

GENERAL PURPOSES COMMITTEE

Meeting to be held in Civic Hall, Leeds, LS1 1UR on
Thursday, 12th February, 2015 at 12.00 pm

MEMBERSHIP

Councillors

D Blackburn	Farnley and Wortley;
J Blake	Middleton Park;
S Golton	Rothwell;
P Gruen	Cross Gates and Whinmoor;
G Latty	Guiseley and Rawdon;
J Lewis	Kippax and Methley;
A Lowe	Armley;
E Nash	City and Hunslet;
J Procter	Wetherby;
M Rafique	Chapel Allerton;
S Varley	Morley South;
K Wakefield (Chair)	Kippax and Methley;

Agenda compiled by:
Governance Services
Civic Hall
LEEDS LS1 1UR
Telephone No:

Phil Garnett

0113 39 51712

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 15.2 of the Access to Information Procedure Rules (in the event of an appeal the press and public will be excluded).</p> <p>(*In accordance with Procedure Rule 15.2, written notice of an appeal must be received by the Head of Governance Services 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>	

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 circumstances shall be specified in the minutes)</p>	
4			<p>DECLARATION OF DISCLOSABLE PECUNIARY AND OTHER INTERESTS</p> <p>To disclose or draw attention to any disclosable pecuniary interests for the purposes of Section 31 of the Localism Act 2000 and paragraphs 13-18 of the Members' Code of Conduct. Also to declare any other significant interests which the Member wishes to declare in the public interest, in accordance with paragraphs 19-20 of the Members' Code of Conduct.</p>	
5			<p>APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE</p> <p>To receive any apologies for absence from the meeting.</p>	
6			<p>MINUTES - 25TH NOVEMBER 2014</p> <p>To confirm as a correct record the minutes of the meeting held on 25th November 2014.</p>	1 - 2
7			<p>APPROVAL OF THE 2015/16 PAY POLICY STATEMENT</p> <p>To receive a report of the Chief Officer HR which seeks Members' views on the revised Pay Policy Statement and for the Committee to make recommendations to Full Council to approve the changes before the start of the 2015/16 Financial Year.</p>	3 - 24

Item No	Ward/Equal Opportunities	Item Not Open		Page No
8			<p>COMMUNITY GOVERNANCE REVIEW RECOMMENDATIONS ON WHETHER TO CREATE A NEW TOWN COUNCIL FOR GUISELEY</p> <p>To receive a report of the Head of Licensing and Registration which considers EWG's recommendations regarding the petition from electors in polling districts from the Guiseley & Rawdon ward and subsequent Community Governance Review to establish whether a new Town Council for Guiseley should be created.</p> <p>THIRD PARTY RECORDING</p> <p>Recording of this meeting is allowed to enable those not present to see or hear the proceedings either as they take place (or later) and to enable the reporting of those proceedings. A copy of the recording protocol is available from the contacts named on the front of this agenda.</p> <p>Use of Recordings by Third Parties– code of practice</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) Any published recording should be accompanied by a statement of when and where the recording was made, the context of the discussion that took place, and a clear identification of the main speakers and their role or title. <li>b) Those making recordings must not edit the recording in a way that could lead to misinterpretation or misrepresentation of the proceedings or comments made by attendees. In particular there should be no internal editing of published extracts; recordings may start at any point and end at any point but the material between those points must be complete. 	25 - 104

GENERAL PURPOSES COMMITTEE

TUESDAY, 25TH NOVEMBER, 2014

PRESENT: Councillor K Wakefield in the Chair

Councillors D Blackburn, J Blake, P Gruen,
G Hyde, T Leadley, A Lowe and M Rafique

24 Appeals against refusal of inspection of documents

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

25 Exempt Information - possible exclusion of the press and public

There were no resolutions to exclude the public.

26 Late items

There were no late items submitted to the agenda for consideration.

27 Declaration of Disclosable Pecuniary and Other Interests

No declarations were made.

28 Apologies for absence

Apologies for absence were submitted on behalf of Councillors S Golton, J Lewis, E Nash and S Varley.

Councillors G Hyde and T Leadley were in attendance as substitute Members for Councillors J Lewis and S Varley respectively.

29 Minutes - 23rd October 2014

RESOLVED – That the minutes of the meeting held on 23rd October 2014 be approved as a correct record subject to an amendment to the previously reported cost of undertaking a referendum.

Minute No. 23 – Community Governance Review for the Creation of a Town Council for Guiseley

Third bullet point to now read as follows:

- The twenty five thousand pounds cost of undertaking a referendum as part of the consultation process should a decision to progress with the review be made and a referendum be supported.

30 Polling District Review - Final Proposals Stage

The Head of Licensing and Registration presented his report which considered the final proposals for the polling district review. Members were requested to agree the final proposals to be published on 28th November 2014.

RESOLVED – The Committee resolved to:

- (a) To confirm as final, those proposals set out in Appendix A where comments were received during the second consultation stage and have all party support.
- (b) To confirm as final those proposals set out in Appendix B to which no further comments were received during the second consultation stage.
- (c) That the proposal set out in Appendix C where comments were received during the second consultation period and do not have all party support, be looked at under the ad hoc polling station review procedure
- (d) That the final proposals agreed today for the polling district review be published as part of the Council's Final Notice of Joint Review on 28 November 2014

Report of the Chief Officer HR

Report to General Purposes Committee

Date: 12th February 2015

Subject: Approval of the 2015/16 Pay Policy Statement

Are specific electoral Wards affected? If relevant, name(s) of Ward(s):	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
Are there implications for equality and diversity and cohesion and integration?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No
Is the decision eligible for Call-In?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
Does the report contain confidential or exempt information? If relevant, Access to Information Procedure Rule number: Appendix number:	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No

Summary of main issues

1. This paper sets out an updated Pay Policy Statement for 2015/16. This is required under the Localism Act and must be annually approved by the Full Council before April.

Recommendations

2. The General Purposes Committee are recommended to:-
 - 2.1. Consider the review of the Pay Policy Statement and make recommendations to full Council in respect of the adoption of the review for the 2015/16 financial year.
 - 2.2. Make recommendations that any required in year amendment to the Annual Pay Policy Statement in respect of the JNC pay scale is undertaken by the Chief Officer HR
 - 2.3. Receive assurances from the Deputy Chief Executive that the senior management pay structure is appropriate and complied with.

1. Purpose of this report

- 1.1. The purpose of this report is to seek Members' views on the revised Pay Policy Statement and for the Committee to make recommendations to Full Council to approve the changes before the start of the 2015/16 Financial Year.

2. Background information

- 2.1. Local Authorities are required under section 38 of the Localism Act 2011 to prepare an Annual Pay Policy Statement. The statement must articulate the Council's policy towards the pay of its most senior staff and relationships with the pay of the rest of the work-force. The provisions of the Act do not apply to the employees of local authority schools.
- 2.2. Each local authority is an individual employer in its own right and has the autonomy to make decisions on pay that are appropriate to local circumstances and which deliver value for money for local taxpayers. The provisions of the Localism Act do not seek to change this or to determine what decisions on pay should be taken. However they require individual employing authorities to be clearer about their own policies in relation to pay.
- 2.3. The Annual Pay Policy Statement has been written to comply with Section 40 of the Localism Act which requires authorities, in developing their Pay Policy Statement, to have regard to any guidance published by the Secretary of State. This includes Communities and Local Government guidance on Openness and Accountability in Local Pay and the Code of Recommended Practice for Local Authorities on Data Transparency ("Open Data").
- 2.4. Under Section 38 the Localism Act and related guidance a Pay Policy Statement must as a minimum include:
 - 2.4.1. Chief Officer salaries and in addition; any policy to award additional fees for local election duties, expenses, bonuses, PRP, earn back, honoraria and ex-gratia payments and any termination or severance award arrangements;
 - 2.4.2. policy on other aspects of Chief Officer remuneration – recruitment, pay increases and additions, transparency, re-employment when the Chief Officer is in receipt of LGPS pension and/or a redundancy/severance payment, and;
 - 2.4.3. policy on remunerating the lowest paid in the workforce including the authority's definition of the lowest paid employee and the reasons for the definition e.g. the authority's lowest pay point and how it was decided;
 - 2.4.4. policy on relationship between the remuneration of Chief Officers and other staff – policy towards maintaining or reaching a specific pay multiple;
 - 2.4.5. Full Council being given the opportunity to consider salary packages in excess of £100k for new appointments before they are offered.¹

¹ This is undertaken by the Employment Committee, the committee appointed by Full Council for the purpose of appointing Senior Officers. See Employment Committee Terms of Reference

3. Main issues

3.1. Policy Compliance 2014/15

- 3.1.1. The Chief Officer HR and Deputy Chief Executive give their assurance that the policy is up to date, fit for purpose, effectively communicated and routinely complied with and monitored. Due to the nature of the statutory framework the policy remains relatively static; with the only major amendment considered being the consultation for pay awards received by Public Health employees. Otherwise variations to pay are subject to discussion between the Chief Executive, Deputy Chief Executive and Executive portfolio holder; with advice given by the Chief Officer (HR). Employment Committees are required to manage appointments to posts covered by the Policy where new appointments and grading issues can be considered. Finally the General Purposes Committee is able to consider the policy before it is presented to Full Council.
- 3.1.2. In drafting the Pay Policy Statement the Council has used guidance available from the national employers and Government legislation and the focus of the Statement is on ensuring that the Council complies with the requirements under the Localism Act as set out in paragraphs 2.3 and 2.4.
- 3.1.3. The focus of the legislation relates to an overall annual pay policy and not to individual post-holders. The key principles underpinning the Pay Policy Statement are that the Council:
- Is committed to equity and fairness of treatment across the whole workforce
 - Is committed to openness, transparency and public accountability
 - Has the right to determine senior officer pay locally
 - Has ensured that senior officer pay and terms and conditions are in line with those applicable to other employees
 - Has sufficient flexibility to cope with a variety of changing circumstances
 - Needs to reflect local circumstances such as a shortage of particular skills
- 3.1.4. The pay multiple in Leeds is 9.9:1. The difference in this and last year's pay multiplier is explained by an increase in the median salary with the revised NJC pay award figure applied and what would be the Chief Executive's substantive pay had he not taken a decision to continue with a voluntary pay reduction. The pay multiplier calculated based on the Chief Executive's actual salary is 9.1:1.
- 3.1.5. The pay multiple in other regional authorities and core cities at 2014/15 (where this has been made available) is contained within in the table below:-

Bradford	9.2:1
Calderdale*	6.1:1
Kirklees	7.65:1
Wakefield*	9.31:1

Birmingham	8.6:1
Bristol	6.68:1
Cardiff	8:1
Liverpool	9.25:1
Manchester	9.08:1
Nottingham	8:1
Sheffield	9.31:1

*In Calderdale and Wakefield there is no policy on reaching or maintaining a specific pay multiple

- 3.1.6. At the time of writing the JNC pay offer is not finalised and it is proposed that the Annual Pay Policy statement is amended in year by the Chief Officer Human Resources as necessary with the revised salary ranges without the need to present the report to Full Council again. This would be in line with contractual arrangements that follow the national collective bargaining. Should other circumstances require, the Policy can be amended in the course of the year subject to approval by Full Council of those amendments

3.2. Policy Updates arising from a review

3.2.1. Public Health

- 3.2.2. Responsibility for Public Health functions transferred to the Council on 1st April 2013. Employees transferred under TUPE principles underpinned by a Department of Health/Secretary of State transfer scheme. Pay and terms and conditions are protected but remain static at the point of transfer for example. there is no entitlement to subsequent annual pay awards agreed in the NHS

- 3.2.3. During the period 2014/15 a review of Public Health has been undertaken as agreed in last year's GPC report. This now includes a decision to consult on allowing transferred Public Health staffs pay awards that would mirror settlements in Local Government.

- 3.2.4. It is proposed that this report serves as an update on Public Health information referenced in last year's GPC report.

4. Corporate Considerations

4.1. Consultation and Engagement

Other Councils in the region and nationally will be publishing policies from January 2015 onwards. A responsive media engagement strategy will be prepared which will reference any advice taken from the LGE in relation to other relevant Pay Policy statements.

4.2. Equality and Diversity / Cohesion and Integration

Equality data has been compared with last year's information and it is noted that BME remain under-represented in Senior Management positions and this year there has been a reduction in JNC graded posts held by female employees.

4.3. Council policies and City Priorities

- 4.3.1. The Pay Policy Statement is required by law and must be approved annually by Full Council prior to 1st April.

4.4. Resources and value for money

- 4.4.1. The Pay Policy Statement is a point of reference for the Council in assessing its senior management costs and its budget strategy.

4.5. Legal Implications, Access to Information and Call In

- 4.5.1. The draft policy has been assessed as complying with the requirements of the Localism Act.
- 4.5.2. In terms of its formal adoption it is proposed to report the Policy to the Council meeting on 25th February 2015, and is therefore compliant with the statutory requirements.

4.6. Risk Management

- 4.6.1. The Council will need to consider any reputational implications of the published policy in terms of how stakeholders and the media respond.
- 4.6.2. Also it is noted that in Reviewing the Policy all requirements regarding pay issues have been complied with in 2014/15. Members are asked to note this compliance.

5. Conclusions

- 5.1. All Councils are legally obliged to provide, on an annual basis, a Pay Policy Statement. The proposed revised policy is intended to meet this requirement.

6. Recommendations

- 6.1. The General Purposes Committee is recommended to:
- 6.2. Consider the review of the Pay Policy Statement and make recommendations to full Council in respect of the adoption of the review for the 2015/16 financial year.
- 6.3. Make recommendations that any required in year amendment to the Annual Pay Policy Statement in respect of the JNC pay scale is undertaken by the Chief Officer HR
- 6.4. Receive assurances from the Deputy Chief Executive that the senior management pay structure is appropriate and complied with.

