promote, facilitate and deliver a wider range of engagement activity, with demonstrable impacts on services and other decisions.

- The Leeds Strategic Plan 2008-2011 includes an improvement priority and a national indicator on increasing the number of people who feel they can influence decisions in their locality.
- The Council has legal obligations it must meet in respect of Equality legislation. It is required to evidence appropriate arrangements for engaging with all communities.
- The Council is a signatory to the Compact for Leeds, where community participation and equal partnerships are key areas of focus.
- Area Committees are about to significantly strengthen their community engagement responsibilities, including a brief to agree Area Community Engagement Plans with the goal of delivering better outcomes from local services.

1.5 It is considered that the scrutiny focus is timely and provides an opportunity to look at the way in which planning applications are publicised and consultation undertaken from a planning perspective and how this fits with current corporate consultation policy, processes and arrangements to facilitate more effective community consultation in neighbourhoods, e.g. the Corporate Consultation Portal, emerging Equalities Forum and Hubs;

2.0 The Scope of this Inquiry

2.1 The scope of this inquiry is to identify:

- a) the methods by which planning applications are advertised and consultation undertaken and the opportunities and barriers for making improvements to that process. This will need to be in the context of balancing local views whilst meeting statutory consultation and notification obligations in terms of timescale, resources and legal parameters under which the planning process operates.
- b) what good practice exists in other planning authorities that can be used and developed.
- c) what is currently being developed in house to further engage with local communities
- d) what resources and other support would be required to implement any improvements identified.

3.0 Comments of the relevant Director and Executive Board Member

3.1 The Director of City Development and the relevant Executive Board Member have been requested to comment on these terms of reference.

4.0 Timetable for the Inquiry

4.1 The inquiry will take place over three sessions with a view to issuing a final report in March 2010.

5.0 Submission of Evidence

5.1 The following formal evidence gathering sessions have been scheduled:

Session One – 12th January 2010

The purpose of this session is to hear evidence about:

- the legal requirements under the Town and Country Planning (General Development Procedure) Order 1995 (GPDO) describing the statutory requirements for consultation and notification within the overall planning process, with reference to the appeals system where costs can be awarded if inappropriate actions are taken and the Code of Practice for Publicity and Consultation on all Planning Applications based on the Statement of Community Involvement (SCI) and other relevant legislation.
- Outline of the planning process and what types of comments can be considered in the decision making process on an application from both consultees and the public who may wish to make representations
- the current methods for publicising planning applications and the consultation processes used in Leeds, including emerging electronic delivery methods.
- CLG proposed changes in response to the Killian Pretty review

Session Two – 9th February 2010

The purpose of this session is to consider:

- any information requested from the last session
- consider evidence of examples of good practice in other local planning authorities concerning the publicity and notification given to planning applications and the methods used.
- consider some Case Studies involving selected residents groups, developers and Area Managers suggesting improvements to the current arrangements for publicising and involving people on planning applications , given the constraints identified in paragraph 1.4 above.
- Identify the strengths and weaknesses of the current arrangements and opportunities and barriers for improvement.
- how this fits with current corporate consultation policy, processes and arrangements to facilitate more effective community consultation in neighbourhoods with regard to statutory requirements for timescale and scope.

- 5.2 The Board is asked to consider at this session any emerging recommendations from the inquiry to date.

Session Three – 9th March 2010

The purpose of this session is to consider:

- any information requested from the last session.
- the Board's draft inquiry report and recommendations.

6.0 Witnesses

- 6.1 The following witnesses have been identified as possible contributors to the Inquiry:

- Director of City Development
- Chief Planning Officer
- Head of Planning Services
- Development Project Manager
- Area Managers, Environment and Neighbourhoods Directorate
- Selected residents groups and developers
- Relevant Executive Board Member
- Chief Regeneration Officer
- Plans Panel Chairs
- Parish and Town Council representatives

7.0 Monitoring Arrangements

- 7.1 Following the completion of the scrutiny inquiry and the publication of the final inquiry report and recommendations, the implementation of the agreed recommendations will be monitored.

- 7.2 The final inquiry report will include information on the detailed arrangements for monitoring the implementation of the Board's recommendations.

8.0 Measures of success

- 8.1 It is important to consider how the Board will deem whether its inquiry has been successful in making a difference to local people. Some measures of success may be obvious at the initial stages of an inquiry and can be included in these terms of reference. Other measures of success may become apparent as the inquiry progresses and discussions take place.

- 8.2 The Board will look to publish practical recommendations.

INQUIRY SELECTION CRITERIA

Scrutiny Board (City Development)

Inquiry Title: Inquiry to Review the Method by which Planning Applications are Publicised and Community Involvement takes place

Anticipated Start Date: 12th January 2010

Anticipated Finish Date: 20th March 2010

The Inquiry meets the following criteria

- It addresses the Council's agreed Strategic outcomes by reviewing the effectiveness of policy to achieve strategic outcomes as defined by the Council Corporate plan X
- Shaping and developing policy through influencing pre-policy discussion X

It fulfils a performance management function by

- Reviewing performance of significant parts of service X
- Addressing a poor performing service
- Addressing a high level of user dissatisfaction with the service
- Addressing a pattern of budgetary overspends
- Addressing matters raised by external auditors and inspectors
- Addresses an issue of high public interest
- Reviews a Major or Key Officer decision
- Reviews an Executive Board decision
- Reviews a series of decisions which have a significant impact _____
- Has been requested by the Executive Board/Full Council/Overview and Scrutiny Committee
- looks at innovative change

Comments of relevant Director and Executive Member

This page is intentionally left blank



Originator: R L Mills

Tel: 2474557

Report of the Head of Scrutiny and Member Development

Scrutiny Board (City Development)

Date: 13th October 2009

Subject: Performance Working Group

Electoral Wards Affected: All

Specific Implications For:

Equality and Diversity

Community Cohesion

Narrowing the Gap

1.0 Introduction

1.1 At the July meeting of the Scrutiny Board (City Development) agreed "that a working group be established to review the performance targets which have been set locally.

2.0 Working Group

2.1 The working group met on 2nd September 2009 and a note of that meeting is attached for Members attention.

2.2 In accordance with recommendations 3.1 and 3.2 of the note of the Working Group meeting a list of all targets monitored by the Scrutiny Board (City Development) is attached in order to assist Members to select a number of targets for further investigation.

3.0 Recommendations

3.1 Members of the Scrutiny Board are asked to

- (i) Receive the note of the meeting of the working group held on 2nd September 2009
- (ii) Consider which targets the Board wishes to select for further investigation.
- (iii) Note that the Board on 1st September requested that consideration be given to city centre management being included in any locally determined target.
- (iv) Consider what further scrutiny (if any) the Board or Working Group wishes to undertake.

This page is intentionally left blank

Scrutiny Board (City Development) Performance Working Group

Meeting held on 2nd September 2009

Present:

Councillor Ralph Pryke (Chair)
Councillor Tom Murray

Others in Attendance:

Paul Maney, Head of Policy, Performance and Improvement
Fiona McAnespie, Senior Performance & Improvement Manager
Elaine Rey, Senior Project officer, Planning Policy and Improvement
Helen Franklin, Acting Head of Highways Services
Laura Nield, Scrutiny Adviser, Democratic Services

1.0 Introduction

1.1 At the July meeting of the Scrutiny Board (City Development) it was agreed *“that a working group be established to review the performance targets which have been set locally, comprising of the following Members:-*

- *Cllr R Pryke*
- *Cllr S Bentley*
- *Cllr T Murray*
- *Cllr N Taggart*

1.2 This was the first meeting of the above working group. Cllr Bentley has now stepped down from the Scrutiny Board (City Development) and Cllr Taggart was advised of the date and time of the meeting but did not attend.

2.0 Issues discussed

2.1 The chair began by explaining that Board members were concerned about the credibility of the current performance management system, as the majority of the targets appeared to be met with ease. This suggested to members that the targets were either not stretching enough, or that the right things were not being measured. Overall members were under the impression that these ‘un-challenging’ targets had been actively lobbied for by officers.

2.2 Paul Maney proceeded to explain to members the process by which targets were agreed. Within the Local Area Agreement there are 35 indicators agreed with the Government. Performance against these affects the amount of funding allocated to the authority, so clearly officers are reluctant to agree to targets which are too challenging.

- 2.3 These 35 targets have to relate to the authority's strategic outcomes, as set out in the Leeds Strategic Plan, although they are chosen from a national indicator set. The Government Office also has its own priorities to take account of. Therefore, LCC officers have very little leeway when it comes to choosing the indicators or the related targets.
- 2.4 In addition to the LAA indicators, there are also those agreed with statutory city-wide partners, national indicators (some with targets and some without) and local indicators set entirely by LCC.
- 2.5 There was some discussion as to whether it would be possible to set an additional local target, higher than the nationally agreed one, but measuring the same indicator, in order to provide a more rigorous challenge to the service. Theoretically this would be possible, but in practice it is unlikely to happen as it would lead to questions from government as to why the national target had not been set higher.
- 2.6 The only other potential source of more challenging targets is those set by 'lead partners' in the Local Area Agreement. As these are not given final approval by LCC, there is the possibility that these may be set higher than officers would like. However, this could potentially be very damaging for the authority if a target were to be set unrealistically high and then missed.
- 2.7 It was pointed out that it can be quite difficult to set indicators for certain improvement priorities, as they are purposely set quite broadly, and it is therefore hard to identify one particular measure, the achievement of which would demonstrate success.
- 2.8 Officers also highlighted that one means of avoiding the suspicion of conflict of interest which sometimes accompanies the setting and measurement of targets by a local authority is to involve an external assessor. One example which was given was that of the number of 'Green Flag' parks, used as an indicator of the quality of the built environment.
- 2.9 A discussion was held around the best means of measuring progress in the complex area of climate change. This issue is complicated by the fact that the Council's own actions only account for a small amount of environmental impact. LCC has a far more important role to play in influencing partners across the city to change their behaviour.
- 2.10 Members also discussed the need to have a coordinated approach across the Council in dealing with environmental issues. It was explained that a programme board including all the accountable directors has been established, to tackle complex issues such as the airport. This was a particularly good example of the complexity of the situation, as while an expanded airport would help the city to meet its economic strategic priorities, it would have an adverse affect on those related to the environment and also could impact upon issues like traffic congestion.

