

## **NORTH WEST (OUTER) AREA COMMITTEE**

**MONDAY, 25TH MARCH, 2013**

**PRESENT:** Councillor P Wadsworth in the Chair

Councillors S Lay, B Anderson,  
C Campbell, B Cleasby, R Downes, C Fox,  
G Latty, C Townsley, P Latty and D Collins

### **75 Appeals Against Refusal of Inspection of Documents**

There were no appeals against the refusal of inspection of documents.

### **76 Exempt Information - Possible Exclusion of the Press and Public**

There were no resolutions to exclude the public.

### **77 Late Items**

A late item was submitted to the agenda which was accepted by the Chair. This was entitled 14(a) – Response to the WARD report presented to the Area Committee and the Planning Minister. Nick Boles.

### **78 Declaration of Disclosable Pecuniary and Other Interests**

There were no Disclosable Pecuniary Interests declared to the meeting, however:-

In relation to the item entitled 'Wellbeing Report', specifically the grant to Aireborough summer activities, Councillor S Lay drew the Committee's attention to his wife being a disability nurse (Minute No. 86 refers).

### **79 Apologies for Absence**

Apologies for absence were received from Councillor J L Carter.

### **80 Open Forum - Part A (Non - NGT items)**

In accordance with Paragraphs 6.24 and 6.25 of the Area Committee Procedure Rules, the Chair allowed a period of up to 10 minutes for members of the public to make representations or ask questions on matters within the terms of reference of the Area Committee.

On this occasion two members of WARD (Wharfedale and Airedale Review Development) were present to update Members with figures and details which challenged the proposed housing allocations in the Leeds Development Framework (LDF).

### **81 Minutes - 4th February 2013**

Minutes approved as a correct record at the meeting  
held on Tuesday, 14th May, 2013

**RESOLVED** – The minutes of the previous meeting held on 4<sup>th</sup> February be approved.

## **82 Matters Arising**

### Minute No. 66 Open Forum

Councillor Cleasby commented on the resolution under Minute No. 66 'Open Forum, that 'a report considering the full facts and figures for debate at the next Area Committee' with regards to WARD (Wharfedale and Airedale Review Development) comments about the proposed housing allocations in the Leeds Development Framework (LDF), had not been completed.

## **83 Open Forum - Part B (NGT items)**

In accordance with Paragraphs 6.24 and 6.25 of the Area Committee Procedure Rules, the Chair allowed a period of up to 30 minutes for members of the public to make representations or ask questions on matters within the terms of reference of the Area Committee.

All comments from members of public were in relation to the proposed NGT project and its implications for the north west outer area of Leeds.

John Dickson from the A660 joint council pointed out the disadvantages of NGT specifically highlighting:

- that the system was merely a bus attached to overhead wires;
- that no other cities were introducing such a system, and that cities with trolley buses had considered removing them;
- that due to the large turning circle at Holt Park, parking spaces would be lost; and
- fewer passengers, compared to regular buses, would be able to sit down.

Alan Mann – Community Champion for Holt Park put the following to the Committee:

- that Highfield surgery would be left on an island;
- that due to changes to the existing roads, traffic would be encouraged to use other routes causing further congestion and traffic to spread to residential streets; and
- it was likely that bus services to the outer north west areas of Leeds would be reduced.

Gordon Brook a local resident commented that:

- the route planning in the North West Outer Area of Leeds did not make sense with NGT likely to compete directly with the No.6 bus;
- the proposed route does not serve the majority of Adel and Cookridge; and
- that bus services would ultimately be reduced if NGT is completed.

Trevor Bavage a local resident put forward the following points:

- that NGT is not rapid transit and will average approximately 12mph;
- that freedom of information requests had been made in relation to NGT and been denied, making it hard to have an informed opinion on the system; and
- there was concern that the £250 million budget for the project could possibly not be enough and it was likely the project would run over budget.

#### **84 New Generation Transport Update**

The City Development Directorate submitted a report updating Members on the progress of NGT.

Dave Haskins (Metro) and Andrew Wheeler (NGT Project Manager) were in attendance to answer Members' questions.

Initially Members were informed of the benefits to the City if the project was to go ahead. They also updated the Committee on amendments to the route and the timescales for delivery of the project.

The officers present went on to address the concerns raised by members of the public in Part B of the Open Forum (Minute No. 83 refers), as agreed by the Chair.

The Chair then invited Members of the Committee to ask questions of the officers present. Members questioned whether investing the same amount of money in the roads and bus lanes, would result in similar journey times to those anticipated if NGT is completed. It was stated that this would not be the case as NGT would be given priority whereas if bus routes were given priority traffic would be at a permanent standstill, due to the large number of buses using the route.

Members also asked about the consultation process and when this would occur. Members were informed that this would take place during Spring next year and would last for 42 days.