This page is intentionally left blank



Annual Pay Policy Statement

Financial Year 2015/16

(To be) Approved by Full Council – 25th February 2015

Contents

Section 1 – Introduction

Section 2 - Policy Statement

- **Definition of senior officers covered by the Policy Statement**
- **Policy on remunerating senior officers**
 - Salaries and Appointment
 - Terms and Conditions
 - Bonuses and performance related pay
 - Earn Back
 - Termination Payments
- **Policy on remunerating the lowest paid in the workforce**
- **Policy on the relationship between the senior officer remuneration and that of other staff**
- **Re Employment of staff in receipt of a LGPS Pension or a Redundancy/Severance Payment**
- **Obligations under the Code of Recommended Practice for Local Authorities on Data Transparency and the data which is published under The Accounts and Audit (England) Regulations 2011**

List of Appendices

Appendix 1 – Pay scales under the JNC Conditions of Service

Appendix 2 – Pay scales under the NJC Conditions of Service

Appendix 3 – Pay scales for the Director of Public Health and Consultants under Agenda for Change

Appendix 4 – Pay scales under Agenda for Change

Section 1 - Introduction

Sections 38 – 43 of the Localism Act 2011 require that the Authority produce a policy statement for each financial year that covers a number of matters concerning the pay of the Authority's staff, principally Chief Officers. This policy statement meets the requirements of the Localism Act in this regard and also meets the requirements of the guidance issued by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government to which the Authority is required to have regard under Section 40 of that Act.

This policy is reviewed annually and is to be considered and approved by full Council at its meeting in February 2015.

This pay policy is in addition to the data on pay and rewards for staff which the Authority already publishes under the Code of Recommended Practice for Local Authorities on Data Transparency

This policy must be complied with for all decisions relating to the remuneration of, or other terms and conditions applying to, those senior officers listed in Section 2.

Section 2 - Policy Statement

Definition of senior officers covered by the Pay Policy Statement

This Pay Policy Statement covers the following senior officer posts;

1. Head of the Paid Service, which in this authority is the post of Chief Executive
2. Deputy Chief Executive, who is the Section 151 Officer, the City Solicitor who is the Monitoring Officer, the Directors of Public Health, Adult Social Care, Children Services, City Development and Environment and Housing and the Assistant Chief Executive (Citizens and Communities). These post holders are members of the authority's Corporate Leadership Team (CLT) and report directly to the Chief Executive.
3. Those required to report directly to, or are directly accountable to, one or more of those described in 1-2 above.
4. This policy statement does not cover or include staff employed in schools and is not required to do so.

Policy on remunerating senior officers

It is the policy of this authority to establish a remuneration package for each senior officer post that is sufficient to attract and retain those with the appropriate skills, knowledge, experience, abilities and qualities that is consistent with the authority's requirements of the post in question.

Salaries and Appointment

The authority may seek independent advice as a means of informing decisions on determining the pay scale for senior officer posts.

All new senior officer appointments will be made by the Employment Committee, who will determine salary packages¹.

Appointments will be made to the appropriate approved minimum point of the grade for the post in question unless there is evidence that a preferred candidate cannot be appointed without varying the remuneration package. In such circumstances incremental advancement within the grade range is permissible.

In exceptional circumstances this policy provides for a departure from the Pay Policy. All departures from this policy will be expressly justified and, in cases where he/she is not personally affected, will be authorised by the Chief Executive in consultation with members of the Employment Committee. In cases where he/she is personally affected, departures from the Policy will be authorised by Full Council.

Where the Employment Committee has not been involved in the appointment of a Senior Officer the appropriate Executive Members will be consulted with; including the Executive Member within whose portfolio the post reports, the Executive Member with responsibility for Human Resources and the Leader of Council.

Information regarding any such decisions will be reported to the next meeting of Full Council.

Honoraria² may be payable in circumstances where additional duties and responsibilities are undertaken which are over and above those which could be reasonably accommodated within existing terms and conditions of employment.

Market supplements may be paid only where it has been established that there is a significant risk of not being able to retain/replace staff with specific knowledge and skills essential to the delivery of a particular service, project or corporate priority. All such payments will be reviewed annually by the Head of Paid Service.

The salary for JNC senior officer posts will be determined by reference to the pay scales at Appendix 1³. At the time of writing this policy statement a review of JNC for Chief Executives and JNC for Chief Officers pay was pending.

The basic salary for the Director of Public Health is currently determined by reference to the pay scales at Appendix 3 and is within the salary range £84,667 - £101,451

The salary for NHS Consultants and other Public Health staff transferred into the organisation in 2013 under TUPE principles is determined by reference to the pay scales at Appendix 3 and at Appendix 4, these remain static at the point of transfer. However consultation is taking place to amend arrangements whereby future pay awards would mirror settlements in Local Government.

Terms and Conditions

The Chief Executive is employed on terms and conditions set out under the Joint National Council for Chief Executives. All other senior officers are employed on terms and conditions set out under the Joint National Council for Chief Officers. Under these arrangements national pay awards are negotiated annually. At the time of writing the JNC pay offer has not been finalised and it is proposed that the Annual Pay Policy statement will be amended in year as with the revised salary ranges.

¹ Senior Officers in this respect refers to the posts in Section 2 points 2 to 3

² Including payments made for joint authority duties

³ For completeness the pay scales for employees employed on NJC terms and conditions of service is provided at Appendix 2

Equivalent arrangements are also in place for staff covered by NHS terms & conditions following the transfer of Public Health in 2013.

Some aspects of remuneration are applicable to all staff (including senior officers covered by this policy). For completeness these are outlined below:

- Membership of the Local Government Pension Scheme; with employee contributions ranging from 5.5% (on salaries up to £13,500) to 12.5% (on salaries over £150,000).
- Expenses for travel and subsistence based on National Joint Council for Local Government Employee rates
- On appointment, incremental progression following 6 months employment and then annual incremental progression on each 1st April thereafter.

The Director of Public Health (DPH) and Public Health Consultants transferred to the local authority on 1st April 2013 and receive protection of general NHS Terms and Conditions that were in place at that point in time.

However, Public Health transferred employees, who could only benefit from collectively agreed pay awards and terms and conditions that applied at 1st April 2013, will now be consulted with on changing terms to link pay awards that reflect relevant settlements in Local Government.

Bonuses and Performance Related Pay

For posts under this policy, the Authority does not currently operate a bonus or performance related pay scheme. Performance is considered however as part of a package to offer market supplements and retention pay when needed.

Earn-Back

The Authority does not operate a scheme of remuneration linked to Earn-Back

Termination Payments

All decisions relating to termination payments will be made by;

- Full Council – in respect of the Head of Paid Service
- The Head of Paid Service – in respect of the Deputy Chief Executive
- Deputy Chief Executive – in respect of other Directors and the City Solicitor
- Directors – in respect of those who report to them.

Termination payments may be made to senior officers covered by this policy. The maximum discretion for the Council is to award 104 weeks' pay under the national statutory framework. There is also discretion to augment pensions.

Payments made must demonstrate value for money and be conducive to the effective and efficient operation of the authority.

The Leader of the Council will be consulted in relation to any such termination payments.

Policy on remunerating the lowest paid in the workforce

The pay scales for staff employed on National Joint Council for Local Government terms and conditions are detailed at Appendix 2, alongside other JNC grades. The pay rate is increased in accordance with any pay settlements which are reached through the National Joint Council for Local Government Services.

These, and other terms and conditions of employment, are negotiated through appropriate collective bargaining mechanisms and then incorporated into contracts of employment.

The lowest pay point in this authority (excluding schools) equates to an annual full time salary of £13,614 and can be expressed as an hourly rate of pay of £7.0565. This is on the A1 grade which rises incrementally to £13,871.

The pay multiplier between this and the substantive salary for the Chief Executive is 14.4:1. However based on the Chief Executive's voluntary pay reduction the pay multiplier is 12.9:1

For comparison the National Minimum Wage was £6.50 p/h as at 1st October 2014.

Policy on the relationship between Senior Officer remuneration and that of other staff

The highest paid salary is paid to the Chief Executive. At March 2014 the average median salary in Leeds City Council (not including Schools) is £19,317.

The ratio between the median and Chief Executive's substantive salary, the 'pay multiple' is 9.9:1, based on actual pay the pay multiple is 9.1:1. This authority does not have a policy on maintaining or reaching a specific 'pay multiple'. However the authority is conscious of the need to ensure that the salary of the highest paid employee is not excessive and is consistent with the needs of the authority as expressed in this policy statement.

The authority's approach to the payment of staff is to pay that which the authority needs to pay to recruit and retain staff with the skills, knowledge, experience, abilities and qualities needed for the post in question at the relevant time, and to ensure that the authority meets any contractual requirements for staff including the application of any local or national collective agreements, or authority decisions regarding pay.

Re-employment of staff in receipt of a LGPS Pension or a Redundancy/Severance Payment

The authority is under a statutory duty to appoint on merit and has to ensure that it complies with all appropriate employment and equalities legislation.

Obligations under the Code of Recommended Practice for Local Authorities on Data Transparency and the data which is published under The Accounts and Audit (England) Regulations (2011).

The Authority will publish information on pay and rewards for staff falling under the criteria specified in the Code of Recommended Practice for Local Authorities on Data Transparency and which requires the authority to provide information relating to those employees with salary packages above £50,000 and which fall below those of Chief Officers as specified above.

Election Fees

Additional fees for national elections and referendums are paid to the Chief Executive in their capacity as Returning Officer. In turn these are apportioned to staff supporting the Returning Officer in accordance with criteria determined by the Chief Executive.

These fees and any apportionment will be published as part of the Council's Obligations under the Code of Recommended Practice for Local Authorities on Data Transparency and the data which is published under The Accounts and Audit (England) Regulations (2011).

Private Service Company Consultants

Individuals who operate as private service companies will not be directly engaged to cover senior officer posts covered by this policy.

Pay scales under the JNC Conditions of Service

Grade	SCP	Salary			
Chief Executive	1	182,147	Director 80%	1	83,958
	2	185,650		2	86,058
	3	189,153		3	88,158
	4	192,655		4	90,255
	5	196,158		5	92,355
Deputy Chief Executive	1	147,118	Director 75%	1	78,711
	2	150,620		2	80,679
	3	154,123		3	82,647
	4	157,626		4	84,615
	5	161,128		5	86,583
Director Grade	1	134,347	Director 70%	1	73,464
	2	137,320		2	75,300
	3	140,293		3	77,136
	4	143,265		4	78,975
	5	146,238		5	80,811
Asst Chief Executives	1	114,215	Director 60%	1	62,970
	2	116,699		2	64,545
	3	119,183		3	66,117
	4	121,667		4	67,692
	5	124,151		5	69,267
Director 95%	1	£99,702	Director 52.5%	1	55,098
	2	102,192		2	56,475
	3	104,688		3	57,852
	4	107,178		4	59,232
	5	109,671		5	60,609
Director 90%	1	94,452	Director 45%	1	47,229
	2	96,816		2	48,408
	3	99,177		3	49,587
	4	101,538		4	50,769
	5	103,899		5	51,951
Director 85%	1	89,208	Director 40%	1	41,979
	2	91,437		2	43,029
	3	93,666		3	44,079
	4	95,898		4	45,129
	5	98,127		5	46,179

Pay scales under the NJC Conditions of Service

Spinal Column Point	1 st April 2013	1 st January 2015
5 ⁴	£12,435	£13,500
6	£12,614	£13,614
7	£12,915	£13,715
8	£13,321	£13,871
9	£13,725	£14,075
10	£14,013	£14,338
11	£14,880	£15,207
12	£15,189	£15,523
13	£15,598	£15,941
14	£15,882	£16,231
15	£16,215	£16,572
16	£16,604	£16,969
17	£16,998	£17,372
18	£17,333	£17,714
19	£17,980	£18,376
20	£18,638	£19,048
21	£19,317	£19,742
22	£19,817	£20,253
23	£20,400	£20,849
24	£21,067	£21,530
25	£21,734	£22,212
26	£22,443	£22,937
27	£23,188	£23,698
28	£23,945	£24,472
29	£24,892	£25,440
30	£25,727	£26,293
31	£26,539	£27,123
32	£27,323	£27,924
33	£28,127	£28,746
34	£28,922	£29,558
35	£29,528	£30,178
36	£30,311	£30,978
37	£31,160	£31,846
38	£32,072	£32,778
39	£33,128	£33,857
40	£33,998	£34,746
41	£34,894	£35,662
42	£35,784	£36,571
43	£36,676	£37,483
44	£37,578	£38,405
45	£38,422	£39,267
46	£39,351	£40,217
47	£40,254	£41,140
48	£41,148	£42,053
49	£42,032	£42,957

⁴ Not used in Leeds but deleted nationally in Oct 2015

Appendix 3

Pay Progression for NHS Public Health Consultants appointed before 21 October 2003				
Seniority at transfer	Years after transfer before threshold level changes	Pay Threshold	Basic Salary (2012/13 rates) £	Pay Scale
30+	On transfer to new contract		90,263	YC71**
	1 year after transfer	7	95,860	
	2 years after transfer	8	101,451	
21 – 29	On transfer to new contract		94,667	YC70**
	1 year after transfer	6	90,263	
	2 years after transfer	7	95,360	
	3 years after transfer	8	101,461	
20	On transfer to new contract		84,667	YC69**
	1 year after transfer	6	90,263	
	3 years after transfer	7	95,860	
	4 years after transfer	8	101,451	
19	On transfer to new contract		84,667	YC68**
	1 year after transfer	6	90,263	
	3 years after transfer	7	95,860	
	5 years after transfer	8	101,451	
18	On transfer to new contract		84,667	YC67*
	2 years after transfer	6	90,263	
	3 years after transfer	7	95,860	
	5 years after transfer	8	101,451	
17	On transfer to new contract		84,667	
	2 years after transfer	6	90,263	
	4 years after transfer	7	95,860	
	6 years after transfer	8	101,451	
16	On transfer to new contract		84,667	YC65**
	3 years after transfer		90,263	
	4 years after transfer		95,860	
	7 years after transfer		101,451	
15	On transfer to new contract		84,667	YC64**
	3 years after transfer	6	90,263	
	4 years after transfer	7	95,860	
	8 years after transfer	8	101,451	
14	On transfer to new contract		84,667	YC63**
	3 years after transfer	6	90,263	
	5 years after transfer	7	95,860	
	9 years after transfer	8	101,451	
13	On transfer to new contract		84,667	YC62**
	3 years after transfer	6	90,263	
	5 years after transfer	7	95,860	
	10 years after transfer	8	101,451	
12	On transfer to new contract		84,667	YC61*
	3 years after transfer	6	90,263	
	6 years after transfer	7	95,860	
	11 years after transfer	8	101,451	
11	On transfer to new contract		84,667	YC60**
	4 years after transfer	6	90,263	
	7 years after transfer	7	95,860	