- 2.11 The introduction of 'action trackers' to the performance management process should help to illuminate complex issues such as this for Members. However, this system is still very much in its infancy.
- 2.12 The example of indicator NI47 (Killed or Seriously injured casualties) was used to demonstrate to members that the measurement of targets does not just relate to annual predictions, but to a trend over a period of time. The graph presented showed that although the figures occasionally increased from one year to the next, overall there was a downward trend. Members were also shown a map with the distribution of casualties by ward. This demonstrated the complexity of presenting such data on an 'area' basis, as some parts of the city had noticeably higher rates due to the presence of major routes. However, this would clearly not necessarily be an indicator of poorer road safety.
- 2.13 Despite this, there may be some scope for presenting information around certain indicators at a local level. For example, the introduction of the new City Card should enable library usage to be recorded much more accurately.

3.0 Recommendations of the Member Working Group

- 3.1 Members were presented with a list of all targets monitored by the Scrutiny Board (City Development) including comments on how the data was collected.
- 3.2 The working group resolved that this list be presented to the full Scrutiny Board to enable board members to select a number of targets for further investigation.

This page is intentionally left blank

NI	Description	Initial comments
NI171	New business registration rate	Information is provided by the ONS. The lowest geographical level that can be reported is district (eg city) level
NI172	Percentage of small businesses in an area showing employment growth	
NI174	Skills gaps in the current workforce reported by employers	The source of the data is National Employer Skills Survey. The confidence levels for local authority district level are high and must be treated with caution
NI175	Access to services and facilities by public transport, walking and cycling	Data are collected on a West Yorkshire basis and cannot be further disaggregated
NI176	Working age people with access to employment by public transport (and other specified modes)	
NI177	Local bus and light rail passenger journeys originating in the authority area	
NI178	Bus services running on time	
NI185	CO ₂ reduction from local authority operations	Whilst data are collected from individual services, buildings etc, the reduction target is city wide. Work is ongoing to breakdown emissions by directorate (by collating building/fleet emissions) as the PI looks at local authority emissions, not area/ward emissions
NI186	Per capita reduction in CO ₂ emissions in the local authority area	Information is provided to the local authority by Defra, and could be split down by emissions type (ie domestic gas, commercial electricity etc), but not spatially. It may be possible to obtain lower level SOA data for domestic gas and electricity consumption (approximately 35% of the information for this PI could be split by ward)
NI188	Planning to adapt to climate change	These NIs measure the actions taken by Leeds as a whole to improve our resilience to climate change/flood and coastal risk management
NI189	Flood and coastal erosion risk management	
NI194	Air quality - percentage reduction in NO _x and primary PM ₁₀ emissions through local authority's estate and operations	Whilst data are collected from individual services, buildings etc, the reduction target is city wide. Work is ongoing to breakdown emissions by directorate (by collating building/fleet emissions) as the PI looks at local authority emissions, not area/ward emissions
NI197	Improved local biodiversity - proportion of local sites where positive conservation management has been or is being implemented	The overall figure is produced through an aggregation of sites. The service could provide aggregated data if required
NI198	Children travelling to school - mode of transport usually used	Information is supplied to local authorities from DfT at a district level (collected from surveys in schools)
NI199	Children and young people's satisfaction with parks and play areas	2009-10 is the baseline year. It is unlikely that data can be provided by ward/area as this is based on the TellUs survey, which does not show where the results came from (and not all schools took part in the survey)
BP14	Accessible services	Information will be collected on a service basis
BV-170c	Pupil visits to museums and galleries	Information is collected by site and aggregated to produce one overall figure - individual site data could be provided, but capacity varies, and the location of sites is fixed
CP-CU50b	Visits to City Council's cultural facilities Sport and Active Recreation	

NI	Description	Initial comments
LEGI1	Support the establishment of 550 new businesses in deprived communities in Leeds by 2011, with two-thirds of these started by local residents	Results could be provided by SOA and by postcode, although the numbers involved are small. LEGL funding is targeted on specific, pre-defined areas and does not apply across all wards in Leeds
LEGI2	Assist 704 existing businesses in deprived communities in Leeds to survive and grow by 2010	
LEGI3	Attract 81 existing businesses to relocate to deprived communities in Leeds by 2010	
LEGI4	Create 1,192 jobs and move 867 people from deprived communities in Leeds into employment or self-employment	
LKI 215a	The average number of days taken to repair a street lighting fault under the control of the local authority	The PI is reported at a city wide level but could be broken down to a ward level. However, this indicator is designed to give an overall view of performance across the city
LKI 215b	The average number of days taken to repair a street lighting fault under the local Distribution Network Operator (DNO)	
LKI CD HW02	Percentage of category 1, 1a or 2 footways where maintenance should be considered	The result of this PI is produced from a sample of footways that is aggregated to provide a city wide percentage
LKI CD HW04	In light percentage of lighting points	The PI is reported at a city wide level but can be broken down to a ward level. However, this indicator is designed to give an overall view of performance across the city
LKI SC19	Number of sports facilities with a specified quality assurance standard	Information is collected by site and aggregated to produce one overall figure
LKI SP9a	The number of swims and other visits (to sport/leisure centres) per 1,000 Population	It is possible to break data down by spatial levels, but data would be historic in relation to super output areas. However, the ONS mid-year population estimates could be broken down to ward; additionally, capacity varies, and the location of sites is fixed
LKI SP9b	Net cost per visit to sports centres	Each specific site sits in a ward, super output area and a postcode. The net cost of each site could be assessed relative to the socio-economic situation in the ward(s), or SOAs that form the catchment area for the site. Generally, the more deprived the area the more significant the cost of delivering the service is
LKI SP9c	Total number of swims and other visits	Information is collected by site and aggregated to produce one overall figure - individual site data could be provided, but capacity varies, and location of sites are fixed
LKI-224b	Percentage of the unclassified road network where structural maintenance should be considered in that year	The result of this PI is produced from a sample of the road network that is aggregated to provide a city wide percentage
LKI-GF1	Percentage of parks and countryside sites assessed internally that meet the Green Flag criteria	Information is collected by site and aggregated to produce one overall figure for each indicator - individual site data could be provided, but capacity varies, and the location of sites is fixed
LSP-CU1a(i)	Visits to libraries	
LSP-CU1a(ii)	Visits to museums and galleries	
LSP-CU2a(i)	Amount spent on developing facilities of national and international significance	This PI does not have a target as such; rather, it monitors/tracks spend on pre-identified significant cultural facilities

NI	Description	Initial comments
NI8	Adult participation in sport	Results are provided to local authorities from data collected from a telephone survey carried out by Ipsos MORI, on behalf of Sport England/DCMS. Additionally, the sample size is small (499) so any disaggregation would be statistically unsound. Sport England have, however, modelled the data to give estimates for Super Output Areas (SOAs) using GIS (for NI 8)
NI9	Visits to libraries	
NI10	Visits to museums and galleries	
NI11	Engagement in the arts	
NI47	People killed or seriously injured in road traffic accidents	
NI48	Children killed or seriously injured in road traffic accidents	Data provided to the local authority by West Yorkshire Police. Each incident is recorded by ward, and by first-part postcode (eg LS2); data could also be analysed by gender, ethnicity and age. Small numbers at ward (and below) levels will limit relevance of disaggregation, however. Furthermore, data shows where an accident occurs, not the home location of the individuals involved - statistics may show the number of accidents in an area, but they could be linked to a main artery road rather than that area; they do not necessarily reflect accidents involving local residents
NI151	Overall employment rate (working age)	Information is provided to the local authority by the Office for National Statistics (ONS). The lowest geographical level at which the Annual Population Survey reports is city level
NI154	Net additional homes provided	The data are held digitally, so output to any spatial zone is theoretically possible
NI157	Processing of planning applications	City-level data already provided - ward, SOA, postcode disaggregation is technically possible, though time-consuming. There is no reason why decisions should take longer in certain parts of the city - this is a measure of the efficiency an administrative process rather than anything else
NI159	Supply of ready-to-develop housing sites	The data are held digitally, so output to any spatial zone is possible in principle
NI163	Proportion of population aged 19-64 for males and 19-59 for females qualified to at least Level 2 or higher	Data provided by ONS. Data are compiled from the national Annual Population Survey. The confidence levels below local authority district (city) level are too high to be considered statistically accurate
NI164	Proportion of population aged 19-64 for males and 19-59 for females qualified to at least Level 3 or higher	
NI165	Proportion of population aged 19-64 for males and 19-59 for females qualified to at least Level 4 or higher	
NI166	Median earnings of employees in the area	
NI167	Congestion - average journey time per mile during the morning peak	
NI168	Principal roads where maintenance should be considered	The result is produced from monitoring 13 selected routes in West Yorkshire. No disaggregation is possible (the PI forms part of the West Yorkshire Local Transport Plan)
NI169	Non-principal roads where maintenance should be considered	These indicators report on the percentage of principal ('A') and non-principal ('B' and 'C') roads that are scanned which require maintenance
NI170	Previously developed land that has been vacant or derelict for more than five years	Incidence in wards, SOA, postal districts and postcode sectors could be identified