Members also made the following comments:

- That Adel and Cookridge will lose out as the X84 and No. 28 buses will be effected;
- Further consideration should be given to the greater use of electric and hybrid buses;
- Congestion is likely to be increased if the project goes ahead;

- The model for NGT is based on those on the continent where people use public transport more, unlike in the UK where the car is the dominant source of transport;
- That in order for park and ride to be effective the cost of parking will have to be low; and
- That no new trolley bus schemes were being built or proposed anywhere else in the world suggesting that they were not an effective answer to traffic congestion.

Members also commented that the NGT system would have to offer a viable and attractive alternative to the car to encourage people to use it, in light of the large number of cheap car parks in Leeds City Centre.

Members raised concerns about the remainder of funding which will not be coming from the Department for Transport and the effect that this would have in deflecting money away from other projects.

Officers present were challenged on the number of long term jobs predicted to be created by the NGT project and questioned as to how the figure had been arrived at. It was confirmed to Members that a standard approach had been applied in the review of the potential amount of jobs likely to be created, as is used on other similar major transport infrastructure projects.

Members also considered the effect on land values on the A660 corridor if the scheme was to go ahead.

Members discussed how best to make the voice of the Committee heard. It was agreed that a letter be written to Members of the Executive Board, which should highlight the issues raised by the Committee. It was confirmed to the Committee that the minutes from this meeting would be going to the meeting of full Council on April 17<sup>th</sup> 2013.

Members also requested a further update report to the September meeting of the Committee in light of Members remaining unconvinced that NGT represents a material improvement to the current situation.

## **RESOLVED –**

- (a) That the report be noted;
- (b) That the Area Leader submit a letter to Members of the Executive Board detailing the views of the Area Committee and highlighting the facts discussed; and
- (c) That a further report be submitted addressing the Committees concern in light of Members remaining unconvinced that NGT represents a material improvement to the current situation.

(Councillor Downes and Councillor Townsley left the meeting at 3:40pm during the discussion of this item.)

## **85 Development of Area Lead Role**

The Assistant Chief Executive (Customer Access and Performance) submitted a report which provided initial proposals to the Committee for its input, shaping and feedback with a view to introducing the revised roles in the new municipal year.

Jane Maxwell, the Area Leader (West North West Leeds) presented the report and was in attendance to answer Members' questions.

Members commented that the Chairs of the sub-committee roles should be tied to the Area Lead Role with the exception of the Employment, skills and the local economy which does not have a sub group however this could be linked to the Transport sub group.

In terms of the definition of the Area Lead Role Members agreed that they preferred the term 'supporting and challenging the relevant executive portfolio holder'.

Members also considered that further work should be done to enhance the job description, to give further clarity as to what the job would involve. The Area Leader suggested the creation of a framework for the role, to provide guidance for Members.

Concern was raised about possible duplication, particularly in relation to Health and Well-Being where there is already a Health and Adult Social Care Scrutiny Board.

Members stressed the importance of the portfolio holder and area leads meeting regularly in order to build up momentum.

**RESOLVED** – The Committee resolved to:

- (a) Note the contents of the report; and
- (b) Feedback the comments made during discussions.

## **86 Well-Being Fund Budget Report**

The Assistant Chief Executive (Customer Access and Performance) submitted a report outlining the current position statement of the Area Committee's Wellbeing budget, detailing for determination those expressions of interest received for Wellbeing funding and presented for information those small grant applications which had been received to date.

Members asked as to the location of the condemned floodlights detailed at paragraph 5.3 to the report, it was confirmed that this information would be supplied to Members.

Member also questioned the reasons for a lack of response from the highways department with regards to the 20mph zone on Queensway and other outstanding highways queries.

**RESOLVED –**

- (a) That the current position of the well-being budget as set out at sections 2 and 3 be noted;
- (b) That the following be agreed in respect of those expressions of interest received for well-being funding, as detailed within Section 4 of the submitted report;