Pay Progression for NHS Public Health Consultants appointed before 21 October 2003				
Seniority at transfer	Years after transfer before threshold level changes	Pay Threshold	Basic Salary (2012/13 rates) £	Pay Scale
	12 years after transfer	8	101,451	
10	On transfer to new contract		84,667	YC69**
	4 years after transfer	6	90,263	
	8 years after transfer	7	95,860	
	13 years after transfer	8	101,451	

Pay circular (M&D 1/2013)

Pay Progression for NHS Public Health Consultants appointed before 1 April 2013				
Seniority at transfer	Years after transfer before threshold level changes	Pay Threshold	Basic Salary (2012/13 rates) £	Pay Scale
9	On transfer to new contract		84,667	YC58**
	4 years after transfer	6	90,263	
	9 years after transfer	7	95,860	
	14 years after transfer	8	101,451	
8	On transfer to new contract		84,667	YC57**
	5 years after transfer	6	90,263	
	10 years after transfer	7	95,860	
	15 years after transfer	8	101,451	
7	On transfer to new contract		84,667	YC57**
	5 years after transfer	6	90,263	
	10 years after transfer	7	95,860	
	15 years after transfer	8	101,451	
6	On transfer to new contract		83,492	YC56**
	1 year after transfer	5	84,667	
	5 years after transfer	6	90,263	
	10 years after transfer	7	95,860	
	15 years after transfer	8	101,451	
5	On transfer to new contract		82,318	YC55**
	1 year after transfer	x	83,492	
	2 years after transfer	5	84,667	
	6 years after transfer	6	90,263	
	11 years after transfer	7	95,860	
	16 years after transfer	8	101,451	
4	On transfer to new contract		77,017	YC54**
	1 year after transfer	3	79,961	
	2 years after transfer	4	82,318	
	3 years after transfer	5	84,667	
	6 years after transfer	6	90,263	
	11 years after transfer	7	95,860	
	16 years after transfer	8	101,451	
3	On transfer to new contract		76,424	YC53**
	1 year after transfer	x	78,780	
	2 years after transfer	4	82,318	
	3 years after transfer	5	84,667	
	7 years after transfer	6	90,263	
	12 years after transfer	7	95,860	
	17 years after transfer	8	101,451	
2	On transfer to new contract		75,836	YC52**
	1 year after transfer	2	77,605	
	2 years after transfer	4	82,318	
	3 years after transfer	5	84,667	
	8 years after transfer	6	90,263	
	13 years after transfer	7	95,860	
	18 years after transfer	8	101,451	
1	On transfer to new contract		75,249	YC51**
	1 year after transfer	*	76,424	
	2 years after transfer	3	79,961	
	3 years after transfer	4	82,318	

Pay Progression for NHS Public Health Consultants appointed before 1 April 2013				
Seniority at transfer	Years after transfer before threshold level changes	Pay Threshold	Basic Salary (2012/13 rates) £	Pay Scale
	4 years after transfer	5	84,667	
	9 years after transfer	6	90,263	
	14 years after transfer	7	95,860	
	19 years after transfer	8	101,451	
<i>*for consultants with seniority of 1,3 or 5 on transition, the first pay threshold is for transitional purposes</i> <i>** Applicable ESR pay codes for this group of staff include YC, YM, YK and YL</i>				

NHS Public Health Consultant Pay and Allowances effective from 1st April 2013

Additional supplements for Directors of Public Health (Chief Officer Supplement) including those who are Consultants in Dental Public Health

Table 2: value of supplement (either contract)⁶

Supplement Band	Minimum £	Maximum £	Exceptional Maximum £
Band A (Regional Director of PH)	13,646	19,808	
Band B	5,284	10,579	13,646
Band C	4,418	8,804	10,579
Band D	3,522	7,042	8,804

(NB: table 2 shows the value of the Director of Public Health supplement to be added to salary)

Table 3: total salary for DPH's on old contract (with additional supplements included)⁶

Supplement Band	Pay Scale Code	Minimum £	Maximum £	Exceptional Maximum £
Band A (Regional Director of PH)	KE31*	94,634	100,796	
Band B	KE21*	86,272	91,567	94,634
Band C	KE11*	85,406	89,792	91,567
Band D	KE01*	84,510	88,030	89,792

(NB: table 3 shows the value of the Director of Public Health supplement added to the maximum of the old Consultant salary scale. These values are not to be used for Consultants on the 2003 Consultant contract)

Table 4: Clinical Excellence Awards for Consultants (either contracts)⁷

Awarded by Local Committees		
Level 1	£2,957	
Level 2	£5,914	
Level 3	£8,871	
Level 4	£11,828	
Level 5	£14,785	
Level 6	£17,742	
Level 7	£23,656	
Level 8	£29,570	
Level 9	£35,484	
		Awarded by ACCEA
		Level 9 (Bronze) £35,484
		Level 10 (Silver) £46,644
		Level 11 (Gold) £58,305
		Level 12 (Platinum) £75,796

Table 5: Discretionary Points for Consultants (either contracts)

Pay Scale/code	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
MC10/KC10	£3,204	£6,408	£9,612	£12,816	£16,020	£19,224	£22,428	£25,632

6: Payable under both the old contract and 2003 consultant contract. Further information for the new contract can be found in Schedule 16 terms and conditions and for the old contract – Consultants (England) 2003 and for the old consultant in HSG (92)12. The KE01 – KE31 scales are now closed pay scales and no further appointments should be made to them.

7: Clinical Excellence awards previously awarded under local area based committee arrangements. From 1st April 2013 Public Health England now supports Local Authorities to meet their statutory obligations through the transfer scheme/TUPE to maintain this contractual provision. This self-nominating award scheme requires the employee to have their application signed off by the Chief Executive/Director of Public Health and applications are considered by an 8 person panel which includes lay, professional and employer members.

NHS Agenda for Change Salary Scales: Table 8

Annex C: Pay bands and pay points on the second pay spine in England from 1st April 2013

Point	Band 1	Band 2	Band 3	Band 4	Band 5	Band 6	Band 7	Band 8				Band 9
								Range A	Range B	Range C	Range D	
1	14,294	14,294										
2	14,653	14,653										
3	15,013	15,013										
4		15,432										
5		15,851										
6		16,271	16,271									
7		16,811	16,811									
8		17,425	17,425									
9			17,794									
10			18,285									
11			18,838	18,838								
12			19,268	19,268								
13				19,947								
14				20,638								
15				21,265								
16				21,388	21,388							
17				22,016	22,016							
18					22,903							
19					23,825							
20					24,799							
21					25,783	25,783						
22					26,822	26,822						
23					27,901	27,901						
24						28,755						
25						29,799						
26						30,764	30,764					
27						31,768	31,768					
28						32,898	32,898					
29						34,530	34,530					
30							35,536					
31							36,666					
32							37,921					
33							39,239	39,239				
34							40,558	40,558				
35								42,190				
36								34,822				
37								45,707	45,707			
38								47,088	47,088			
39									49,473			
40									52,235			
41									54,998	54,998		
42									56,504	56,504		
43										59,016		
44										61,779		
45									*	65,922	65,922	
46									*	67,805	67,805	
47											70,631	
48											74,084	
49										*	77,850	77,850
50										*	81,619	81,619
51												85,535
52												89,640
53											*	93,944
54											*	98,453

*Pay spine points 45 and 46 at the top of pay band 8C, pay spine points 49 and 50 at the top of pay band 8D and pay spine points 53 and 54 at the top of pay band 9 are annually earned (see paragraphs 1.11 to 1.15 in Section 1 (a) England

This page is intentionally left blank

Report of: Head of Licensing and Registration

Report to: General Purposes Committee

Date: 12 February 2015

Subject: Community Governance Review recommendations on whether to create a new Town Council for Guiseley

Are specific electoral Wards affected?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No
If relevant, name(s) of Ward(s): Guiseley and Rawdon		
Are there implications for equality and diversity and cohesion and integration?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
Is the decision eligible for Call-In?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
Does the report contain confidential or exempt information?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
If relevant, Access to Information Procedure Rule number:		
Appendix number:		

Summary of main issues

1. The Council received a petition from electors in polling districts from the Guiseley and Rawdon ward on 29 August 2014 asking for the creation of a new Town Council for Guiseley.
2. The petition was validated by Electoral Services staff and met the requirements of the Local Government and Public Involvement in Health Act 2007.
3. Following the receipt of a valid petition the Council was required to decide whether to undertake a Community Governance Review. The Council had the option not to do so as it had previously carried out such a review in the area concerned within the past 2 years.
4. General Purposes Committee agreed to undertake a review, and approved the Terms of Reference on 23 October 2014.
5. Public consultation was carried out during the period 24 October – 28 November 2014. The Council's Electoral Working Group (EWG) met on 8 December 2014 to consider any representations received and additional background information before making their recommendations for General Purposes Committee's consideration which are given in this report.
6. EWG were also provided with a document pack containing electoral arrangements, statistics, representations, details of existing community organisations and proposed

precept information on 8 January 2015, for further comment by 16 January 2015. No further comments were received. This pack is attached at Appendix A.

Recommendations

7. That General Purposes Committee notes the recommendations as detailed in 3.6 of the report as made by EWG following the Community Governance Review and either
 - 7.1. Confirm that there are no recommendations to be made to Full Council as there is no Order confirmed; or
 - 7.2. Confirm the request for a Town Council for Guiseley as the authority's final proposals and sent to Full Council for approval.

1 Purpose of this report

- 1.1 To consider EWG's recommendations regarding the petition from electors in polling districts from the Guiseley & Rawdon ward and subsequent Community Governance Review to establish whether a new Town Council for Guiseley should be created.

2 Background information

- 2.1 The Council received a valid petition from electors in polling districts from the Guiseley and Rawdon ward on 29 August 2014. Following receipt of the petition the Council was required to decide whether to undertake a Community Governance Review.
- 2.2 The Council had the option not to undertake a review as it had already completed a Community Governance Review of the area in question during the past 2 years.
- 2.3 The petition was submitted in accordance with the Local Government and Public Involvement in Health Act 2007 (the Act).
- 2.4 The area covered by the review had 11,039 local government electors and as such would need any petition to be signed by at least 1,039 of those electors in accordance with the Act. The petition has been signed by 1,179 local government electors in the area affected by the review.
- 2.5 The petition defined on a map the area to which the review is to relate. A map was submitted with the petition and the geographical area is defined as that currently known as Guiseley.
- 2.6 The petition asked for the creation of a new Parish, and a new Parish (Town) Council called Guiseley to serve the community. A copy of the map illustrating the boundaries of the proposed new Town Council area is attached at Appendix B.
- 2.7 A Community Governance Review must in any event make recommendations as to what new Parish or Parishes (if any) should be constituted in the area under review. If the review recommends that a new Parish should be constituted, the review must also make recommendations as to the name of the new Parish, whether or not the new Parish should have a Parish Council, and whether or not the new Parish should have one of the alternative styles (in the case of this review – a Town Council). However, where a new Parish has 1,000 or more local government electors, the review must recommend that the Parish should have a Council.
- 2.8 The Council has the power to undertake a Community Governance Review of the whole or part of its area other than in response to a valid community governance petition. As a result, the Council could commence a separate review of a wider area than the petition area if it so wished, and could then make recommendations as to new Parishes, the aggregation of Parishes, or the alteration or abolition of Parishes in a wider part of its area.

- 2.9 At its meeting on 23 October 2014, General Purposes Committee agreed to undertake a Community Governance Review, and approved the Terms of Reference for a Community Governance Review of the area affected by the petition.

3 Main issues

- 3.1 The Council is required to undertake a Community Governance Review within 12 months. In these circumstances the stages of the review are as follows:
- petition validated (this has been undertaken by Electoral Services)
 - Terms of Reference for the review agreed (agreed by GPC on 23 October 2014)
 - Council consults with local people on the proposal (public consultation was carried out between 24 October – 28 November 2014)
 - Council takes into account any representations received (all representations were considered by EWG at their meeting on 8 December 2014.
 - Council makes recommendations whether a new Town Council should be implemented (the reason for this report)
 - Interim governance arrangements agreed and precept set
 - Election held (the timetable for the review has been set so the elections to any new Parish can coincide with the Parliamentary Election, Leeds City Council Elections and all out Parish and Town Council Elections on 7 May 2015 to help to reduce costs)
- 3.2 When undertaking a Community Governance Review, a principal Council must have regard to guidance issued by the Department of Communities and Local Government. The stages outlined above take account of the requirements of the legislation and the available guidance. However, subject to this, it is for the Council to decide how to undertake the review. In deciding what recommendations to make, the Council must take into account any other arrangements (apart from those relating to Parishes) that have already been made, or that could be made for the purposes of community representation or community engagement in respect of the area under review. EWG considered this at this meeting on 8 December 2014 before agreeing their recommendations.
- 3.3 In order for any required election to take place jointly with the Parliamentary, Leeds City Council and all out Parish and Town Council Elections on 7 May 2015, this review needs to be finalised by no later than 28 February 2015 in order to make the necessary changes to the registers before publication on 1 March 2015. Also, it should be noted that the last date for publication of the Notice of Election for a Parish or Town Council Election to take place on 7 May 2015 is 30 March 2015, after this date the election could not take place on 7 May. This makes the timetable critical with no allowance for any slippage.

3.4 If a decision is taken to create a new Town Council they will have the ability to produce a Neighbourhood Plan for their area.