NI	Description	Initial comments
LSP-CU2a(ii)	Number of physical infrastructure capital build projects of national or international significance that will increase and/or improve culture provision	This PI does not have a target as such; rather, it monitors/tracks spend on pre-identified significant cultural facilities
LSP-EE1a	To create 1,100 jobs and move 800 people from deprived communities in Leeds into employment or self-employment. Part (i): Move 800 people from deprived communities in Leeds into employment or self-employment	Results could be provided by SOA and by postcode, although the numbers involved are small. LEGL funding is targeted on specific, pre-defined areas and does not apply across all wards in Leeds
LSP-EE1b	Satisfaction with Planning Performance Agreements	Data could be provided from individual planning applications; however, the aim of this indicator is to measure overall satisfaction. There is no reason why decisions should take longer in certain parts of the city - this is a measure of the efficiency an administrative process rather than anything else
LSP-EE2a	Percentage of UK residents surveyed who regard Leeds as a 'great place to live' (when asked to name any city in the UK)	The results are lifted from a perception survey of UK residents (a) and businesses (b) and no disaggregation is possible
LSP-EE2b	Improve Leeds' image as a major centre for business (when asked if you would regard as a major city)	
LSP-TP1e	Increase the number of new customers on low incomes accessing Credit Union services (savings, loans and current accounts)	Data are collected for the entire metropolitan district. The aim of this work is to address financial exclusion and is therefore targeted at low income individuals across the city
LSP-TR1a	Cycle trips to the city centre in the morning peak period	The result is calculated from modal split surveys on a cordon around central Leeds.
LSP-TR1b(i)	Percentage of non-car journeys into central Leeds in the morning peak period	Data are averaged from four separate weekday surveys to produce a single figure - disaggregation would not be statistically sound
LSP-TR1b(ii)	Percentage of non-car journeys into central Leeds in the morning peak period	Information is provided by Metro at a district level
PCP22	Overall user satisfaction with Parks and Countryside	This indicator is managed at a city wide level; any area based results may be disproportionate due to the random selection of sites by public respondents. The individual site-based information is used alongside the inspection data from Leeds Quality Park scheme to inform development activities

Target Setting - Presentation Scrutiny working.
Wednesday 2nd September 15.00-17.00

NI 169 - % of B&C classified roads where maintenance needs to be considered

Place target setting into context:-

4 condition indicators

Indicator	Streets covered	Total length	2008-09 result
NI168	Principal roads	240km	5%
NI169	B&C classified roads	230km	9%
Local	Unclassified roads	2400km	12%
Local	Most important footways	90km	17%

Unclassified roads had historically received very little funding and these were in the poorest state of repair. They are arguably the roads which are of most importance to the residents of Leeds in terms of quality of the street environment and the where most journeys start or end.

NI 169 was chosen for inclusion in the LAA basket because of the priority highway condition has within the council and because it covers roads which are closest in nature to local roads.

Effectively a proxy for performance on rest of network. And as such, we must not target work to achieve on this NI at cost of rest of network.

Result was actually 9.3% in 2008-09 against a target of 10%. 2009-10 target already pre-set at 9% in accordance with GO guidance.

Maintenance Strategy

Targets are set taking into account the improvements which can be achieved with existing funding and with the current strategy.

In broad terms we are looking to spend money wisely to make a real and lasting improvement to condition of whole network.

The condition surveys assess every 10m length of road as RAG and the condition indicators report on the % red.

R – Can't do all reds at once but want to eat away at backlog on worst first basis. But actually, they won't cost significantly more if leave for a year.

Dark A – on other hand are next year's reds. They can be treated cheaply with preventative maintenance if do them now. If left, they will drag out indicators down and cost a lot more.

Doing a balance of R and dark A, together with safety and routine maintenance. These address local repairs, particularly ones which could result in trips and claims if not addressed.

Working with Area Management / Area Committees

Primarily around agreement as to which schemes should be included on the planned maintenance programme.

Priorities are largely driven by the condition data.

But local factors will determine whether a street is accelerated up the priority list, eg due to residents concern about trips if it is near a day centre.

Local input can also help with co-ordination with closer knowledge of non highway proposals for an area, eg housing regeneration.

Therefore around September each year, send out a consultation schedule on a three year rolling programme of work on local roads in each ward. Goes to ward members, area management teams, parish clerks etc.

Programme for the next year is then finalised based on the consultation response.



Originator:	C Follin/C Owen
Tel:	74474

Report of the Director of City Development

Scrutiny Board City Development

Date: 13th October 2009

Subject: Legible Leeds Project

Electoral Wards Affected: City & Hunslet <input type="checkbox"/> Ward Members consulted (referred to in report)
--

Specific Implications For: Equality and Diversity <input type="checkbox"/> Community Cohesion <input type="checkbox"/> Narrowing the Gap <input type="checkbox"/>

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

1. It was recognised during 2007 that there was a need to improve the legibility of Leeds city centre. This means providing information that makes it easy to get into and out of the city centre and once there easy to find your way around. This will help to link together the different parts of the expanding city centre, make attractions better known and easier to find and to ensure that new developments become fully integrated into the city centre.
2. Independent advisors, AIG Lacock Gullam, were appointed in 2007 to produce an Audit of the current wayfinding information in Leeds city centre, which led to the development of the Legible Leeds Wayfinding Strategy (LLWS). The LLWS document recommends what should be done to make Leeds city centre more legible.
3. On behalf of LCC, AIG Lacock Gullam have developed a new city centre walking map, 'Walk it' (**sent with papers**), which has proved extremely popular and are currently developing a concept product design for an on-street wayfinding system that will consist of maps and directional signage.
4. Funding of £1.2 million (combination of LCC and Yorkshire Forward match funding) has been identified to carry out the installation of the on-street wayfinding system.
5. Members' observations on the project and recommendations on the way forward would be welcomed.

1.0 Purpose Of This Report

1.1 To advise Members of the:

- publication of a new city centre 'Walk it' map and how it has been received;
- the need for significant investment in the city centre's on-street wayfinding system (i.e. integrated map units and fingerpost information);
- planned expenditure to March 2011 of £1.2 million (consisting of £600,000 Leeds City Council funding and £600,000 of Yorkshire Forward funding) on the Legible Leeds project, specifically the phased implementation of the city centre on-street pedestrian wayfinding scheme;
- need to improve legibility for car drivers and public transport users.

2.0 Importance of Legibility

2.1 Attractions and opportunities within the city centre draw a significant level of footfall from shoppers, visitors, workers and residents alike. Currently over 112,000 pedestrians enter the retail area weekdays and 139,000 on a Saturday. The current wayfinding signage is not making the most of the large volume of people moving around the city centre at any one time.

2.2 For the city centre to become legible it must be easy to get into *and* out of, and once there, easy to find your way around. This is affected by factors relating to the visitor, such as their own wayfinding ability and level of previous knowledge of the city centre, but also the availability of up-to-date city centre maps and directional signage in appropriate locations.

2.3 The importance of good legibility is not unique to Leeds city centre. Considered in a competitive context to other key cities such as Bristol, Sheffield, Glasgow, Liverpool and Southampton, Leeds is currently lagging behind. Gaining a reputation for a successful legibility scheme is invaluable for raising Leeds' profile to go up a league as a city and become internationally competitive.

2.4 The City Centre Retail Group (chaired by the Director City Development and attended by the Trinity and Eastgate retail developers) first identified that wayfinding information in the city centre needed to be improved. This was to ensure that new large retail developments, particularly Eastgate Quarter and Trinity Leeds, become integral parts of the city centre so that the core retail offer expands rather than shifts. Improved legibility would encourage visitors arriving at the new retail developments to explore the rest of the city centre because the route there and back again would be clearly mapped and signed.

2.5 Members of the group, TQD Ltd (Caddick's and Land Securities) for Trinity Leeds and Hammerson's and Town Centre Securities for Eastgate Quarter, offered a sum of £25,000 (£12,500 each) to progress the work.

2.6 Further aims of the Legible Leeds project include:

- increasing visitor numbers and a good rate of repeat visits to the city centre;
- increasing awareness of, and numbers of visitors to, cultural attractions; particularly the new City Museum and the Royal Armouries;
- maximising benefits of the forthcoming Arena being located in the city centre;
- that continued investment in the city centre to secure further growth in employment is encouraged and supported.