**Name of Project:** Additional Staff Resources Wharfemeadows Park

**Ward Affected:** Otley & Yeadon

**Name of delivery organisation:** Parks & Countryside

**Decision** £3,028 revenue (Otley & Yeadon)

**APPROVED**

**Name of Project:** Site-based Gardener

**Ward affected:** Guiseley & Rawdon and Otley & Yeadon

**Name of delivery organisation:** Parks & Countryside

**Decision** £20,113 (£11,415 G&R / £8,698 O&Y)

**APPROVED**

**Name of Project:** Watering and purchase of replacement planters

**Ward affected:** Guiseley & Rawdon

**Name of delivery organisation:** Guiseley in Bloom

**Decison:** £3,442 revenue (Guiseley & Rawdon)

**APPROVED**

**Name of Project:** Police Off-Road Bikes

**Ward affected:** All

**Name of delivery organisation:** West Yorkshire Police

**Decison:** £2683 (£671 per ward)

**APPROVED subject to approval by 2 other West North West Area Committees**

**Name of Project:** Aireborough Summer Activities

**Ward affected:** All

**Name of delivery organisation:** Aireborough Summer Activities Association

**Decision:** £21,060 revenue total split between:-

A & W £2,860

O & Y £6,760

H £3,640

G & R £7,800

**APPROVED**

**Name of Project:** Lighting Footpath along Otley Parish Church Yard  
**Ward affected:** Otley & Yeadon  
**Name of delivery organisation:** Otley Town Partnership  
**Decison:** £2,000 revenue  
**APPROVED**

**Name of Project:** Guiseley Cold Calling Control Zone  
**Ward affected:** Guiseley & Rawdon  
**Name of delivery organisation:** Guiseley Neighbourhood Watch Association  
**Decison:** £ 3,000  
**APPROVED**

- (c) That the small grant and skip approvals as detailed at section 4 of the report be noted; and
- (d) The Area Leader to collate all outstanding queries relating to Highways and request a response at the earliest opportunity.

#### **87 Area Update Report 25 Mar 13**

The Assistant Chief Executive (Customer Access and Performance) submitted a report which brought together a range of information regarding Area Committee business.

With regards to the Environmental Sub Group Members considered that potential well-being spend should be provided to Members which would make it easier when deciding whether to commit money to projects or not.

Councillor P Latty updated the Committee on The Children and Young People's Sub Group, informing Members of the intention to organise a celebration event for foster carers.

With regards to Micklefield House, Horsforth Ward Members requested that they be involved in discussions and requested that they be kept up to date with regards to the re-location of the one stop service, due to residents from Horsforth using the service.

**RESOLVED** – That the contents of the report be noted.

#### **88 Area Chairs Forum Minutes**

The Assistant Chief Executive (Customer Access and Performance) submitted a report which formally notified Members that the minutes of Area Chairs Forum meetings will continue to be brought to Area Committee meetings as a regular agenda item, and to give a brief overview of the Area Chairs Forum meetings.

It was noted that these minutes were now out of date.

**RESOLVED** – That the contents of the report and the minutes form the Area Chairs Forum meetings be noted.

**89      Dates, Times and Venues of Area Committee Meetings 2013/14**

The Chief Officer (Democratic Services) submitted a report which sought approval of a meeting schedule for 2013/14 municipal year.

Members noted the dates and times proposed. It was agreed that all meetings of the Committee should be held in the North West Outer area, excepting where the meeting is scheduled in the same week as full council and also the election of Chair meeting, in which case the meeting should be held in Civic Hall.

**RESOLVED – The Committee resolved that**

- (a) That the meeting dates as set out in paragraph 3.1.1 to the report be approved;
- (b) That once the date of the Annual Council Meeting for 2014 has been finalised that the Chair in consultation with Area Support Officers approve the arrangements for the seventh Area Committee meeting; and
- (c) That the Committee hold all its meetings in the North West Outer area excepting where the meeting is scheduled in the same week as full council and the election of Chair meeting, in which case the meeting should be held in Civic Hall.

**90      Response to the WARD report presented to Area Committee and the Planning Minister. Nick Boles**

The Head of Planning and Economic Policy presented a report of the Chief Planning Officer. The report provided an initial response to the issues that have been raised by WARD for the visit to the area by Nick Boles, planning Minister, in January.

The Head of Planning and Economic Policy stated that Leeds needed to grow in a managed way and that a 5 years supply of land for building houses needed to be demonstrated.

Members asked about the difference between demand and need. It was explained that demand and need had to be considered when planning housing supply for the future. Demand takes in to account desire to move, which might be suppressed due to the current state of the economy, whilst need considers the actual needs of people which have to be met.

Members commented that developers are likely to consider that the Council have underestimated the number of houses required for Leeds, with residents groups thinking the opposite. Members expressed concern about the amount of development proposed and its sustainability.



Members noted the figures that had been presented to them by WARD and considered that further investigation needed to be done in relation to them and that a report should be brought back to the Committee detailing the results of the investigation.

(Councillor Collins entered the meeting at 2:30pm during the discussion of this item)

**RESOLVED** – The Committee resolved that:

- (a) A report be brought to the Committee from the planning department to include consideration of the full facts and figures at the next meeting on 14<sup>th</sup> May 2013;
- (b) That the issues raised by WARD and initial response to them be noted; and
- (c) Officers from planning and highways and transportation meet with WARD representatives to clarify some of the issues and to seek solutions wherever possible.

**91     Date and Time of Next Meeting**

2pm, Tuesday, 14<sup>th</sup> May 2013, Civic Hall, Leeds.