3.5 Recommendations of Electoral Working Group (EWG) – EWG met on 8 December 2014 to consider the following information from the review. This information was also supplied to Members of EWG via email on 8 January 2015, for further comment by 16 January 2015:-

- A map of the area affected by the review, and its relation to other nearby Parish or Town Councils and existing polling districts
- Any other arrangements (apart from those relating to Parishes) that have already been made, or that could be made for the purposes of community representation or community engagement in respect of the area under review (e.g. residents associations, community forums, tenant management organisations, Community Committee(s))
- The need to secure that community governance in the area under review reflects the identities and interests of the community in that area, and is effective and convenient
- Details of any developments in the area under review which is likely to occur in the period of five years from the start of the review
- Demographic information on population size for the area under review and any change which is likely to occur in the period of five years from the start of the review
- Electorate information for the area under review including the number of local government electors for the Town Council, any change in the number, or distribution, of the local government electors which is likely to occur in the period of five years from the start of the review, the desirability of fixing boundaries which are, and will remain, easily identifiable, and any local ties which will be broken by the fixing of any particular boundaries
- Details of any likely precept or any change to an existing precept as a potential consequence of a review
- Details of any Council land or property that will transfer to any new Town Council on formation
- Details of any representations made during the public consultation and
- Officer recommendations regarding the electoral arrangements for the area under review which will include:
 - The ordinary year in which elections are held;
 - The number of Councillors to be elected to the Council

- The division (or not) of the Town Council into wards for the purpose of electing Councillors
- The number and boundaries of any such wards
- The number of Councillors to be elected for any such ward and
- The name of any such ward

3.6 A copy of the information that was provided to EWG is at Appendix B which includes the above information. After careful consideration of the above information, EWG also considered the need to secure that community governance arrangements reflect the identities of the community in the area and have recommended:-

- That the request for a Town Council for Guiseley be rejected on the grounds that electors in polling districts GRA and GRB (covering the areas of Hawksworth and Menston) do not consider themselves to be part of the Guiseley area and are against their inclusion in a Town Council for Guiseley
- That the petition organiser is asked to reconsider the boundary to exclude the above mentioned polling districts, and to submit a new petition for consideration

3.7 GPC is asked to consider the report and information to EWG at Appendix B as well as the recommendations made by EWG, and to agree whether final proposals need to be submitted to Full Council.

4 Corporate Considerations

4.1 Consultation and Engagement

4.1.1 All local government electors for the area under review and any other person or body who appears to have an interest in the review has been consulted on the proposal, and GPC is asked to take into account all representations received in connection with the review. GPC is also asked to have regard to the need to secure that the community governance arrangements for the area reflect the identities and interests of the community in the area and are effective and convenient. In deciding what recommendations to make to full Council, GPC is also asked to take into account any other arrangements (apart from those relating to Parishes and their institutions), that have already been made, or that could be made, for the purposes of community representation or community engagement in respect of the area.

4.2 Equality and Diversity / Cohesion and Integration

4.2.1 An equality screening document has been completed for this review and has concluded that the consultation arrangements have helped ensure all people affected by the review were given an opportunity to comment which includes and opportunity to raise any equality, diversity, cohesion or integration issues.

4.3 Council policies and City Priorities

- 4.3.1 This review does not affect the Council's budget and policy framework, although reviewing local electors' needs does support the Council's aims to be the best city for communities, and in particular the four year priority to increase a sense of belonging that builds cohesive and harmonious communities.

4.4 Resources and value for money

- 4.4.1 No additional human resources are required to carry out the review.
- 4.4.2 There is no budget to carry out Community Governance Reviews so the cost of this review will have to be met from within existing budget. The cost of carrying out this review was estimated at £2,000. This is mainly costs from printing and publishing Notices in local press.

4.5 Legal Implications, Access to Information and Call In

- 4.5.1 Under the Council's Constitution, General Purposes Committee alone has the delegated authority to receive final recommendations for any Community Governance Review. General Purposes Committee is then authorised to make appropriate recommendations to Full Council if necessary to give effect to the final recommendations of the review by the making of an Order under S86 of the Act. Neither power is delegated to the Chief Executive.

4.6 Risk Management

- 4.6.1 There is always a risk of challenge to the decision. There is no right to appeal as such, although if local electors disagreed with the final recommendations they could lobby the Full Council not to give effect to them, or a decision by Full Council could be challenged by way of judicial review on the usual principles.

5 Conclusions

- 5.1 That EWG have properly considered any representations received and the additional information listed at 3.5 of this report to determine their recommendations whether a new Town Council for Guiseley should be established.

6 Recommendations

- 6.1 That General Purposes Committee notes the recommendations as detailed in 3.6 of the report as made by EWG following the Community Governance Review and either
- 6.1.2 Confirm that there are no recommendations to be made to Full Council as there is no Order confirmed; or
- 6.1.3 Confirm the request for a Town Council for Guiseley as the authority's final proposals and sent to Full Council for approval.

7 Background documents

- None

Community Governance Review Establishment of a Town Council for Guiseley


Information pack for Electoral Working Group

Electoral Services
Level 2
Town Hall
The Headrow
Leeds LS1 3AD

0113 3952858
electors@leeds.gov.uk
www.leeds.gov.uk/elections



Map of the proposed Guiseley Town Council area



Current arrangements relating to community engagement / representation

Organisation	Purpose
<p>Aireborough Neighbourhood Forum</p> <p>Jennifer Kirkby Chairlady and Programme Manager</p> <p>aireboroughnp@gmail.com</p>	<p>The purpose of the Aireborough Forum is to support the regeneration and sustainable development of the Aireborough Neighbourhood Area. The aim is to facilitate collaboration between the Area's stakeholders in order to evaluate, plan and implement initiatives to improve the economic, social, cultural and environmental well-being of the people who live, work or do substantial business in the Aireborough Neighbourhood Area.</p>
<p>Leeds North West (Outer) Area Committee</p> <p>Jane Maxwell West North West Area Leader 0113 336 7858 jane.maxwell@leeds.gov.uk</p>	<p>Area Committees aim to improve the delivery and co-ordination of local council services and improve the quality of local decision making.</p> <p>Area Committees have a lot of influence. They make sure local concerns are taken into account in the development of major policies and strategies.</p> <p>Area Committees also make sure priorities are addressed through local partnership working arrangements, with senior officer groups from Leeds City Council collaborating with organisations such as the Primary Care Trust and the Police which sit under the umbrella organisation, the Leeds Initiative: http://www.leedsinitiative.org/</p> <p>The council has given specific responsibilities to the Area Committees known as Area Functions. These include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Area Well Being budgets – a budget to be spent on local priorities • Community centres • Neighbourhood wardens

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CCTV • Neighbourhood management co-ordination • Community engagement • Other areas where the Committees powers can exert influence but do not directly manage are: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Community greenspace • PCSOs, neighbourhood policing teams and multi agency Crime & Grime operations • Environmental action teams • Street cleansing • Highways maintenance • Local children and young people plans • Health and wellbeing (including adult social care) • Conservation area reviews • Grounds maintenance • Area based regeneration schemes and Town & District Centre projects • Advertising on lampposts
--	--

Developments

Planning Services have advised of the following known developments within the next 5 years:

- 1) Springhead Mills, Springfield Road – development by Shepherd Homes of 54 dwellings of 3, 4 and 5 bedrooms – currently under construction.
- 2) Queensway – Development by Stonebridge Homes of 14 dwellings – 4 and 5 bed – currently under construction.

They have advised that it is possible that new housing sites will be brought forward within this area through the Local Development Framework process but this is perhaps 2 years away from a conclusion so it is too early to say but it is conceivable that this could bring more homes into the area.

Demographic information

The proposed Guiseley Town Council area has an approximate population of 12,500.

There is no anticipated major increase in the above figures within the next five years.

Electorate

Figures provided as of current register of electors, published on 1 December 2014


Polling Districts	Electorate
GRA	356
GRB	1057
GRC	2080
GRD	2628
GRI	972
GRJ	1705
GRK	2183
Total	10,981

There is no anticipated major increase in the above figures within the next five years.

Transfer of land and property

There is one allotment site in the Guiseley area, which is Moor Lane (see map below). This would transfer to the Town Council should it be established.

Moor Lane is a self managed sites in that it is run by an association. There are currently 40 plot holders on the allotments on plot on sizes varying from quarter to full plots.



Precept

An estimate of £15 per Band D equivalent has been provided by the Principal Financial Manager.

Comparative information for nearby Parishes

Parish	Parish Band D Council Tax £
Horsforth	14.84
Otley	55.59
Bramhope & Carlton	30.47

Comparative information for other new parishes when set up:

Parish (and year established)	Parish Band D Council Tax £
Drighlington (2004/05)	10.00
Gildersome (2004/05)	10.00
Kippax (2004/05)	12.00
Alwoodley (2008/09)	10.00

Summary of representations

See Appendix A.

Electoral arrangements

Representations made

During the consultation period, no representations were made in respect of the electoral arrangements of the proposed Town Council.

The petition organiser submitted his recommendations with the petition on 21 August. These are as follows:

Polling Districts	Electorate	Name	Number of Councillors
GRA & GRJ	2,061	Hawksworth & Tranmere Ward	2
GRK	2,183	Green Meadows Ward	2
GRC	2,080	St Oswalds Ward	2
GRI	972	Queensway Ward	1
GRD	2,628	Oxford Road Ward	2
GRB	1,057	St Mary's Ward	1
Totals	10,981		10

Officer recommendations

The ordinary year in which elections are held

Ordinary Parish elections are held once every four years with all Councillors being elected at the same time. The standard parish electoral cycle is for elections in 2015 and every four years after 2015, but Parish elections may be held in other years so that they can coincide with other elections and share costs.

New or revised parish electoral arrangements come into force at ordinary Parish elections, rather than parish by-elections, so they usually have to wait until the next scheduled Parish elections. They can come into force sooner only if the terms of office of sitting Parish Councillors are cut so that earlier Parish elections may be held for terms of office which depend on whether the parish is to return to its normal year of election.

It is therefore recommended that the ordinary year for elections to Guiseley Town Council be every fourth year, in line with the existing cycle for Parish and Town Council elections.

The next scheduled elections will take place on 7 May 2015.

The number of Councillors to be elected to the Council

Please find attached for reference at Appendix B, a schedule which shows the number of Councillors per existing Parish/Town Council, and their respective wards (if any).

The Local Government Boundary Commission for England's guidance on community governance reviews states that typical Parish Council representing between 2,501 and 10,000 electors have between 9 and 16 Councillors and representing between 10,001 and 20,000 between 13 and 27 Councillors.

Officer recommendations for the number of Councillors can be found under the warding information below.

Boundaries

Officers recommend that Members consider redrawing the boundary of the proposed Town Council to exclude polling districts GRA and GRB, given the lack of support from electors in those polling districts.

The division of the Parish into wards for the purpose of electing Councillors

Parish warding is the division of a parish into wards for the purpose of electing Councillors. This includes the number and any boundaries of any wards, the number of councillors to be elected for any ward and the names of wards.

In considering whether or not a Parish should be divided into wards, the 2007 Act requires that consideration be given to whether:

- a) the number, or distribution of the local government electors for the parish would make a single election of councillors impracticable or inconvenient; and
- b) it is desirable that any area or areas of the parish should be separately represented

Officers agree that warding is the preferable option for a Parish of this size.

Officers have no objections to the suggested wards, ward names or number of Councillors proposed in the recommendations of the petition organiser.

Community Governance Review - Proposed Guiseley Town Council Representation Log

<u>File Ref.</u>	<u>Date</u>	<u>Capacity</u>	<u>In Support?</u>	<u>Comments</u>
1	30/10/2014	Elector	N	As a resident of polling district GRJ I oppose the formation of a Guiseley Council. This is an unnecessary cost and additional layer of administration and bureaucracy. Government should slimming down, not burdening tax payers with further costs and bureaucracy. I see this as purely a vehicle for a vocal minority to impose their view of how Guiseley should be developed and how services run, I feel that Leeds City Council is far from perfect, but a more impartial forum for decision making.
2	31/10/2014	Electors	N	I think that the Neighbourhood forum are quite capable of meeting our needs another forum would be just another cost and talking shop
3	31/10/2014	Elector	N	I should like to put on record, that to my disgust a letter dated 29th of October is the first notice I have had about this proposal. The origins to me seem to be questionable in terms of how only a relatively small number of people can trigger a consultation and begs the question why wasn't every resident approached. Perhaps you could consider and comment on these questions:- 1. Is there some group of people trying to manipulate this process to suit their own ends? 2. Was everyone who took part in the petition aware that a town council will require an increase in council tax? 3. What political motivation exists behind this exercise, so far the only comments I have seen have come from the Conservative party. Given these concerns perhaps you can say how we discover the pros and cons about the proposal in an open and honest manner
4	01/11/2014	Elector	Y	Re: Proposals for Guiseley Town Council. As a Guiseley resident I would like to register my support for a Guiseley Town Council. The Neighbourhood Forum and development of a Neighbourhood Plan is a second best approach. Development in the area has been poorly addressed over the last 10 years, with inadequate representation from local councillors who from what I have seen at public meetings in the past do not fight for what is best for the area. Principally though, I support a Town Council to help develop Guiseley as a good place to live, bring some pride to the town, develop community projects, drive improvements for residents and local businesses and foster awareness of what Guiseley has to offer, both to current residents and nearby areas. A comparison with Otley Town Council and the good community work they do to strengthen the community feel in the town shows that the existing system does not work for Guiseley. I was not aware of these consultations, but I'm also rather concerned at the use of public funds by the local councillors to argue against this proposal. Could I ask whether funds were made available for a counter argument?
5	01/11/2014	Elector	N	I am thoroughly opposed to the proposed institution of a Guiseley Town Council. This will be yet a further layer of administration/bureaucracy together with the imposition of a precept to service the council and its aspirations. In the event that this consultation shows a measure of support for this proposal, then before it is enacted a referendum to clearly establish the overall wishes of the community will be essential. To proceed without a referendum would I believe be undemocratic and open to be challenged at law.
6	01/11/2014	Electors	N	My wife and I are not in favour of forming a Guiseley Town Council. In fact we are very much against the idea. In our opinion it will be nothing more than a talking shop for the so called 'do gooders' to try and impose their ideas where they are not wanted. And, of course, at our expense. But please tell me, when the initial paper came round inviting people to consider the thought of a Guiseley Town Council the petition was to hold a ballot to see if the idea had any support. It was not a straight vote for or against a town council but a vote in favour of holding a ballot. Certainly the person who canvassed me pleaded that I support the holding of a ballot in order that one could be held. However may I now suggest that if Leeds City Council consider that the petition was a call for a Guiseley Town Council then only receiving 1,179 votes clearly shows there is not any great desire for such a Council.
7	01/11/2014	Elector	N	We live in polling district GRB. We consider ourselves to live in Menston as our postcode suggests. Our children both attend school in Menston and we are very much a part of the Menston community. We are very much against paying an additional council tax precept for Guiseley. Clearly if we were part of the Guiseley community this is something we may wish to support however we are not. We have no links to Guiseley and feel it inappropriate to be asked to contribute towards any town council. I trust you will consider our comments and put them forward.
8	02/11/2014	Elector	N	I am writing in response to your recent letter, I am totally against any such proposal and do not want to pay additional council tax for something I do not need.