3.0 The Audit

- 3.1 Under the guidance of an inter-disciplinary officer steering group, independent advisors AIG Lacock Gullam were commissioned to carry out a three phase Legible Leeds project.
- 3.2 Phase one was to produce an Audit of the current wayfinding information in Leeds city centre. The focus of the research was primarily on the existing and proposed city centre retail area, but also included transport interchanges, car parks, the Civic quarter and the waterfront.
- 3.3 The Audit identified that the city centre's pockets of excellence are not connected together by clear pedestrian routes or information. The shopping areas do not link with the cultural destinations. The waterfront is hidden away and the waterside pathways are disjointed. The viaduct to the south and inner ring road to the north form strong physical barriers that deter pedestrians walking into the city centre.
- 3.4 Leeds' current wayfinding information, which consists of city maps in 33 locations and a system of fingerposts in 70 locations, was installed incrementally in a reactive and ad hoc manner through the mid 1990's. The Audit observed that the location of the fingerposts, the destinations included on them, as well as the destination names and symbols used are not consistent. In addition the fingerposts do not indicate the length of time it will take to walk to the named destination.
- 3.5 The Audit also found that the existing city centre on-street map was designed with motorists rather than pedestrians in mind. For example the inner ring road and city centre loop are visually prominent and it does not show walking routes through shopping centres and the arcades, such as the Victoria Quarter.
- 3.6 The style and physical condition of the fingerposts and map stands are increasingly tired and dated, especially in comparison to the improved public realm, and does not support the aspiration for Leeds to compete at a European level.
- 3.7 Street name and road signs are part of the family of wayfinding directional signage. The Audit identified that city centre's street name signs are not consistent in style or positioning so do not support the idea of a cohesive Leeds city centre area. Road signage tends to direct traffic to car parks without indicating whether the car parks are best for shoppers or visiting cultural attractions.
- 3.8 The Audit also showed how the delivery of a successful legible city is closely linked to the quality of the public realm. Up-to-date, clear and easy to use on-street wayfinding information is a complementary layer of a high quality public realm, offering interpretation and information when needed.

4.0 Legible Leeds Wayfinding Strategy

- 4.1 Phase two of the Legible Leeds project, informed by the findings of the Audit, was the development of a Legible Leeds Wayfinding Strategy (LLWS). The LLWS recommends the ways in which the city centre could improve access, perception, and wayfinding information to become more legible.
- 4.2 The LLWS has three key objectives:
- 1. Welcoming people to Leeds** – improving gateways, providing a consistent image of the city and making sure people's first impression is a full, positive picture.

2. Connecting places – integrating new developments, removing physical barriers, creating a network of pedestrian routes through the whole of the city.

3. Making movement easy – linking transport, giving wayfinding information where it's needed and naming places to make areas easier to find.

- 4.3 By improving on-street pedestrian signage, creating maps designed for people on foot, producing visitor information that links with the on-street information, and improving street and traffic signs, visitors will be encouraged to explore further than they otherwise would. This is beneficial to the visitor as they have a more positive experience of the city centre encouraging repeat visits and beneficial to the destinations as they receive increased visitor numbers and associated custom.

5.0 Implementation – the Map

- 5.1 Phase three of the Legible Leeds project has started to put recommendations from the LLWS in to practice. On behalf of LCC, AIG Lacock Gullam have developed a new city centre walking map 'Walk it', and working on the concept design for an on-street wayfinding system.
- 5.2 The 'Walk it' map has been very well received by Council officers from a wide range of disciplines, the private sector, the general public, equality groups and the Civic Trust. Comments include that people did not know the city centre had so many cultural facilities and that things were much closer than they had realised. A number of companies have asked for the maps to be available at their offices and displayed in their empty shop windows.
- 5.3 Such is the popularity of the map that officers are producing it in a variety of formats, including tailored versions to appear in city event brochures, such as Light Night and Leeds Shopping Week, downloadable versions and simple A3 tear off pads for use in hotels. Options to allow city partners and organisations to sponsor a print run of the map are being explored.

6.0 Implementation – the on-street wayfinding system

- 6.1 AIG Lacock Gullam have developed a placement plan of where the on-street wayfinding system should be installed. This identifies the most popular pedestrian routes and, within these, the most appropriate locations for the signs and maps to be positioned. They are providing options for the concept design of how the mapping units and fingerposts could look.
- 6.2 AIG Lacock Gullam have already successfully delivered this type of work in various other cities, including London, Glasgow and Brighton. With their guidance to date a single strategy for mapping, sign position and preferred routes can now be implemented. The planned approach will allow the system to be logically extended in the future as required.
- 6.3 Sign clutter and street clutter exists on many pedestrian routes in Leeds city centre. Clutter creates 'visual noise' that reduces the effectiveness of on-street information, and affects the overall perception and enjoyment of the area. Therefore prior to putting in further pedestrian signage, a de-cluttering process is underway to remove unnecessary street clutter.

7.0 Consultation

- 7.1 Internal and external partners have been consulted throughout the development and delivery of Legible Leeds wayfinding project. The draft LLWS was sent out to consultation with key city centre stakeholders, including retail developers, Yorkshire Forward, Leeds Civic Trust, University of Leeds, Aire Action Leeds and various Leeds City Council members and officers. The feedback was positive and comments have been incorporated into the final document.
- 7.2 Further consultation has been conducted via dedicated group workshops and presentations and through the creation of the bi-monthly Legible Leeds Working Group that includes members from both internal and external partners. Consultees include, from Leeds City Council, representatives from Planning, Highways, Public art, Urban design, Equality, Visit Leeds (tourism) and, externally Marketing Leeds, the University of Leeds, Aire Action Leeds, the Waterfront Association, NHS, Leeds Civic Trust, property owners, retail developers, shopping centre managers, key retailers, hoteliers and city centre residents.
- 7.3 Two group workshops were held that specifically focused on agreeing the names and facilities to appear on the map. The fact that, for example, six different names were identified for the Leeds train station illustrates that this exercise was not always as simple as it might seem. A clear strategy was devised that determined which buildings and shops should also be included, only if they provided an aid to wayfinding and navigation.
- 7.4 Detailed equality and inclusivity consultation via questionnaires and meetings has taken place with a focus group consisting of visually, hearing and mobility impaired users of the city centre. Within the suite of Walk it maps, the objective to provide a range of maps available on the internet tailored with additional detailed access information, including large print, indication of gradient and using more symbols than words, arose from this consultation. The consultation and involvement in the development of the scheme has been very well received.

8.0 The Future for On-Street Wayfinding in the City Centre

- 8.1 The city centre's existing uncoordinated wayfinding information will start to be removed in 2010 and be replaced by bespoke location specific mapping units, with integrated 'fingerpost' information. Stand alone fingerposts will also be installed where necessary. Installation will be carried out in a number of phases. The actual number of phases will be determined once further work has been carried out on the specific 'Leeds' design and associated costings.
- 8.2 Further to the initial concept design work that has taken place, a number of influential factors regarding the design of the future on-street wayfinding signage have yet to be decided. These will determine what can feasibly be implemented in the first phase within the specified budget. These decisions include the:
- number of on-street map and signage locations required;
 - materials and design of the on-street wayfinding signage system;
 - quality of materials used, options include vitreous enamel (baked glass), stainless steel and/or glass;
 - flexibility of the design to allow future change of information.

8.3 Street name plate upgrading and co-ordination and modifications to highway signage are considered to be part of the overall project, and will primarily be funded through yearly maintenance budgets.

9.0 Implications For Council Policy And Governance

9.1 Improvement to the legibility of Leeds city centre through, initially, the installation of a contemporary up-to-date on-street wayfinding system supports a number of strategies for the city. These include the Council Plan, the Vision for Leeds 2004 to 2020, the Leeds City Centre Strategic Plan 2006 to 2010, Renaissance Leeds Delivery Plan 2007-2009 and the Leeds City Centre 2020 Vision Prospectus.

9.2 The project supports LCC's Green Strategy and the Leeds Health and Wellbeing Plan as it will encourage and promote walking over using transport.

9.3 The project supports LCC's core values to put customers first, looking after Leeds and treating people fairly. The design will consider, and address where appropriate, the needs of the disabled so improving accessibility for all in the city centre.

10.0 Resource Implications

10.1 £600,000 LCC funding was approved in February 2009 by Executive Board and Full Council. This will be spent by March 2011.

10.2 Yorkshire Forward (YF) has agreed to match fund the above LCC commitment and contribute an additional £600,000 for the financial year 2009/10.

10.3 Investment for future phases will have to be sought and secured from further sources, including future LCC capital programme, the regional development agency, the private sector and large city centre developers.

10.4 There will be future revenue implications for the on-going maintenance of the wayfinding system, including managing map data content over time and the physical condition of the units. It is currently anticipated that this will be met from existing City Centre budgets.

11.0 Recommendations

11.1 Members are asked to note the contents of this report and comment on the Legible Leeds project.

12.0 Background Papers

- Executive Board report "Proposed Refurbishment Of The City Centre Public Realm" dated 11th September 2007
- Leeds City Centre Strategic Plan 2006 to 2010
- Vision for Leeds 2004 to 2020
- Renaissance Leeds Delivery Plan 2007-2009
- The Council's Green Strategy
- Leeds Strategic Plan 2008 to 2011
- Leeds City Centre 2020 Vision Prospectus
- Legible Leeds Wayfinding Strategy August 2008



Originator: R L Mills

Tel: 2474557

Report of the Head of Scrutiny and Member Development

Scrutiny Board (City Development)

Date: 13th October 2009

Subject: Work Programme, Executive Board Minutes and Forward Plan of Key Decisions

Electoral Wards Affected: All

Specific Implications For:

Equality and Diversity

Community Cohesion

Narrowing the Gap

1.0 Introduction

- 1.1 Appendix 1 to this report provides Members with a copy of the Board's current Work Programme.
- 1.2 Appendix 2 is the current Forward Plan of Key Decisions for the period 1st October to 31st January 2010.
- 1.3 Appendix 3 provides Members of the Board with the latest Executive Board Minutes.

2.0 Recommendations

- 2.1 The Board is requested to:
 - (i) Determine from these documents whether there are any additional items the Board would wish to add to its Work Programme.
 - (ii) Receive and make any changes to the attached Work Programme following decisions made at today's meeting.

Background Papers

None used

This page is intentionally left blank

Scrutiny Board (City Development) - Last Revised 24th September 2009

Appendix 1

ITEM	DESCRIPTION	NOTES	TYPE OF ITEM
<p>Meeting date: 13th October 2009 Reports required by 23rd September 2009</p>			
<p>Update on Street Design Guide</p>	<p>To consider a report of the Director of City Development</p>	<p>Update requested at the Board meeting on 9th June 2009</p>	<p>RP/DP</p>
<p>Inquiry to Review the Method by which Planning Applications are Publicised and Community Involvement takes place</p>	<p>To consider draft terms of reference</p>	<p>Consideration of this issue was requested at the Board's first meeting of the municipal year</p>	<p>RP</p>
<p>Meeting date: 10th November 2009 Reports required by 21st October 2009</p>			
<p>Leeds City Region Transport Strategy Vision</p>	<p>To consider a report of the Director of City Development</p>	<p>The Board requested this at their meeting on 9th June 2009</p>	<p>DP</p>
<p>Planning Compliance Update</p>	<p>To consider an update report of the Director of City Development</p>	<p>The Board requested this in June 2009</p>	<p>RP</p>
<p>Review of the City Centre Loop</p>	<p>To consider an initial report by the Director of City Development</p>	<p>Last advised in December 2008 that modelling work would commence in January 2009 and would not be completed until the summer.</p>	<p>DP/RP</p>

Scrutiny Board (City Development) - Last Revised 24th September 2009

ITEM	DESCRIPTION	NOTES	TYPE OF ITEM
Meeting date: 8th December 2009 Reports required by 17th November			
Recommendation Tracking	To monitor progress on meeting the recommendations agreed on the A660		MSR
Quarterly Accountability Reports	To receive quarter 2 performance reports		PM
Review of Conservation Unit & Conservation Areas	To consider a report of the Director of City Development	The Board requested this at their meeting on 9th June 2009	RP
Meeting date: 12th January 2010 Reports required by 23rd December 2009			
Scrutiny of the Budget	To receive budget proposals under the budget and policy framework rules		
Session 1 Inquiry to Review the Method by which Planning Applications are Publicised and Community Involvement takes place	To consider a report of the Director of City Development		RP/DP
Consultation document on the Agenda for an Improved Economic Performance	To consider a consultation document on the Agenda for improved Economic Performance	Was to be considered by Scrutiny Board in the Autumn 2009 before final submission to Executive Board at the end of the year but the timetable has been moved to the New Year	RP/DP

Scrutiny Board (City Development) - Last Revised 24th September 2009

ITEM	DESCRIPTION	NOTES	TYPE OF ITEM
Meeting date: 9th February 2010 Reports required by 20th January 2010			
Session 2 Inquiry to Review the Method by which Planning Applications are Publicised and Community Involvement takes place	To consider further evidence		RP/DP
Meeting date: 9th March 2010 Reports required by 17th February 2010			
Session 3 Inquiry to Review the Method by which Planning Applications are Publicised and Community Involvement takes place	To consider the Board's final report and recommendations		RP/DP
Recommendation Tracking	To monitor progress on meeting the recommendations agreed in 2009/2010		MSR
Quarterly Accountability Reports	To receive quarter 3 performance reports		PM
Playbuilder Initiative	To consider a further update from the Director of Children's Services with on this initiative	An initial report was considered by the Board on 1st September 2009	DP

Scrutiny Board (City Development) - Last Revised 24th September 2009

ITEM	DESCRIPTION	NOTES	TYPE OF ITEM
Performance Indicator NI 157 - Majors	To consider a report of the Director of City Development on this National Indicator in detail	Scrutiny Board on 1st September 2009 in considering the performance reports of the department in Q1 requested to consider this target on major planning applications including some case studies.	RP/B
Meeting date: 6th April 2010		Reports required by 17th March 2010	
Annual Report			

Key: CCFA / RFS – Councillor call for action / request for scrutiny
 RP – Review of existing policy
 DP – Development of new policy
 MSR – Monitoring scrutiny recommendations
 PM – Performance management
 B – Briefings (Including potential areas for scrutiny) SC – Statutory consultation
 CI – Call in

Issues Identified but not yet included in Work Programme

1. Leisure Centres and Vision for Sport /sport centre closures- report going to Executive Board July 2009. Scrutiny Board would like to consider to have input to the 5 year vision and perhaps do some further scrutiny
2. Report requested updating members on work to improve signage in the station area and city centre and the Civic Trust proposals.
3. Agreed that arrangements be made for Members of the Scrutiny Board to visit the building site of the new well being PFI leisure centre site at Morley as soon as the new build has progressed to make the visit worthwhile.
4. Report requested on Review of Libraries - new technology, opening hours, greater use of mobile libraries, building maintenance.
5. Update report requested from Marketing Leeds and the role it plays in marketing Leeds nationally and internationally
6. Concerns expressed by Members as to the lack of publicity and promotion of "gems" in the city some privately owned (Wetherby racecourse, Harewood House) and the many events like concerts, Chapeltown Carnival, St George's Day
7. Report on the outcome of the trial of a designated barbecue area on Woodhouse Moor probably September 2010
8. Climate Change reports on key issues agreed at Scrutiny Board on 16th September 2009. **Waiting for confirmation of dates from the department including progress in planning policy to strategically plan for large scale grid renewables**
9. The Board in December 2008 asked that further scrutiny be undertaken of the work being carried out to the City Varieties during 2009.
10. Possible issue raised by the Board in June 2008 for consideration later in the year - Review of the Environmental Policy and EMAS.

This page is intentionally left blank

LEEDS CITY COUNCIL

FORWARD PLAN OF KEY DECISIONS

For the period 1 October 2009 to 31 January 2010

Key Decisions	Decision Maker	Expected Date of Decision	Proposed Consultation	Documents to be Considered by Decision Maker	Lead Officer (To whom representations should be made and email address to send representations to)
The award of the West Yorkshire sub regional element of the YORbuild Regional Construction Framework	Chief Procurement Officer	1/10/09		Delegated Decision Report	Chief Procurement Officer wayne.baxter@leeds.gov.uk

Key Decisions	Decision Maker	Expected Date of Decision	Proposed Consultation	Documents to be Considered by Decision Maker	Lead Officer (To whom representations should be made and email address to send representations to)
<p>A653 Dewsbury Road Bus Priority Measures - Ring Road Beeston Park Bus Lane Advance Northern Gas Diversion and Additional Fees Permission to finance Northern Gas Networks Ltd diversion in advance of the proposed main contract work. This diversion is required to enable the efficient construction of the Ring Road Beeston Park Bus Lane Scheme, an intrinsic part of the A653 Dewsbury Road Bus Priority Measures. Additional fees for an enlarged Geotechnical Study and consequent redesign of the scheme.</p>	<p>Director of Resources, Director of City Development</p>	<p>6/10/09</p>	<p>Initial member consultation has taken place</p>	<p>None</p>	<p>Director of City Development david.wilson@leeds.gov.uk</p>

Key Decisions	Decision Maker	Expected Date of Decision	Proposed Consultation	Documents to be Considered by Decision Maker	Lead Officer (To whom representations should be made and email address to send representations to)
Royal Park Primary School To decline the request from the Royal Park Community Consortium for a six-month delay prior to any decision as to disposal and to seek Members approval to the selection of a purchaser of the property.	Executive Board (Portfolio: Development and Regeneration)	14/10/09	Ward Members	The report to be issued to the decision maker with the agenda for the meeting	Director of City Development john.ramsden@leeds.gov.uk

Key Decisions	Decision Maker	Expected Date of Decision	Proposed Consultation	Documents to be Considered by Decision Maker	Lead Officer (To whom representations should be made and email address to send representations to)
<p>Leeds Core Cycle Network Project</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Approve progressing the design and implementation of the proposed Leeds Core Cycle Network Project, subject to financial approvals and regulation. • Approve the estimated expenditure of £1,446,305 for the following routes that form part of the proposed Core Cycle Network Project, to be funded from the Integrated Transport Parent Scheme 99609 within the approved Capital Programme: <p>Route 16 Wyke Beck Way (Roundhay Park to Easterly Road section) Route 5 Cookridge – City Centre Route 3 Middleton – City Centre Route 15 Alwoodley – City Centre</p>	<p>Executive Board (Portfolio: Development and Regeneration)</p>	<p>14/10/09</p>	<p>Ward Members have been consulted at outline design and there will be another stage of Member consultation following detailed design</p>	<p>The report to be issued to the decision maker with the agenda for the meeting</p>	<p>Director of City Development andrew.hall@leeds.gov.uk</p>