Community Governance Review - Proposed Guiseley Town Council Representation Log

<u>File Ref.</u>	<u>Date</u>	<u>Capacity</u>	<u>In Support?</u>	<u>Comments</u>
9	02/11/2014	Elector	N	I am writing in response to your recent letter, I am totally against any such proposal and do not want to pay additional council tax for something I do not need. I fail to see the purpose of such a proposal and was never approached regarding this matter by any Guiseley residents
10	02/11/2014	Electors	N	Please note that we do not agree with the above proposal & would object to any council tax caused by such a move
11	02/11/2014	Elector	N	A brief email to say that I do <i>not</i> support the formation of a town council for Guiseley as I do not believe it would offer value for money.
12	02/11/2014	Electors	N	I am emailing on behalf of my wife and myself, residents of Guiseley for over 30 years, to register our opposition to the creation of a Town Council for Guiseley for the reasons given in the letter recently received from councillors Graham Latty, Paul Wadsworth and Pat Latty.
13	02/11/2014	Electors	N	We are not in favour of the formation of a Town Council for Guiseley and prefer the existing arrangements
14	02/11/2014	Elector	N	As a resident of the Guiseley and Rawdon Ward, I am writing to express my opposition to the above proposal. I am opposed for the following reasons:1. Guiseley already has a Neighbourhood Forum that carries out many of the functions of a Town Council, which would make the latter a duplication of effort 2. Guiseley residents would see their Council Tax increase to pay for a Town Council and I don't see why they should have to pay for something they currently receive for free. 3. It is only fair that a referendum of those affected is held to determine if a Town Council is wanted, but I understand the Council's General Purposes Committee has rejected the idea, which is about as democratic as Vladimir Putin's Russia.
15	02/11/2014	Electors	N	My wife and I do not think that there is a need for a Guiseley Town Council
16	02/11/2014	Elector	N	I refer to the 'letter to residents' dated 29th October and take the opportunity to express my opposition to the proposal to create a Town Council for Guiseley. Hopefully, I speak as someone who believes stongly in the value of public services and local representation. However, I do not believe that the creation of a Town Council would make any positive contribution to the cause. In a time of economic and financial stringency, front line public services are facing considerable pressure. The costs of the proposed new organisation can only result in commensurate reduction in the resources available for service provision and, therefore, in the services themselves.In making these comments, let me stress that I could be open to persuasion if real and tangible benefits are demonstrated. However, I do not believe that the case has been made or, indeed, can be made. In the meantime, the burden of proof must lie with the proponents of the proposal. In closing I would also record my opposition to any referendum on the subject. There are fundamental shortcomings with the referendum process. Although I recognise that referendums are unavoidable in some, limited, circumstances, I do not believe that one is justified in this particular case. The decision should, ultimately and after due consideration, be taken by elected officials who have all the evidence available to them
17	03/11/2014	Elector	N	Regarding the review of the proposed Guiseley Town Council, I cannot easily find a map of the proposed area – please could you point me in the right direction. Also, could you tell me how, where and on what dates this consultation is being brought to the attention of people affected, and what care you are taking to ensure that as many people are engaged in the process of such a major change as possible? Have you for example, approached local community groups, of which there are a number.

Community Governance Review - Proposed Guiseley Town Council Representation Log

<u>File Ref.</u>	<u>Date</u>	<u>Capacity</u>	<u>In Support?</u>	<u>Comments</u>
18	03/11/2014	Elector	N	In short, this is a terrible idea. I am studying for a PGCE so only have a few minutes to give you my views:I work in schools and know how underfunded they are, with numbers of pupils increasing and staff taking real terms cuts in their wages/not having contracts renewed because there is no money.There is a general acknowledgement that the NHS can't keep functioning with the level of funding it currently receives. Money needs to be spent on caring for the elderly in their own homes, so they don't have to live their lives in hospitals or 'care-homes'These are just three key areas. There are plenty more. Money does NOT need to be spent setting up further local bureaucracy. I cannot see how a local town council could improve any of the above. I cannot afford to pay an increase in council tax, and would be extremely angry to be asked in this time of wage deflation. Next September, on a newly qualified teacher's salary I shall be struggling to make things pay PLUS I shall be working my heart out. As you can see I am pretty angry about a few things. I suggest local and national politicians start fighting for our votes by making some sensible and joined up decisions, that don't denigrate the efforts (and living standards) of ordinary people any further. If people were doing their jobs properly, no-one would even be asking for a town council. I would never vote UKIP in a thousand years, because they are a bunch of misogynist racists, but there are plenty who would. However, there <i>are</i> plenty of other 'protest vote' options out there for people like me.
19	03/11/2014	Elector	N	Having just received your letter about the consultation on the creation of a Town council for Guiseley, I wish to express my concerns.I live in Menston and I have no wish to be part of the same boundary. I hope you can record my concerns.
20	03/11/2014	Elector	N	Please note that we totally disagree with the creation of Town Council for Guiseley
21	03/11/2014	Elector	N	We do not see any benefit form having a town council for Guiseley. It would cost more with no real benefits. We pay enough in council tax as it is
22	03/11/2014	Elector	N	Under no circumstances would I agree to the creation of any body that results in an increase of taxation, such as the proposed Town Council for Guiseley. I, like many hard working people in this country, are fed up with taxation. We pay far too much. It would appear to us that local and national governments have no respect for the tax money they spend. It was hard earned, we have no say in how much tax I pay or on what it is spent. Massive amounts are spent carelessly, needlessly, and without the proper scrutiny and frugality that one would exercise when spending your own money. Money raised through taxation does not belong to you, therefore I would urge you in all your decisions to treat it with the same respect as if it were your own, and look not to increase costs to us but reduce them
23	03/11/2014	Business owner	N	My feeling regarding this issue is that local residents will resent an extra charge on there council tax bills for what appears to be little gain. I think we should accept the recommendation of our local councillors & scrap the idea. Guiseley is an expanding community & needs careful monitoring to ensure our infrastructure can cope but hopefully our local councillors & the system already in place can help us maintain the standards of our area
24	04/11/2014	Elector	N	On behalf of my family and I, I wish to register my strong objection to the proposal to introduce a Town Council in Guiseley. We already have too many 'gravy train' and ineffective politicians feeding from the trough of so called public money (which is anything but). We would be much better served by reducing the number of local representatives to two per ward and requiring each to be resident in that ward.Alternatively, let us return to the pre-reorganisation situation and bring back Aireborough Urban District Council as an autonomous Authority totally divorced from the parasitic Leeds City Council, whose only interest appears to be the regeneration of south Leeds to the detriment of more affluent areas.
25	05/11/2014	Elector	N	I really don't think it necessary as the Neighbourhood Forum is working perfectly well.Also, I would not appreciate an additional charge to my Council Tax
26	05/11/2014	Elector	N	I don't see the point of another tier of councillors, at extra cost to the taxpayer, when the current councillors don't look after, (or have the power) the needs of their constituents. Or for that matter reply to their constituents when contacted

Community Governance Review - Proposed Guiseley Town Council Representation Log

<u>File Ref.</u>	<u>Date</u>	<u>Capacity</u>	<u>In Support?</u>	<u>Comments</u>
27	05/11/2014	Elector	N	Please can I register my concerns at the wish for a town council for my area.I am against any wish to create more roles that would create further cost for rate payers. We have a neighbourhood forum which I am led to understand can complete tasks at no cost to the rate payer which is surely a much better deal. If these changes are to be made surely it is only fair if all rate payers have a say on the matter. But of course that would be another cost! In these times of straightened circumstances surely it is the role of all government officials of all parties to keep costs too a minimum
28	05/11/2014	Electors	N	In response to the letter we received informing us of the public consultation on the above proposal, we would like to express our opposition to the proposal as we feel the needs of Guiseley Residents are already being met under the current arrangements.The introduction of a Town Council would just be another layer of bureaucracy
29	06/11/2014	Elector	N	Thank you for your letter re the proposed town council for Guiseley. I am opposed to the suggestion of creating another committee / council which would need to be funded by extra council tax charges. I agree that the limited benefits are not cost effective.The Neighbourhood forum already carries out a lot of these duties free of charge.
30	07/11/2014	Elector	Y	I am not convinced by the arguments put forward Clls Wadsworth, Latty and Latty I look at Otley who have their own council and they seem to do so much for the town more than we do for Guiseley. I think there is also more of a community feeling, the same for Ilkley so I would like to see Guiseley have its own parish council
31	08/11/2014	Elector	N	Further to your recent letter regarding the above, I and my wife wish to register our collective objection to this proposal. At times of financial constraint it seems almost inconceivable that anyone would put forward proposals which would add a financial burden on to families.On another matter, I should be most grateful if you would try and do something about the state of the road outside our house, (address removed - polling district GRJ). It is crumbling away and mud and rubble surface when it rains. Much of the estate was recently patched up but for some reason, this bit of road was not done and it is in a worse state, at least outside our house, than many areas which were patched up.I do not think it is too much to ask for this to be done as we already pay a significant council tax bill and maintenance of streets is covered within that. Perhaps this is one reason some residents wish to have a local council. I don't know.
32	07/11/2014	Elector	N	I do not believe there is a need for such a structure for the simple reason that we already have a Neighbourhood Development Forum for Aireborough. This Forum has almost 2 years of experience in consulting local people and has developed credibility, professionalism and robust foundations for developing a Neighbourhood Plan. It would be a complete waste of resources to 'start again' with a Guiseley Town Council. Aireborough does feel besieged by housing development and infrastructure pressures however the Aireborough Neighbourhood Development Forum has successfully channelled local people's feelings into mature and informed views which can address these issues in partnership with Leeds City Council. It can call upon a wide range of skilled and experienced members of the community who understand what a Neighbourhood Forum is and what it does.Aireborough Neighbourhood Development Forum is also much more representative of this area than a Guiseley Town Council would be because it covers Yeadon, Hawksworth and High Royds and other parts of this area such as Nunroyd and New Scarborough. Thus Aireborough Neighbourhood Development Forum is going to be a much more useful body for Leeds City Council to develop a relationship with going forward, as it can speak for a wider geographical area - but more importantly it covers an area which shares interests, issues and concerns and is a much more logical and cohesive entity than just Guiseley alone. If a Town Council emerges it will exclude these other important areas of Aireborough and Leeds City Council will have to find other ways to engage with the rest of Aireborough, which will be time consuming and unsatisfactory in terms of representation.Guiseley Town Council is an old fashioned political structure - a Neighbourhood Development Forum responds more fully to modern ideas of Localism and thus has a better chance of engaging younger people in local issues.Guiseley Town Council will charge a precept and this will also put people off engaging in issues. Aireborough Neighbourhood Forum is non-party political and draws support from people across the political spectrum. This is a much better and efficient foundation for dealing with local issues and engaging genuine support than a Town Council which is being led by a single political party.Aireborough Neighbourhood Development Forum has developed excellent contacts in local business, local education providers and within Leeds City Council itself with local Ward members, the MP and with council officers within the planning section and so on. It has already started serious work on a Plan with an external grant, further demonstrating that it has gained experience and credibility. I really do not see that creating a totally new body in the form of a Town Council will be in anyone's interests and it would certainly not be in Guiseley's or indeed Aireborough's interests. It would put back localism in this area by 2 years or more whilst the new Town Council 'got up to speed'. I doubt it could ever gain the ground that the Forum has.I know that myself and many of my contacts would be likely to feel disillusionment and disengagement if Leeds City Council were to promote a Town Council above the Aireborough Neighbourhood Development Forum.I would be grateful for acknowledgement that my representation on this consultation has been received and noted. Thanks

Community Governance Review - Proposed Guiseley Town Council Representation Log

<u>File Ref.</u>	<u>Date</u>	<u>Capacity</u>	<u>In Support?</u>	<u>Comments</u>
33	08/11/2014	Elector	N	My Husband and I do not wish to see a town council in Guiseley, adding more cost and another layer the council structure
34	08/11/2014	Elector	N	I've received a letter informing me that there will a consultation on the creation of a Town Council for Guiseley. This came as a surprise to me, I've not been informed, nor given the opportunity of commenting on this previously. My concern, and reason for writing to you, is that I live in Menston (polling district GRB). I do not consider myself to be living in Guiseley and do not believe our street/estate should have been included within the boundary for this proposed Town Council. This would have been my view, should I have been consulted.I therefore am against the proposed Town Council and would like my views to be taken into consideration in any further discussions on this topic.
35	08/11/2014	Elector	N	Further to a letter received from councillor Latty concerning the consultation on the creation of a Town Council for Guiseley I should like to record my opposition to such a plan.
36	08/11/2014	Elector	N	I am responding to your letter of 29 October with regard to a public consultation about the creation of a town council for Guiseley. My response is as follows:I have seen nothing about this until now. I was not aware of the petition requesting the creation and had I been so, I would not have signed.I do not understand why a town council would be of benefit to what is, essentially, a suburb of a city. The city already has a functional council.I do not understand how this council would be funded, what it's powers would be, where it would sit within the existing civic apparatus, or what form the body would take.I do not understand who is driving this initiative and what their agenda is.If I were to be told the answers to these question I might look on the matter with a more favourable mind. At the moment, without the answers to these questions, I am fervently against the creation of another public sector cost centre. I strongly urge you to resist the creation of a Guiseley town council until a fuller debate has taken place.
37	09/11/2014	Elector	N	Please accept this email as our notice of disapproval for the suggested formation of a Guisley Council and the amended boundary to encompass parts of Menston and Hawksworth
38	09/11/2014	Elector	N	Given that my address is in Menston (polling district GRB), and that we already have the Neighborhood Forum that consults on nearly all of the issues a Town Council would provide us, I would urge that the town Council be opposed. If Menston residents are likely to incur a charge for something that they wouldnt really be represented on, I think the additional charge would be unfair, and essentially be a notional charge that facilitates Guiseley residents taking control of matters that are actually dealt with already. I would oppose any such council formationI have attended schemes that look after matters on the High Royds development for which volunteers take control and think a Guiseley Town Council would have zero affect, whilst costing residents money that they don't really have
39	09/11/2014	Elector	N	I have been informed that there is a proposal to create a Guiseley town council... and that my property in Menston (polling district GRB) could come within that proposed boundary.It is clear to me that this would be totally unacceptable. We wish to remain in the Menston area and reject any assertion that we should be associated with (or charged for) any such Guiseley based proposal. Feel free to contact me if you need any further details.
40	09/11/2014	Elector	N	I don't know who started this stupid idea off but I want it known that I don't want a town council for Guiseley. To even consider it and let vested interests take sway over the majority (90%, according to your letter) would be irresponsible government. I cannot believe that Leeds city council have let things progress this far. Whoever is behind this should be open to investigation in the press and I don't know who is after building this town council or why they want it. Please stop this stupid initiative right now. In fact, please write to me to tell me what I can do to make sure that it is stopped