Key Decisions	Decision Maker	Expected Date of Decision	Proposed Consultation	Documents to be Considered by Decision Maker	Lead Officer (To whom representations should be made and email address to send representations to)
New Generation Transport Project (NGT) To approve the submission of the Major Scheme Business Case(MSBC) for the NGT Project.	Executive Board (Portfolio:Development and Regeneration)	14/10/09	Extended public consultation including Ward Members, local community groups, relevant area committees and wider stakeholders and interest groups was carried out in the summer.	The report to be issued to the decision maker with the agenda for the meeting	Director of City Development francis.linley@leeds.gov.uk
Supply of agricultural, Horticultural, arboricultural and commercial grounds care equipment Award of contract	Chief Recreation Officer	20/10/09		Award Report	Acting Chief Recreation Officer chris.simpson@leeds.gov.uk
World Cup 2018 Approve the final bid document for Leeds to become a host city for World Cup 2018.	Executive Board (Portfolio:Development and Regeneration)	28/10/09	City Region Partners	The report to be issued to the decision maker with the agenda for the meeting	Chief Asset Management Officer paul.brook@leeds.gov.uk

Key Decisions	Decision Maker	Expected Date of Decision	Proposed Consultation	Documents to be Considered by Decision Maker	Lead Officer (To whom representations should be made and email address to send representations to)
Award of tender for supply of cardiovascular and strength equipment	Chief Recreation Officer	2/11/09	Sport and Active Recreation Department	Relevant reports for the award of tender and associated Delegated Decision Notice	Chief Recreation Officer kim.newman@leeds.gov.uk
Middleton Park Restoration Project; Submission of Stage 2 Bid to the Heritage Lottery Fund To approve the submission of the Stage 2 Bid to the Heritage Lottery Fund (HLF) for Middleton Park.	Executive Board (Portfolio: Leisure)	4/11/09	Consultation with communities in the area, the Executive Member, with Local Ward Members and with the Heritage Lottery Fund will be ongoing during the development phase between March and July.	The report to be issued to the decision maker with the agenda for the meeting.	Chief Recreation Officer richard.mond@leeds.gov.uk
Community Asset Strategy Approval requested	Executive Board (Portfolio: Development and Reeneration)	4/11/09	Asset Management Board 24 th July	The report to be issued to the decision maker with the agenda for the meeting	Director of City Development john.ramsden@leeds.gov.uk

Key Decisions	Decision Maker	Expected Date of Decision	Proposed Consultation	Documents to be Considered by Decision Maker	Lead Officer (To whom representations should be made and email address to send representations to)
Sustainable Buildings Strategy Approval requested	Executive Board (Portfolio: Development and Regeneration)	4/11/09	September Strategic Investment Board	The report to be issued to the decision maker with the agenda for the meeting	Director of City Development john.ramsden@leeds.gov.uk
A65 Quality Bus Initiative Authority to spend up to £2million pound advance payments for Statutory Undertakers Diversions . Subject to full approval, authority to construct the A65 QBI at a cost of £16million	Executive Board (Portfolio: Development and Regeneration)	4/11/09	Ongoing consultation	The report to be issued to the decision maker with the agenda for the meeting	Chief Officer (Highways and Transportation) paul.russel@leeds.gov.uk
Asset Management Plan and Capital Strategy Approval of the Capital Strategy and Asset Management Plan	Executive Board (Portfolio: Development and Regeneration)	6/1/10		The report to be issued to the decision maker with the agenda for the meeting	Director of City Development john.ramsden@leeds.gov.uk

Key Decisions	Decision Maker	Expected Date of Decision	Proposed Consultation	Documents to be Considered by Decision Maker	Lead Officer (To whom representations should be made and email address to send representations to)
<p>A653 Dewsbury Road Bus Priority Measures, Ring Road, Beeston Park Bus Lane</p> <p>Permission to construct the scheme, subject to satisfactory funding arrangements being in place on return of tenders. The works are required to provide a quality bus corridor identified in the LTP and are an intrinsic part of the Yorkshire Bus Initiative.</p>	<p>Executive Board (Portfolio: Development and Regeneration)</p>	<p>12/2/10</p>	<p>Initial Member consultation has taken place.</p>	<p>The report to be issued to the decision maker with the agenda for the meeting</p>	<p>Director of City Development jean.dent@leeds.gov.uk</p>

NOTES

Key decisions are those executive decisions:

- which result in the authority incurring expenditure or making savings over £250,000 per annum, or
- are likely to have a significant effect on communities living or working in an area comprising two or more wards

Executive Board Portfolios

Executive Member

Central and Corporate

Councillor Richard Brett

Development and Regeneration

Councillor Andrew Carter

Environmental Services

Councillor James Monaghan

Neighbourhoods and Housing

Councillor John Leslie Carter

Leisure

Councillor John Procter

Children's Services

Councillor Stewart Golton

Learning

Councillor Richard Harker

Adult Health and Social Care

Councillor Peter Harrand

Leader of the Labour Group

Councillor Keith Wakefield

Leader of the Morley Borough
Independent Group

Councillor Robert Finnigan

Advisory Member

Councillor Richard Lewis

In cases where Key Decisions to be taken by the Executive Board are not included in the Plan, 5 days notice of the intention to take such decisions will be given by way of the agenda for the Executive Board meeting.

EXECUTIVE BOARD

WEDNESDAY, 26TH AUGUST, 2009

PRESENT: Councillor R Brett in the Chair

Councillors A Carter, J L Carter, R Finnigan,
S Golton, R Harker, P Harrand, J Monaghan,
J Procter and K Wakefield

Councillor R Lewis – Non-Voting Advisory Member

61 Exempt Information - Possible Exclusion of the Press and Public

RESOLVED – That the public be excluded from the meeting during consideration of the following parts of the agenda designated exempt on the grounds that it is likely, in view of the nature of the business to be transacted or the nature of the proceedings, that if members of the public were present there would be disclosure to them of exempt information so designated as follows:-

- a) Appendices 1 and 2 to the report referred to in minute 73 under the terms of Access to Information Procedure Rule 10.4(3) and on the grounds that the public interest in maintaining the exemption outweighs the public interest in disclosing the information as disclosure could prejudice the commercial interests of the Council and other outside bodies.
- b) Appendices 1, 2 and 4 to the report referred to in minute 69 under the terms of Access to Information Procedure Rule 10.4(3) and on the grounds that the public interest in maintaining the exemption outweighs the public interest in disclosing the information by reason of the fact that:-
 - i) Appendices 1 and 2 – The success of the scheme could potentially be prejudiced by speculative investors acquiring properties in advance of the Council's action.
 - ii) Appendix 4 – The costs attributed to the purchase of private properties are purely estimates at this stage and their disclosure could prejudice the Council's ability to reach an agreement on the purchase price with the owners.
- c) Appendices 1, 2 and 4 to the report referred to in minute 70 under the terms of Access to Information Procedure Rule 10.4(3) and on the grounds that the public interest in maintaining the exemption outweighs the public interest in disclosing the information by reason of the fact that:-

Draft minutes to be approved at the meeting
to be held on Wednesday, 14th October, 2009

- i) Appendices 1 and 2 – The success of the scheme could potentially be prejudiced by speculative investors acquiring properties in advance of the Council’s action. Each of these appendices identifies the location of the affected properties.
 - ii) Appendix 4 – The costs attributed to the purchase of private properties are purely estimates at this stage and their disclosure could prejudice the Council’s ability to reach an agreement on the purchase price with the owners.
- d) Appendices 1 and 2 to the report referred to in minute 84 under the terms of Access to Information Procedure Rule 10.4(3) and on the grounds that the public interest in maintaining the exemption outweighs the public interest in disclosing the information as publication would be detrimental to the finances of the authority and thereby the provision of its services to the public.

62 Declaration of Interests

Councillor Finnigan declared a personal interest as a Director of Aire Valley Homes in relation to minutes 67, 68, 69 and 70 of this meeting, as appropriate.

63 Withdrawal of Item - Playbuilder Initiative Update

The Chair, with the consent of the Board, withdrew the above report from the agenda.

64 Minutes

RESOLVED – That the minutes of the meeting held on 22nd July 2009 be approved.

DEVELOPMENT AND REGENERATION

65 Adoption of the Supplementary Planning Document of the Street Design Guide and Response to the Deputation of the National Federation of the Blind

The Director of City Development submitted a report on the outcome of consultation on the Street Design Guide including further discussions following the attendance of the deputation to Council on 10th September 2008 on behalf of the National Federation of the Blind. The report presented the amended Street Design Guide and recommended its adoption as a Supplementary Planning Document.

RESOLVED – That the Street Design Guide, as now drafted and presented to the Board, be approved as a Supplementary Planning Document, subject to an amendment to paragraph 3.2.2.18 of the guide by deletion of the reference to 25 dwellings and replacement with reference to 10 dwellings and any subsequent associated references.

LEISURE

66 Deputation to Council - North Hyde Park Residents' Association, South Headingley Community Association, and Friends of Woodhouse Moor regarding the Council's proposal to Establish Barbeque Areas on Woodhouse Moor

The Director of City Development submitted a report in response to the deputation to Council from North Hyde Park Residents' Association, South Headingley Community Association and the Friends of Woodhouse Moor organisation on 15th July 2009. The report outlined the result of a recent consultation exercise with local residents and stakeholders and presented a proposed solution for the consideration of the Board.