Community Governance Review - Proposed Guiseley Town Council Representation Log

<u>File Ref.</u>	<u>Date</u>	<u>Capacity</u>	<u>In Support?</u>	<u>Comments</u>
41	09/11/2014	Electors	N	With regard to the consultation we would like to make the following points in response to the letter we received from the above councillors: <u>Cost</u> - Yes, a town council would cost extra, but the members of the neighbourhood forum are, we believe, volunteers. So we are counting on the goodwill of residents to stand up and fight our corner against the developers etc. The cost of a town council would be shared by all residents, and paid councillors would definitely be there doing their bit for the community, whereas you cannot guarantee there will always be people willing to volunteer for the neighbourhood forum. <u>Boundary</u> -According to our address we live in Menston, but pay Leeds council tax, our children go to school in Guiseley, and we travel through Guiseley on a daily basis, so issues affecting Guiseley directly affect us.
42	28/11/2014	Elector	N	I wish to register my objection to a Guiseley Town Council being formed. I believe the Aireborough Council serves our needs. I also object to increase in council tax to pay for these councils with no power to operate.
43	09/11/2014	Elector	N	We do not consider that we have been consulted in this matter. As far as the area that the council is proposed to cover we live in Menston (polling district GRB) which is included, surely we are Menston, just as Hawskworth is Hawskworth, not Guiseley. We are not part of the town and never have been. I also feel that a town council will be a financial burden we can well do without. Six possible wards, six councillors with expense accounts and a salaried clerk of council. The councillors will be of different political parties spending more time scoring points against each other than working towards the good of the area. Is there going to be a more transparent consultation or is it remaining invisible?
44	09/11/2014	Elector	N	We write to oppose the creation of the above as we do not want an additional charge to pay for more ineffective governance. We already have a Neighbourhood Forum which operates at no cost.
45	07/11/2014	Elector	N	Please note that we are entirely in agreement with the views expressed by councillors Graham and Pat Latty and Paul Wadsworth in their letter dated 29 October 2014. We do not support the proposal for the creation of a Guiseley Town Council
46	01/11/2014	Elector	N	Not in favour of Guiseley Town Council, I can't see the point any change not necessary
47	07/11/2014	Electors	Y	While our postal address is Menston we pay our council tax to Leeds and receive services from Leeds. I feel that we are not really included in the issues about the Guiseley/Tranmere Park areas when we should be and would very much welcome a Guiseley Council being established issues such as roads, schools and public services in this area are particular to Guiseley and would certainly not coming under the control of Bradford neither do they easily fit in with the Aireborough Area. Having a local town council would I feel mean that the people of this area would begin to feel they were part of the local area to which they are a part something which if they are like me, don't feel they are at the moment
48	03/11/2014	Elector	N	I am very much against a proposal for a town council for Guiseley. Leeds City Council do a good job and I am sure we do not need any more administration added to what we already have. Here in Hawskworth we pay enough council tax without being burdened with anymore. particularly as it does not really concern the village of Hawskworth. I hope there will be a good outcome from all this and that the proposal will be turned down by Leeds Council
49	10/11/2014	Electors	N	Regarding the proposed Town Council for Guiseley, there is absolutely no common sense reason for such to be established. If the idea was for a Borough Council for Aireborough, then that would be a very different idea worthy of serious consideration. In the meantime, however, the Neighbourhood Forum is quite adequate for the local needs of Guiseley folk
50	10/11/2014	Electors	N	Following advice from our local representative on the Leeds City Council, I wish to submit my strong objection to the proposed formation of a Town Council for Guiseley. We are already satisfactorily represented by the current arrangements and the last thing we need is an additional tier of local government with the necessary additional administration costs for the rate-payer to incur. We only need to observe, in the press, the relative ineffectiveness of a neighbouring Town Council.

Community Governance Review - Proposed Guiseley Town Council Representation Log

<u>File Ref.</u>	<u>Date</u>	<u>Capacity</u>	<u>In Support?</u>	<u>Comments</u>
51	11/11/2014	Elector	N	I am writing to you with concerns about the area Guiseley Town Council hopes to represent. Menston and the High Royds area have never been part of Guiseley and have nothing to do with the town. Neither does Hawksworth village. These are separate areas and I believe will be amply represented by Aireborough Neighbourhood Development Forum. These areas are part of Aireborough, but most definitely not part of Guiseley. The historic and geographic boundary between Menston and Guiseley runs along Mire Beck, with a definite break between the two settlements defined by a corridor of green belt. I urge you to reconsider these inclusions
52	11/11/2014	Elector	N	We live in polling district GRD and have recently received a letter regarding a consultation on the proposed Town Council. Regarding the proposals, we can see that the negative aspects to the proposal have been portrayed in the letter, however we do not feel that we have enough information around what a Town Council would actually mean, why it has been proposed and what the changes would consist of. Please could some information be provided on this or at least some detail as to who we should speak to in order to find out?
53	11/11/2014	Elector	Y	I would like to take this opportunity to express my support for a Town Council for Guiseley. I consider that a Town Council would be a great benefit to Guiseley. I consider it would be equitable to have same provision for Guiseley as has been enjoyed in Rawdon by way of Rawdon's Town Council. I do not consider that the existing Neighbourhood Forum allows a wide enough representation for Guiseley residents and is largely inaccessible to many residents. For the reasons set out above I would like to reiterate my support for a Guiseley Town Council.
54	11/11/2014	Elector	Y	I am a Guiseley resident and would like to express my support for a Guiseley Town Council. I believe a Town Council is the most accountable form of local government and has an important role in promoting the town, representing its interests and supporting the work of different groups in the community. The Town Council will be an important voice for residents and can support community interests by providing grants etc. Additionally any money apportioned to the area as a result of Government planning policies would be better allocated to a body that is accountable to the public via the ballot box. I also believe that a Town Council would be better placed to deal with planning matters which are the cause of much consternation in Guiseley. The cost of a Town Council would be cost effective.
55	12/11/2014	Elector	N	I strongly disagree with the formation of a Town Council for Guiseley. We already have a Neighbourhood Forum who are doing a very good job at no cost to the Ratepayers. A Guiseley Council would cost us money for no added advantage. The petition for one only had just over 10% of the electorate. I feel it would be necessary to have a referendum of the whole electorate of Guiseley to be fair to all. I have spoken to many people and have not found any in favour; yet the problem is people don't know or understand this consultation process but would understand and have the chance to vote in a referendum.
56	13/11/2014	Elector	Y	In response to your letter dated the 29th October 2014, I must advise you that I believe that more control locally is, in my opinion, a high priority. My reason for this view is the major expansion in the housing numbers (approved by both Leeds and Bradford City Councils). These are of course necessary, but there appears to be no corresponding plan to improve facilities and services to cope. The roads through Guiseley are frequently completely jammed by traffic even at periods outside of rush hour. In addition, service facilities such as Medical Practices are over stretched and cannot cope efficiently. Furthermore, there appears to be no coordination of road works such that we often find that all the main roads are blocked. Finally, the Bradford plan to build Houses in Menston and then allow further building across to the A65 horrifies me. If you wish to have a longer letter giving my full reasons, please contact me.
57	24/11/2014	Electors	N	Mrs Moyes phoned the office on behalf of herself and her husband. She thought initially a Town Council may be a good idea if it would help to deal with the issues in Guiseley surrounding the roads and the building of additional homes which the local area cannot cope with in terms of capacity in schools, doctors surgeries, dentists etc. It is her understanding that the Town Council would not be able to influence these things so she would like to register the fact that they are not in favour of a Town Council for Guiseley.

Community Governance Review - Proposed Guiseley Town Council Representation Log

<u>File Ref.</u>	<u>Date</u>	<u>Capacity</u>	<u>In Support?</u>	<u>Comments</u>
58	14/11/2014	Elector	N	We have the following concerns about the proposal to have a Town Council for Guiseley: Overlap of functions and extra costs. Guiseley already has a Neighbourhood Forum, used to to develop a neighbourhood Plan. This is at no cost. There is little or no value added in having a Town Council. 1)Overlap of existing boundaries. The suggested boundary includes areas not currently considered part of Guiseley. Residents in areas that fall under Menston and Hawksworth are unlikely to be ready to pay additional Council Tax for Guiseley. 2)Question of support not addressed. The consultation asks for comment but does not directly address the question to all affected residents of what support there is for the proposal. We have excellent representation for Guiseley by our local Councillor's, Cllr's Graham Latty, Pat Latty and Paul Wadsworth and do not consider a further layer of government is required nor warranted.
59	14/11/2014	Elector	N	I am writing to you with concerns about the area Guiseley Town Council hopes to represent. Moorland Crescent Menston and the High Royds area have never been part of Guiseley and have nothing to do with the town. Neither does Hawksworth village. These are separate areas and I believe will be amply represented by Aireborough Neighbourhood Development Forum. These areas are part of Aireborough, but most definitely not part of Guiseley. The historic and geographic boundary between Menston and Guiseley runs along Mire Beck, with a definite break between the two settlements defined by a corridor of green belt. I urge you to reconsider these inclusions.
60	14/11/2014	Elector	N	I understand there is to be a consultation on the creation of a Town Council for Guiseley. I am strongly opposed to this issue as I feel the Guiseley Neighbourhood Forum are doing an excellent job and represent the needs of Guiseley. Also a Parish Council would mean an increase in Council Tax, in an era when some people are already struggling to meet bills etc. The Forum does an excellent job for free, so I cannot see the need for a Parish Council which would really do exactly the same job as the Forum, except for an unwelcome rise in Council Tax Bills. I sincerely hope this does not go through when the majority of the electorate do not want a Parish Council.
61	14/11/2014	Elector	N	I feel that the need for a local council other than what is already provided by Leeds City is totally unnecessary, it will only add to another level of decision making thus slowing the whole process down. This area is very well covered by the neighbourhood forum, which has the added advantage of being free, I doubt a Guiseley Council will be as cheap as that.
62	14/11/2014	Electors	N	Further to your letter dated 14th November 2014, I would like to advise you that my wife and I are firmly against the proposal for a town council for Guiseley
63	15/11/2014	Electors	N	Please consider including Moorland Crescent, Menston, and the High Royds area, in the area that may be covered by the proposed Guiseley Town Council, as these are obviously parts of Menston not parts of Guiseley.
64	16/11/2014	Elector	N	I do not feel a town council for Guiseley is a good idea because we are already served by our local councillors who represent all the residents of Guiseley and are ready to act or listen to any concerns that affect the community. I also would not support the idea of having to pay an additional council tax precept for Guiseley Town Council because I feel this a wholly unnecessary extra expense. I believe the fairest option would have been to offer a referendum to all residents to make decision on this important issue.

Community Governance Review - Proposed Guiseley Town Council Representation Log

<u>File Ref.</u>	<u>Date</u>	<u>Capacity</u>	<u>In Support?</u>	<u>Comments</u>
65	16/11/2014	Elector	N	I have had a leaflet through my door advising that I need to be concerned regarding the area Guiseley Town Council hopes to represent. Yes I am concerned. But, I am also concerned that there is even going to be a Guiseley Town Council at all. According to the leaflet there should be some consulting with the people of Guiseley to find out their views. This process allegedly began on 24.10.14 which is over 3 weeks ago. First & foremost I do not regard it necessary to create a Guiseley Town Council. There are already enough voluntary groups in Guiseley to deal with Guiseley in Bloom etc. The Neighbourhood Forum group deals with many functions of a town council anyway at no cost to the residents. The costs involved in the creation of a Town Council would not be justifiable in relation to the benefits that the Town Council would provide. As regards the area that the Town Council hopes to represent. I can appreciate that the area of Moorland Crescent, Highroyds, Hawksworth village have LS postcodes. But the boundary between Menston & Guiseley follows the beck behind the Wetherby Whaler & petrol station, everything beyond that is Menston. Hawksworth village is exactly that Hawksworth not Guiseley. These are all separate areas and although part of Aireborough, they are not part of Guiseley. May I request that first and foremost every resident of Guiseley is asked whether they want a Town Council. Then if there is a Guiseley Town Council the boundaries can be established which should not include areas outside of Guiseley ie Menston & Hawksworth.
66	17/11/2014	Elector	N	I have received the letter regarding the above and most assuredly do NOT want another layer of people telling us all what to do in a country full of them.
67	17/11/2014	Elector	N	I do not agree with a Town Council for Guiseley it inflicts another layer of bureaucracy into the system with a consequent cost and I am not sure what it will have to offer over and above what we have today. We are suffering from the effects of the Scottish Referendum and cabals of people are stirring up the idea of home rule for ever smaller parts of the UK. Any boundaries drawn for the purpose of this referendum should have purely reflected Guiseley. The present system is not perfect but it provides an acceptable level of governance for Guiseley. We know whilst a referendum might be a way forward the turn out will be small giving the advantage to the 1179 who apparently signed the petition, remember the views of the other 10,611 are just as important. I urge the Local Councillors and the Council to reject any idea of a Town Council for Guiseley but they should reflect on the fact that some people in Guiseley are unhappy with the status quo
68	17/11/2014	Electors	N	Following the recent letter regarding a new town council for Guiseley, I'm just expressing our opinion. Firstly, like many other residents I'm sure, we wouldn't be happy with a council tax increase. Secondly, we don't understand how it would benefit us? As far as we can see Guiseley seems to operate fine as it is at the moment.
69	17/11/2014	Elector	N	Re. your letter of 14 th November, an elector of polling district GRK contacted Electoral Services. She feels very strongly that things should be left as they are. She cannot be at the meeting on Wednesday but wanted you to know her views. She believes that there is open discussion as things stand where people can find things out if they wish. The current people work very hard, and people can ask whatever questions they want. So she wants things to be left as they are
70	17/11/2014	Elector	N	With modern methods of communication & transport the concept of each town having its own assembly seem rather QUAIN & WHOLLY OUTDATED. Access to both our elected and appointed representatives on Leeds City Council has never been easier. During recent months I have had cause to contact many departments including planning, building control, highways, environment etc. on numerous local issues/concerns; All these dealings have been both SPEEDY & PROFESSIONAL; So, I fail to see how the formation of an additional layer of expensive local bureaucrats could improve my experience. NO TO GUISELEY TOWN COUNCIL.
71	17/11/2014	Elector	N	I DO NOT WANT A TOWN COUNCIL FOR GUISELEY

Community Governance Review - Proposed Guiseley Town Council Representation Log

<u>File Ref.</u>	<u>Date</u>	<u>Capacity</u>	<u>In Support?</u>	<u>Comments</u>
72	17/11/2014	Electors	N	We are writing with reference to the public consultation on the creation of a town council for Guiseley. It is not clear to us what the benefits in forming a town council would be, or to the inclusion of parts of Menston and Hawksworth and the upset this may cause. We are not happy with the likely increase to our council tax bill as a result of this and more importantly wonder what democratic process is at play when 10% of the town's population can 'force' this consultation without any prior redress to the town's residents, we certainly were not aware, further supported by the council's decision to reject a referendum. We do not support this proposal
73	17/11/2014	Elector	Y	I whole heartedly approve of a town council at Guiseley, I for one have lost faith in my councillors and feel the best interest will be served if we have our own council, I can evidence this if required .
74	17/11/2014	Elector	N	With reference to the above, I am not happy about this proposal. I feel that it is quite unnecessary for Guiseley to have a Town Council as it would create another tier of government with additional cost to the residents. We already have a Neighbourhood Forum which can carry out much of the work undertaken by a Town Council. I am therefore against this proposal for a Town Council for Guiseley.
75	17/11/2014	Elector	N	For the record I do not feel that we need an additional tier of bureaucracy if it will add further costs for ratepayers. Councils are already having to make unwelcome cuts to their budgets as a result of cuts in funding from central government and I do not feel that added costs for a town council are appropriate if it would further impact on such services as welfare and care of the elderly, physically and mentally disabled
76	18/11/2014	Elector	N	With regards to the above. I would like to express that I am strongly opposed to a Town Council for Guiseley. The council tax bills are already high and the increase in the cost is unnecessary and it light of higher utility bills and living costs, the additional cost will put more pressure on already tight budgets. In the Guiseley area, we have an active Neighbourhood scheme and a very proactive community. This is very well supported by local people, counsellors and MPs. I disagree stongly that we need a Town Council
77	18/11/2014	Elector	N	I have received a letter about the above and would like to make the following comments: The letter makes no reference to the aims and objectives of a proposed Town Council! It refers to a Neighbourhood Forum- as a resident of Guiseley I have no idea what this is- who is on it and what their remit is. How can I find out about them? Who are they acting on behalf? Are they elected? The idea that a Town Council would increase Council Tax is a complete 'no go' in my opinion!! The idea that a Town Council should be party political would mean it completely stops in being in the interests of Guiseley and will become a political football based upon national agendas- so if you want a Town Council ask for interested parties who are concerned about Guiseley and have NO party political agenda. Ask for people to stand who do NOT bring party affiliations to the table The letter is poor because it does not define anything- and focuses on finance, boundaries, and anything but the positives of such a Town Council. I would propose that there is a clear definition of the role of the Town Council. Why would it be better that what already exists? What decision and executive powers would it have? Remove it from political parties because they have their own agenda and will not represent the Guiseley community. What is the budget for the proposal? what would be the budget for mailing everyone within the Guiseley postcode to receive and facilitate their views? How would elections be carried out? This is a poorly conceived idea with little or no thought about how it is administered. I have serious concerns that it has emanated from the Conservative Group office with no reference to other parties- even though I think such an initiative should be non party political
78	18/11/2014	Elector	N	With response to the consultation on the above I would wish to record my opposition to the establishment of a Town Council for Guiseley. I cannot understand how an additional layer of local government can be justified and to take any action that increases cost and puts an additional financial burden on struggling families in the current economic climate would be wrong.

Community Governance Review - Proposed Guiseley Town Council Representation Log

<u>File Ref.</u>	<u>Date</u>	<u>Capacity</u>	<u>In Support?</u>	<u>Comments</u>
79	18/11/2014	Elector	N	My wife and I live in polling district GRC and have received the letter dated 14th November on the above subject. My view is that Guiseley is adequately represented by the Councillors to whom this is being copied and that the Neighbourhood Forum is quite capable of relaying to those Councillors residents' concerns about which they may otherwise be unaware of. I cannot see any good reason to introduce (at an additional cost to local Council Tax payers) an additional layer of bureaucracy in the decision making process. The powers of such a Town Council are, in any event, somewhat limited and any decision made by it can often be overridden by the main Local Authority Council. I am aware that the failed Labour candidate canvassed the petition for a Town Council. I declined to sign this when I was asked to do so as I did not feel strongly enough to support it and could not obtain from him compelling argument for such a Council. I am glad that the City Council is consulting and feel sure that when residents appreciate the extra cost to them, that there is an existing forum for local concerns to be aired and that areas outside the recognised "boundaries" of Guiseley would fall under the remit of such Council, a view against its formation will be formed
80	18/11/2014	Electors	N	Please note that we are strongly against the proposal to form a Town Council for Guiseley. The only result of the creation of a Town Council for Guiseley would be an increase in our council tax, which is already far too high
81	18/11/2014	Elector	N	In my experience, our local needs are adequately met by the services of our MP and elected councillor. Both major political parties advocate devolving more decision making to regional bodies and perhaps some future consideration to additional, local and elected representation will be warranted. At present, the last thing we require is another tier of representation based upon the usual party politics. I doubt the advantages would outweigh the cost. This proposal is a definite NO in my opinion
82	18/11/2014	Elector	N	I see no requirement for such a body at present. I have been quite satisfied with the support of our MP & councillors with regard to planning, education, road maintenance etc. I supported the Neighbourhood Plan and contributed to its' compilation. My concerns extend beyond the precept likely to be added to our council tax were this body to emerge. The last thing most folks want to see is yet another tier of so called local government that slavishly follows party political ambitions
83	19/11/2014	Elector	N	With reference to the circular letter dated 14 th November 2014 regarding the public consultation on the creation of a Town Council for Guiseley, I/we strongly oppose this development purely on the grounds that the NF carry out many of the functions that a TC carry out, at no cost. Fully support that with an additional charge on Council Tax it is unacceptable and not worthwhile as Council tax is high enough at current levels and will put pressure on many local residents, pensioners etc
84	19/11/2014	Elector	N	As a resident of Guiseley (polling district GRC) I would like to make my view known on the subject of the proposed Town Council. I support the setting up of a Town Council for Guiseley as I believe the town needs some local governance and a local place where Guiseley residents can bring matters of local interest to councillors who will have the town's interests as their first priority. I hope that Leeds City Council will support the setting up of a local town council for Guiseley
85	19/11/2014	Electors	N	I am writing to you with concerns about the area Guiseley Town Council hopes to represent. Moorland crescent Menston and the High Royds area have never been part of Guiseley and have nothing to do with the town. Neither does Hawksworth village. These are separate areas and I believe will be amply represented by Aireborough Neighbourhood Development Forum. These areas are part of Aireborough, but most definitely not part of Guiseley. The historic and geographic boundary between Menston and Guiseley runs along Mire Beck, with a definite break between the two settlements defined by a corridor of green belt. I urge you to reconsider these inclusions.
86	19/11/2014	Electors	N	I am writing to you with concerns about the area Guiseley Town Council hopes to represent. Moorland Crescent Menston and the High Royds area have never been part of Guiseley and have nothing to do with the town. Neither does Hawksworth village. These are separate areas and I believe will be amply represented by Aireborough Neighbourhood Development Forum. These areas are part of Aireborough, but most definitely not part of Guiseley. The historic and geographic boundary between Menston and Guiseley runs along Mire Beck, with a definite break between the two settlements defined by a corridor of green belt. I urge you to reconsider these inclusions

Community Governance Review - Proposed Guiseley Town Council Representation Log

<u>File Ref.</u>	<u>Date</u>	<u>Capacity</u>	<u>In Support?</u>	<u>Comments</u>
87	15/11/2014	Electors	N	Moorland Crescent, Menston and the High Royds area have never been part of Guiseley and have nothing to do with the town. Neither does Hawksworth Village. These are separate areas and I believe will be amply represented by Aireborough Neighbourhood Development forum. These areas are part of Aireborough but most definitely not part of Guiseley. The historic and geographic boundary between Menston & Guiseley runs along Mire Beck, with a definite break between the 2 settlements defined by a corridor of green belt. We urge you to reconsider these inclusions.
88	13/11/2014	Elector	N	Initially our first thoughts were what a good idea! But with consideration we have changed our minds. A nnother layer of officialdom of officers, secretary and assistants possibly needed increased rates to pay. Possibly will grow. The benefit of a town council for Guiseley is an unknown factor. They would probably be looking for things to do, which might well be unnecessary. No town council for Guiseley please
89	11/11/2014	Elector	N	We do not want a town council, it is more expense (precept) and councillors do the job just as well. We should have a vote and the costs should be shown.
90	24/11/2014	Electors	N	We wish to register our opposition to this idea
91	21/11/2014	Elector	N	Moorland Crescent Menston and the High Royds area have never been part of Guiseley and have nothing to do with the town. Neither does Hawksworth village. These are separate areas and believe will be amply represented by Aireborough Neighbourhood Development Forum. These areas are part of Aireborough, but most definitely not part of Guiseley. The historic and geographic boundary between Menston and Guiseley runs along Mire Beck, with a definite break between the two settlements defined by a corridor of green belt. urge you to reconsider these inclusions.
92	21/11/2014	Elector	N	Moorland Crescent Menston and the High Royds area have never been part of Guiseley and have nothing to do with the town. Neither does Hawksworth village. These are separate areas and believe will be amply represented by Aireborough Neighbourhood Development Forum. These areas are part of Aireborough, but most definitely not part of Guiseley. The historic and geographic boundary between Menston and Guiseley runs along Mire Beck, with a definite break between the two settlements defined by a corridor of green belt. urge you to reconsider these inclusions.
93	20/11/2014	Elector	N	Moorland Crescent Menston and the High Royds area have never been part of Guiseley and have nothing to do with the town. Neither does Hawksworth village. These are separate areas and I believe will be amply represented by Aireborough Neighborhood Development Forum. These areas are part of Aireborough, but most definitely not part of Guiseley. The historic and geographical boundary between Menston and Guiseley runs along Mire Beck with a definite break between the two settlements defines by a coruidor of green belt I urge you to reconsider these instructions.
94	20/11/2014	Elector	N	I have come to the conclusion that I do not agree to the Guiseley Town Council. The present city Councillors Aireborough Neighbourhood forum and Civic Society cater for our needs I can see little point as an OAP, paying more for a duplicate of these services.
95	19/11/2014	Elector	N	I am writing to you with concerns about the area Guiseley Town Council hopes to represent. There are several areas which are to be included within the boundary which I believe have no right or reason to be. These are Moorland Crescent, Menston and the High Royds housing complex community and Hawksworth Village. These are completely separate areas which would be represented by the Aireborough Neighbourhood Development forum. These area's do form part of Aireborough but not Guiseley. The historic and geographic boundary between Menston and Guiseley is the patch of green belt land which runs along Mire Beck. As a resident of Guiseley I would urge you to reconsider these inclusions
96	18/11/2014	Electors	N	Moorland Crescent Menston and the High Royds area have never been part of Guiseley and have nothing to do with the town. Neither does Hawksworth village. These are separate areas and I believe will be amply represented by Aireborough Neighbourhood Development Forum. These areas are part of Aireborough, but most definitely not part of Guiseley. The historic and geographic boundary between Menston and Guiseley runs along Mire Beck, with a definite break between the two settlements defined by a corridor of green belt. I urge you to reconsider these inclusions.

Community Governance Review - Proposed Guiseley Town Council Representation Log

<u>File Ref.</u>	<u>Date</u>	<u>Capacity</u>	<u>In Support?</u>	<u>Comments</u>
97	17/11/2014	Elector	N	I am writing to you with concerns about the area Guiseley Town Council hopes to represent. Moorland Crescent, Menston and High Royds area have never been part of Guiseley and have nothing to do with the town. Neither does Hawkesworth village. These are separate areas and I believe will be amply represented by Aireborough Neighbourhood Development Forum. These areas are part of Aireborough, but most definitely not part of Guiseley. The historic and geographical boundary between Menston and Guiseley runs along Mire Beck, with a definite break between the two settlements defined by a corridor of green belt. I urge you to reconsider these inclusions.
98	20/11/2014	Elector	N	I am writing to make my view known to you in the strongest possible terms that the creation of a town council for Guiseley is completely unnecessary and a waste of money for the residents of the area. Councillor Latty already conducts meetings of people interested in the development of Guiseley at no cost to its residents. I am perfectly happy with this arrangement, and totally opposed to the creation of a town council. Please take my view into consideration.
99	20/11/2014	Elector	N	I am writing to you with concerns about boundaries to the area which Guiseley Town Council hopes to represent. Moorland Crescent (Menston), the High Royds area and Hawksworth village have never been part of Guiseley and have nothing to do with the town. These areas are part of Aireborough, but most definitely not part of Guiseley and believe they will be amply represented by Aireborough Neighbourhood Development Forum. The historic and geographic boundary between Menston and Guiseley runs along Mire Beck, with a definite break between the two settlements defined by a corridor of green belt. I urge you to remove these inclusions.
100	20/11/2014	Elector	N	I am totally against the creation of a town council for Guiseley. Councillor Latty already conducts meetings of people interested in the development of Guiseley at no cost to its residents and I am perfectly happy with this arrangement, and totally opposed to the creation of a town council. Please take my view into consideration.
101	Not dated	Electors	N	We can see no gain from the creation of a town council for Guiseley. Indeed to the contrary we can see only the adding of a further level of bureaucracy and additional red tape and expense. Let us hope that this ridiculous idea is dead in the water.
102	17/11/2014	Elector	N	I am writing to you with concerns about boundaries to the area which Guiseley Town Council hopes to represent. Moorland Crescent (Menston), the High Royds area and Hawksworth village have never been part of Guiseley and have nothing to do with the town. These areas are part of Aireborough, but most definitely not part of Guiseley and believe they will be amply represented by Aireborough Neighbourhood Development Forum. The historic and geographic boundary between Menston and Guiseley runs along Mire Beck, with a definite break between the two settlements defined by a corridor of green belt. I urge you to remove these inclusions.
103	06/11/2014	Electors	N	We totally agree with your comments. We do not need a town council for Guiseley already having a neighbourhood forum at no cost. There are enough bureaucrats that we already pay for. We strongly oppose the proposal for a town council for Guiseley.
104	23/11/2014	Elector	N	I have been a rate payer in Guiseley since 1970 and over the years I have seen councillors of all political colours come and go. I am sure that the political needs of Guiseley have been well served by its Councillors and I see absolutely no need or justification for adding another political body. Not only would it be unnecessary expense but it could have an adverse effect on the work of the existing councillors. I see no need for a town council for Guiseley and I fear that it might be detrimental to the areas interests, by all means give extra support to our existing councillors but please no Town Council for Guiseley.
105	23/11/2014	Electors	N	My wife and I would like to register our opposition to this proposal. We strongly believe that it is completely unnecessary to add an additional layer of bureaucracy and at the same time incurring an increase to the Council Tax.