The report appraised 3 options, as follows:-

- Option 1: Provision of a permanent designated barbecue area as outlined in the consultation process
- Option 2: Enforce byelaws preventing barbecue use as outlined in the consultation process
- Option 3: To trial a designated barbecue area

RESOLVED -

- a) That the analysis and summary consultation activity contained in the report be noted.
- b) That approval be given to the implementation of Option 3: to trial a designated barbecue area, from 1 April 2010 until the end of the barbecue season.

(Under the provisions of Council Procedure Rule 16.5 Councillor Wakefield required it to be recorded that he voted against this decision.)

NEIGHBOURHOODS AND HOUSING

67 Response to the Environment and Neighbourhoods Scrutiny Board Inquiry into Older People's Housing

The Director of Environment and Neighbourhoods submitted a report in response to the recommendations from the Scrutiny Board (Environment and Neighbourhoods) inquiry into older people's housing.

The Chair of the Scrutiny Board attended the meeting, presented the inquiry findings and requested that officers offer a more robust response to recommendation 9.

RESOLVED – That the proposed responses to the Scrutiny Board (Environment and Neighbourhoods) recommendations, as contained in the submitted report, be approved and that the request of the Scrutiny Chair be acceded to.

68 Response to the Environment and Neighbourhoods Scrutiny Board Inquiry into the Private Rented Sector

The Director of Environment and Neighbourhoods submitted a report in response to the recommendations from the Scrutiny Board (Environment and Neighbourhoods) inquiry into the private rented sector.

The Chair of the Scrutiny Board attended the meeting and presented the inquiry findings.

RESOLVED – That the proposed responses to the Scrutiny Board (Environment and Neighbourhoods) recommendations, as contained in the submitted report, be approved.

69 Regeneration of Holbeck - Phase 4

The Director of Environment and Neighbourhoods submitted a report outlining the options for regeneration of the Holbeck area and seeking approval of the acquisition and clearance of 20 properties within Holbeck by utilising £1,300,000 of Single Regional Housing Single Regional Housing Pot funding during 2009/11.

The options presented were:-

- a) Do the minimum to meet legal conformity.
- b) Undertake group repair and internal remodelling.
- c) Acquisition, clearance and redevelopment of the site for housing.

Following consideration of Appendices 1, 2 and 4 to the report, designated as exempt under the terms of Access to Information Procedure Rule 10.4(3), which were considered in private at the conclusion of the meeting, it was

RESOLVED –

- a) that Scheme expenditure to the to the amount of £1.300,000 be authorised.
- b) That officers proceed in accordance with option C
- c) That the Director of Environment and Neighbourhoods and the Director of City Development authorise and promote any necessary Compulsory Purchase Orders should such become necessary

70 Regeneration of Cross Green - Phase 3

The Director of Environment and Neighbourhoods submitted a report outlining the options for regeneration of the Cross Green area and seeking approval of the acquisition and clearance of 14 street lined semi detached properties built in the early 1900s by utilising £1,100,000 of Single Regional Housing Pot funding during 2009/11.

The options presented were:-

- a) Do the minimum to meet legal conformity.
- b) Undertake group repair.
- c) Acquisition, clearance and redevelopment of the site for housing.

Following consideration of Appendices 1, 2 and 4 to the report, are designated as exempt under the terms of Access to Information Procedure Rule 10.4(3), which were considered in private at the conclusion of the meeting, it was

RESOLVED -

- a) That Scheme expenditure to the amount of £1,100,000 be authorised.
- b) That officers proceed in accordance with option C.
- c) That the Director of Environment and Neighbourhoods and the Director of City Development authorise and promote any necessary Compulsory Purchase Orders should such become necessary

DEVELOPMENT AND REGENERATION

71 Leeds (River Aire) Flood Alleviation Scheme

Further to minute 191 of the meeting held on 13th February 2009, the Director of City Development submitted a report providing an update on the progress made in relation to the Leeds Flood Alleviation Scheme, outlining the feedback from the public consultation exercise, and presenting for approval the latest version of the Design Vision and Guide, along with a recommended approach to be adopted by the Environment Agency in designing a scheme for the River Aire.

The report outlined the following 5 options identified by the Environment Agency, upon which the Council were invited to express a preference:-

- a) 1 in 200 years plus precautionary climate change: Raised flood defences. Total scheme cost £145m. £0m external funding required.
- b) 1 in 200 years plus precautionary climate change: Upstream Storage. Total scheme cost £180m. £30-35m external funding required.
- c) 1 in 200 years Managed Adaptive approach dealing with climate change in the future. Total scheme cost £145m. Raised defences - £5-10m external funding required.
- d) 1 in 200 years Managed Adaptive approach dealing with climate change in the future. Total scheme cost £150m. Upstream Storage - £15-20m external funding required.

- e) 1 in 200 years Managed Adaptive approach dealing with climate change in the future. Total scheme cost £200m. Bypass Channel - £65m – 70m external funding required.

RESOLVED –

- a) That the progress on the Leeds (River Aire) Flood Alleviation Scheme and the comments received during the public consultations be noted.
- b) That the latest version of the Design Vision and Guide document be approved.
- c) That the Environment Agency be informed that a Managed Adaptive approach to protecting Leeds from major flooding should be adopted by the Agency.

72 The Agenda for Improving Economic Performance

The Director of City Development submitted a report presenting the draft 'Agenda for Improved Economic Performance' proposed for formal consultation.

RESOLVED – That the document, as submitted, be approved for a formal consultation process.

73 Leeds United - Thorp Arch Academy

The Director of City Development submitted a report on the history and current position of the Leeds United Thorp Arch Academy and on options for the Council to support Leeds United Football Club in the continuation of the facility.

The report presented the options of declining the Club's request for assistance, of giving the Club a loan to acquire the facility or of the Club novating to the Council its option to purchase and the Council acquiring the facility and leasing it back to the Club.

Following consideration of appendices 1 and 2 to the report, designated as exempt under Access to Information Procedure Rule 10.4(3), which were considered in private at the conclusion of the meeting it was

RESOLVED –

- a) That the request from Leeds United 2007 for support in exercising its option to acquire the Thorp Arch training facility be noted.
- b) That the option of offering a loan to the Club be discounted.
- c) That the Director of City Development be authorised, in consultation with the Director of Resources, the Assistant Chief Executive

(Corporate Governance) and the Executive Member Development and Regeneration, to enter into discussions with the Club on the lines now discussed in order to explore whether the option of the Club novating to the Council its option to purchase with subsequent acquisition by the Council and lease back to the club can be progressed. Such preliminary discussions to include the need for appropriate guarantees in respect of the income from the lease to the Club, adequate provision for community and educational use, securing levels of Council control appropriate to the City's hosting of international sporting events, necessary maintenance arrangements and such other matters as may be necessary to protect the Council's interests as owner of the facility.

- d) That a meeting of this Board be convened sufficiently in advance of the 10th October 2009 deadline, in the event that the discussions referred to in (c) give rise to a recommendation to progress the option to a conclusion.

ENVIRONMENTAL SERVICES

74 Response to the Young People's Scrutiny Forum Inquiry entitled, 'Protecting Our Environment'

The Director of City Development, the Director of Environment and Neighbourhoods and the Chief Executive of Education Leeds submitted a joint report in response to the recommendations of the Young People's Scrutiny Forum inquiry into the protection of the environment.

The Chair of the Scrutiny Board (Children's Services) attended the meeting and presented the inquiry findings.

RESOLVED – That the proposed responses to the Young People's Scrutiny Forum's recommendations, as contained in the submitted report be approved.

75 Response to the Environment and Neighbourhoods Scrutiny Board Inquiry into Street Cleaning

The Director of Environment and Neighbourhoods submitted a report in response to the recommendations from the Scrutiny Board (Environment and Neighbourhoods) inquiry into street cleaning.

The Chair of the Scrutiny Board attended the meeting and presented the inquiry findings.

RESOLVED – That the proposed responses to the Scrutiny Board (Environment and Neighbourhoods) recommendations, as contained in the submitted report, be approved.

CHILDREN'S SERVICES

76 Proposal to close the LEA maintained nursery and change the lower age limit of Christ the King Catholic Primary School, Bramley

The Chief Executive of Education Leeds submitted a report presenting the outcome of the statutory notice period to close the maintained nursery with effect from 31st August 2009 and to change the lower age limit of Bramley Christ the King Catholic Primary School from 3-11 years to 5-11 years of age.

RESOLVED – That the lower age of Christ the King Catholic Primary School be changed from 3-11 years to 5-11 years of age and that the LEA maintained nursery be closed.

77 Design and Cost Report - Seacroft Children's Centre Accommodation and Extension

The Acting Chief Officer for Early Years and Integrated Youth Support Service submitted a report on the costs and fees related to the proposed refurbishment and extension of the existing Seacroft Children's Centre.

RESOLVED – That authority be given to incur expenditure on construction £819,350 and fees £180,650 on the refurbishment and extension of the existing Seacroft Children's Centre to enable the relocation of children, staff and services from East Leeds Children's Centre and the amalgamation of the two children's centres.

78 Response to the Children's Services Scrutiny Board Inquiry into 'Entering the Education System'

The Director of Children's Services submitted a report in response to the recommendations of the Scrutiny Board (Children's Services) inquiry entitled, 'Education Standards - Entering the Education System'.

The Chair of the Scrutiny Board attended the meeting and presented the findings of the inquiry.

RESOLVED – That the proposed responses to the Scrutiny Board (Children's Services) recommendations, as contained in the submitted report, be approved.

LEISURE

79 Vision for Council Leisure Centres

Further to minute 74 of the meeting held on 2nd September 2008, the Director of City Development submitted a report proposing a Vision for Leisure Centres following extensive public consultation and a review of Sport England's Facility Planning Model.

RESOLVED – That approval be given to the following proposals:-

Proposal 1 – The Eight Refurbishment Sites

- i) Modernisation and improvement to the quality of the facilities provided at the following sites, and detailed in table 3 to the report: Kirkstall, Rothwell, Aireborough, Otley Chippendale Pool, Bramley, Pudsey, Scott Hall* (*scheme currently being delivered) and Wetherby with a commitment to deliver and resource this work up to 2020.
- ii) The Director of City Development to submit bids in respect of the Free Swimming Capital Modernisation Programme 2010/11 by 4th September 2009.
- iii) The indicative phasing of works, as detailed in table 3 to the report, was noted.

Proposal 2 – Inner East

- iv) Re-provision of Fearnville and East Leeds Leisure Centres in the form of one new, purpose built, well being centre, with a commitment to deliver and resource by 2013/15.
- v) To seek expressions of interest to transfer East Leeds and Fearnville Leisure Centres to a Community Organisation.
- vi) East Leeds Leisure Centre and Fearnville Leisure Centre to remain under Council management until such time that:-
 - a) a new well being centre is confirmed; or
 - b) a suitable community organisation has been identified to whom to transfer the asset(s).
- vii) To seek to transfer the management of Richmond Hill Sports Hall to a Community Organization.

Proposal 3 – Outer East

- viii) To re-provide Kippax and Garforth Leisure Centres in the form of one new or refurbished swimming pool, fitness suite and other appropriate dry side sports facilities to serve the communities of Garforth and Kippax, with a commitment to deliver and resource by 2017.

Proposal 4 South Leeds & Middleton

- ix) To seek expressions of interest to transfer South Leeds Sports Centre to a Community Organisation
- x) To close South Leeds Sports Centre (if no suitable community group is identified) when the new Morley Leisure Centre opens in 2010, and concentrate leisure provision at the John Charles Centre for Sport and Morley

- xi) To provide a new well being facility for Middleton, at or in close proximity to the current St George's Centre, with a commitment to deliver and resource by 2013/15.
- xii) To seek expressions of interest to transfer the existing Middleton Leisure Centre to a Community Organisation
- xiii) Middleton Leisure Centre to remain under Council management until such time that a) a new well being centre is confirmed (at St George's Centre) or b) a suitable community organisation has been identified to whom to transfer the existing Middleton Leisure Centre (asset).

(Under the provisions of Council Procedure Rule 16.5 Councillor Wakefield required it to be recorded that he voted for Proposal 1, abstained from voting on Proposals 2 and 4 and voted against Proposal 3.)

ADULT HEALTH AND SOCIAL CARE

- 80 Leeds - A City for All Ages: Developing a Strategic Approach to Ageing**
The Director of Adult Social Services submitted a report outlining proposals for the development of a strategic response to the development of demographic change and the ageing society under the banner of "Leeds – a City for all ages".

RESOLVED –

- a) That consultation be commenced to develop a strategic framework for the city to address demographic change and an ageing society.
- b) That the outline of the strategic framework, as described in section 6 of the submitted report, be supported.
- c) That 'Leeds – a city for all ages' be used as a headline to encourage and engage all age groups, but in particular people over 50, in setting the strategic framework to address the ageing society.

- 81 Response to the Adult Social Care Scrutiny Board Inquiry into Major Adaptations for Disabled People**

The Director of Adult Social Services and the Director of Environment and Neighbourhoods submitted a joint report in response to the recommendations from the Scrutiny Board (Adult Social Care) inquiry into major adaptations for disabled people.

The Chair of the Scrutiny Board attended the meeting, presented the inquiry findings and reiterated the request at minute 67 that officers offer a more robust response to this same recommendation 9.

RESOLVED –

- a) That the proposed responses to the Scrutiny Board (Adult Social Care) recommendations, as contained in the submitted report, be approved and that the request of the Scrutiny Board Chair be noted.
- b) That this Board requests that future Scrutiny Board inquiry reports should, as a matter of course, make reference to any cost implications arising from the recommendations.

CENTRAL AND CORPORATE

82 Design and Cost Report: Demolition of East Leeds Family Learning Centre

The Chief Officer (Corporate Property Management) submitted a report on proposals for the demolition of the East Leeds Family Learning Centre.

RESOLVED –

- a) That approval be given to the proposed demolition of the remaining ELFLC buildings.
- b) That approval be given for the use of the revenue savings following the vacation of the ELFLC site to provide £880,000 of unsupported borrowing to part fund the demolition costs.
- c) That the transfer of £118,505 from the Demolitions and Dilapidations Fund (scheme 15620) to fund the balance of the demolition costs be approved.
- d) That Authority to Spend of £998,505 in respect of the demolition of the ELFLC premises be given.

83 Financial Health Monitoring 2009/10 - First Quarter Report

The Director of Resources submitted a report on the Council's financial health position for 2009/10 after the first three months of the financial year.

RESOLVED –

- a) That the projected financial position of the authority after three months of the new financial year be noted and that directorates be requested to continue to develop and implement action plans.
- b) That the following budget adjustments be approved:-
 - i) A revenue contribution to capital (RCCOs) to fund decency works on the Woodbridge estate (£500,000) and a projected shortfall in funding for the HICT orchard project (£200,000) within the Housing Revenue Account.

- ii) A virement in the sum of £800,000 within City Development directorate from the Highways Direct Labour Organisation account, as detailed in the City Development report attached to the submitted report.
- iii) The reallocation of the Strategy and Policy budget within City Development as detailed in the City Development report attached to the submitted report.

(Under the provisions of Council Procedure Rule 16.5, Councillor Wakefield required it to be recorded that he abstained from voting on this matter.)

84 Local Taxation Collection Policy, Business Rate Hardship Relief and Discretionary Rate Relief Guidance

The Director of Resources submitted a report on proposals regarding the categories and criteria used to write off outstanding Council Tax and Business Rates debts, the current guidelines used in respect of hardship relief and the current guidelines used in respect of discretionary rate relief.

Following consideration of Appendices 1 and 2 to the report, designated as exempt under the terms of Access to Information Procedure Rule 10.4(3) which were considered in private at the conclusion of the meeting, it was

RESOLVED –

- a) That approval be given to the revised criteria to be used to write off debts for both Council Tax and Business Rates as outlined in the revised local taxation collection policies in exempt Appendices 1 and 2 to the report.
- b) That the revised guidance for Discretionary Rate relief be approved.
- c) That the current hardship relief guidelines be retained.

DATE OF PUBLICATION: 28th August 2009
LAST DATE FOR CALL IN: 7th September 2009

(Scrutiny Support will notify Directors of any items called in by 12:00 noon on 8th September 2009.)

EXECUTIVE BOARD

THURSDAY, 17TH SEPTEMBER, 2009

PRESENT: Councillor R Brett in the Chair

Councillors A Carter, J L Carter,
R Finnigan, S Golton, R Harker, P Harrand,
J Procter, K Wakefield and J Monaghan

Councillor R Lewis – Non-voting advisory member

85 Exclusion of the Public

RESOLVED – That the public be excluded from the meeting during the consideration of appendices 2 and 3 to the report referred to in Minute No. 87, under the terms of Access to Information Procedure Rule 10.4(3) and on the grounds that the public interest in maintaining the exemption outweighs the public interest in disclosing the information, as disclosure could prejudice the commercial interests of the Council and other outside bodies.

86 Late Items

There were no late items submitted for consideration, however, a revised version of exempt appendix 2 and exempt appendix 3 to agenda item 5 were circulated prior to the meeting (Minute No. 87 refers).

DEVELOPMENT AND REGENERATION

87 Leeds United Thorp Arch Academy

Further to Minute No. 73, 26th August 2009, the Director of Resources, the Director of City Development and the Assistant Chief Executive (Corporate Governance) submitted a joint report regarding an approach received from Leeds United Football Club with respect to possible Council involvement in the purchase of the Thorp Arch training facility.

A revised version of exempt appendix 2 and appendix 3 to the report were circulated prior to the meeting for Members' consideration.

Following consideration of appendices 2 and 3 to the report, designated as exempt under Access to Information Procedure Rule 10.4(3) which were considered in private at the conclusion of the meeting, it was

RESOLVED –

- (a) That the Director of Resources, the Director of City Development and the Assistant Chief Executive (Corporate Governance) be authorised to continue negotiations with the Club with a view to agreeing terms that incorporate the conditions now specified by the Executive Board; and
- (b) That, subject to such terms as finally negotiated being agreed by the Chair, the Executive Member for Development and Regeneration, the Leader of the Morley Borough Independent Group and the Leader of the Labour Group, the officers named above be given delegated

Draft minutes to be approved at the meeting
to be held on Wednesday, 14th October, 2009

authority to enter into any documentation necessary to conclude the relevant transactions.

DATE OF PUBLICATION: 21st September 2009
LAST DATE FOR CALL IN: 28th September 2009

(Scrutiny Support will notify Directors of any items called in by 12.00 noon on 29th September 2009)

Draft minutes to be approved at the meeting
to be held on Wednesday, 14th October, 2009