Community Governance Review - Proposed Guiseley Town Council Representation Log

<u>File Ref.</u>	<u>Date</u>	<u>Capacity</u>	<u>In Support?</u>	<u>Comments</u>
106	23/11/2014	Elector	N	Moorland Crescent, Menston and the High Royds area have never been part of Guiseley and have nothing to do with the town. Neither does Hawksworth Village. These are separate areas and I believe will be amply represented by Aireborough Neighbourhood Development Forum. These areas are part of Aireborough, but most definitely not part of Guiseley. This historic and geographic boundary between Menston and Guiseley runs along Mire Beck with a definite break between the settlements defined by a corridor of green belt. I urge you to reconsider these inclusions
107	19/11/2014	Elector	N	In my opinion Guiseley is a totally independent entity and should remain so. To amalgamate guiseley with Menston and Hawksworth will inevitably dilute it's importance as an historical town. Planning decision should be based upon the town's needs. Additionally the concerns that exist over plans to develop green belt land on Ings Lane and Moorland Crescent are largely being ignored. the traffic situation is bad enough as it is, added to which the plans to develop the Guiseley Town football stadium will inevitably increase traffic on match days to an already intolerable level for residents, particularly those of us who live on Ings Lane and are inconvenienced enough as it is. There are already brown belt areas that have not been developed and it is important to maintain the existing green belts. once destroyed they are gone forever. There have been already an excessive amount of housing developments in and around Guiseley, with no consideration given to the lack of infrastructure necessary to support them. In particular the traffic congestion, shortage of medical facilities and overcrowded schools will increase
108	21/11/2014	Electors	N	Moorland Crescent, Menston and the High Royds area have never been part of Guiseley and have nothing to do with the town. Neither does Hawksworth Village. These are separate areas and I believe will be amply represented by Aireborough Neighbourhood Development Forum. These areas are part of Aireborough, but most definitely not part of Guiseley. This historic and geographic boundary between Menston and Guiseley runs along Mire Beck with a definite break between the settlements defined by a corridor of green belt. I urge you to reconsider these inclusions
109	22/11/2014	Elector	N	I do not feel that a town council would make any difference to Guiseley. The main problem in Guiseley is over development putting pressure on all services. Seventy new houses in the townsgate area is a further potential 140 cars on roads which are jammed. and no town council could do anything to halt all this development
110	Not dated	Elector	N	Moorland Crescent, Menston and the High Royds area have never been part of Guiseley and have nothing to do with the town. Neither does Hawksworth Village. These are separate areas and I believe will be amply represented by Aireborough Neighbourhood Development Forum. These areas are part of Aireborough, but most definitely not part of Guiseley. This historic and geographic boundary between Menston and Guiseley runs along Mire Beck with a definite break between the settlements defined by a corridor of green belt. I urge you to reconsider these inclusions
111	Not dated	Electors	N	Moorland Crescent, Menston and the High Royds area have never been part of Guiseley and have nothing to do with the town. Neither does Hawksworth Village. These are separate areas and I believe will be amply represented by Aireborough Neighbourhood Development Forum. These areas are part of Aireborough, but most definitely not part of Guiseley. This historic and geographic boundary between Menston and Guiseley runs along Mire Beck with a definite break between the settlements defined by a corridor of green belt. I urge you to reconsider these inclusions
112	22/11/2014	Elector	N	Moorland Crescent, Menston and the High Royds area have never been part of Guiseley and have nothing to do with the town. Neither does Hawksworth Village. These are separate areas and I believe will be amply represented by Aireborough Neighbourhood Development Forum. These areas are part of Aireborough, but most definitely not part of Guiseley. This historic and geographic boundary between Menston and Guiseley runs along Mire Beck with a definite break between the settlements defined by a corridor of green belt. I urge you to reconsider these inclusions
113	24/11/2014	Elector	N	We wish to register our objections to the above proposal. The powers of the proposed Council will be illusory and it will be no more than a talking shop discussing trivialities. None the less it will cost money to set up service and maintain which can only come from an addition to council tax. a further burden on us. Our locally elected local councillors are on the council to look after our local interests and a guiseley and Rawdon forum meets regularly to advise them of our concerns. They do not need to give their time taking heed at another bunch of politically minded locals.

Community Governance Review - Proposed Guiseley Town Council Representation Log

<u>File Ref.</u>	<u>Date</u>	<u>Capacity</u>	<u>In Support?</u>	<u>Comments</u>
114	19/11/2014	Elector	N	I am wholly opposed to the creation of such a body. I believe it would add an unnecessary level of governance and bureaucracy, which in turn would contribute very little and certainly not enough to justify what it would inevitably cost. Guiseley already has a Neighbourhood Forum. This does what a town council would be likely to do, with no call upon the public purse. I can see no justification at all to elect a further tier of politicians to carry out functions which are already being undertaken at little or no cost. At this time of public spending cuts, proposals to spend more money where there is no discernible outcome simply cannot be justified. In addition, I do not believe that the suggested boundary is appropriate. I live in Menston, not in Guiseley. It is a distinct area and it is wrong to seek to subsume Menston into Guiseley in this way. As a Menston resident, I would be particularly aggrieved to pay for something that I did not feel would benefit my own area, and which I do not believe pertains to that area.
115	24/11/2014	Elector	Y	I would support the establishment of a Town Council boundaries proposed by the petitioners along with the electoral arrangements (i.e. polling districts, and number of Councillors) also proposed by the petitioners. I believe that the establishment of a Town Council would serve a vital vote for the area of Guiseley which Guiseley is increasingly in need of. The promotion and representation of the best interests of Guiseley to other authorities like the (City Council, Health Authorities, Police and Fire Authorities) is increasingly important. This is best done by town councillors who know the area, who listen to local opinion and can act as a voice of local residents. The Town Council would also have a legal right to be consulted on planning matters, something we see as becoming increasingly important. Town Councils are the most non-bureaucratic and cheapest kind of local authority in existence. Their funds are the smallest part of the Council Tax and they do not receive a general government grant. So they have every incentive to keep expenditure low and be economical. Their accounts are strictly and independently audited every year. I/we therefore believe that monies coming from the new Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) in Guiseley should be allocated to the Guiseley Town Council. A body that is accountable to the electorate via the ballot box. I hope that you will be able to confirm to me that the proposal for a Town Council in Guiseley will go forward as quickly as possible.
116	24/11/2014	Elector	Y	I would support the establishment of a Town Council boundaries proposed by the petitioners along with the electoral arrangements (i.e. polling districts, and number of Councillors) also proposed by the petitioners. I believe that the establishment of a Town Council would serve a vital vote for the area of Guiseley which Guiseley is increasingly in need of. The promotion and representation of the best interests of Guiseley to other authorities like the (City Council, Health Authorities, Police and Fire Authorities) is increasingly important. This is best done by town councillors who know the area, who listen to local opinion and can act as a voice of local residents. The Town Council would also have a legal right to be consulted on planning matters, something we see as becoming increasingly important. Town Councils are the most non-bureaucratic and cheapest kind of local authority in existence. Their funds are the smallest part of the Council Tax and they do not receive a general government grant. So they have every incentive to keep expenditure low and be economical. Their accounts are strictly and independently audited every year. I/we therefore believe that monies coming from the new Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) in Guiseley should be allocated to the Guiseley Town Council. A body that is accountable to the electorate via the ballot box. I hope that you will be able to confirm to me that the proposal for a Town Council in Guiseley will go forward as quickly as possible.

Community Governance Review - Proposed Guiseley Town Council Representation Log

<u>File Ref.</u>	<u>Date</u>	<u>Capacity</u>	<u>In Support?</u>	<u>Comments</u>
117	25/11/2014	Elector	N	<p>I do not support this proposal because of the following reasons: Town or Parish Councils are only <u>consulted</u> in some matters by Leeds City Council. Guiseley Town Council if it existed would have no power of veto on planning matters and other major LCC proposals. It might cost me as much as an extra £50 or so, an almost 4% increase in my rates which I would prefer to spend elsewhere. I am retired living on a pension, so do not welcome any increase in our cost of living. Duplication of examination of planning consents will occur as it will be done once by LCC and once by GTC if it exists. This work is already done well enough by our existing councillors, and also by Aireborough Civic Society which does examine Aireborough planning applications and comments on planning proposals if required for nothing. It is my opinion that whilst the process used in this proposal may be technically correct, it may be flawed and open to challenge, thus causing even more unwelcome expense. The I Petition survey itself has shown that there is very little electoral support locally, for town council. If you enquire you will find out that the I Petition went live just after Christmas 2013. As of yesterday Sunday 23rd November 2014 at 16.30 hours it only had 205 signatures, that is less than one signature per day. After almost two months in February of this year it only had about 28 as far as I remember. The other flaw in this I Petition method of trying to gather support is of course that it only records those in favour of the proposal and does not record those against. Similarly the other 974 signatures that the Mr. Bowe must have obtained door to door were only for those in favour. Further, since the actual fact that the gathering of support door to door has taken so long (almost 4/5 of year), this again shows the low density of support amongst the rate payers within the Aireborough district. Clearly some of those who were personally approached refused to support the proposal, but are not recorded! Using the concept of natural justice, the electors in Guiseley and district have not been given enough time to look at this proposal. In view of the time allowed and accepted by LCC to get the required 10% of elector support for a review of the need for a Town Council, (about 40 weeks) one would think that in a well run and truly democratic council, and equal amount of time would be given to the electors to properly consider the merits and demerits of this proposal. It is reprehensible that the City Council General Purposes Committee has chosen not to have an LCC council organised referendum on this matter, amongst the electors of Guiseley, Hawksworth and Menston. I think this because the rate payers will have to pay extra rates, at a time of austerity for most persons as well as my other objections. You might like to know that Portsmouth City Council have set a precedent on this sort of thing by holding a proper full vote amongst the electors of Southsea. At a 24% turnout 66% voted for the abolition of Southsea Town Council, and only 33% voted for its retention. Southsea Town Council was abolished by Portsmouth City Council on the 31st March 2010, it existed for 11 years. Thus I can see no reason why a proper LCC organised vote cannot be held next May along with the General Election, this would be cheaper to do, and far more democratic. <u>General Comment</u> - I find it completely outrageous that local politicians allow themselves almost a full year of nice steady time to get the 10% of signatures required by law. Whilst we the electors, and ratepayers who will be footing the bill for Guiseley Town Council should it actually come into existence, only get five weeks to consider and respond properly to the proposal. I only found out about the terms of reference of the 24 October 2014 on the 19th November 2014. In view of the fairly recent electoral outcomes for Regional Councils, and elected City Mayors I find this proposal totally at odds with what the electorate appear to want.</p>
118	25/11/2014	Elector	Y	I wish to inform you that I think that Guiseley should have a town council. My wife also says that Guiseley should have a town council
119	Not dated	Elector	N	Moorland Crescent, Menston and the High Royds area have never been part of Guiseley and have nothing to do with the town. Neither does Hawksworth Village. These are separate areas and I believe will be amply represented by Aireborough Neighbourhood Development Forum. These areas are part of Aireborough, but most definitely not part of Guiseley. This historic and geographic boundary between Menston and Guiseley runs along Mire Beck with a definite break between the settlements defined by a corridor of green belt. I urge you to reconsider these inclusions
120	Not dated	Electors	N	Moorland Crescent, Menston and the High Royds area have never been part of Guiseley and have nothing to do with the town. Neither does Hawksworth Village. These are separate areas and I believe will be amply represented by Aireborough Neighbourhood Development Forum. These areas are part of Aireborough, but most definitely not part of Guiseley. This historic and geographic boundary between Menston and Guiseley runs along Mire Beck with a definite break between the settlements defined by a corridor of green belt. I urge you to reconsider these inclusions
121	25/11/2014	Elector	N	Moorland Crescent, Menston and the High Royds area have never been part of Guiseley and have nothing to do with the town. Neither does Hawksworth Village. These are separate areas and I believe will be amply represented by Aireborough Neighbourhood Development Forum. These areas are part of Aireborough, but most definitely not part of Guiseley. This historic and geographic boundary between Menston and Guiseley runs along Mire Beck with a definite break between the settlements defined by a corridor of green belt. I urge you to reconsider these inclusions

Community Governance Review - Proposed Guiseley Town Council Representation Log

<u>File Ref.</u>	<u>Date</u>	<u>Capacity</u>	<u>In Support?</u>	<u>Comments</u>
122	Not dated	Elector	N	Moorland Crescent, Menston and the High Royds area have never been part of Guiseley and have nothing to do with the town. Neither does Hawksworth Village. These are separate areas and I believe will be amply represented by Aireborough Neighbourhood Development Forum. These areas are part of Aireborough, but most definitely not part of Guiseley. This historic and geographic boundary between Menston and Guiseley runs along Mire Beck with a definite break between the settlements defined by a corridor of green belt. I urge you to reconsider these inclusions
123	Not dated	Elector	N	Moorland Crescent, Menston and the High Royds area have never been part of Guiseley and have nothing to do with the town. Neither does Hawksworth Village. These are separate areas and I believe will be amply represented by Aireborough Neighbourhood Development Forum. These areas are part of Aireborough, but most definitely not part of Guiseley. This historic and geographic boundary between Menston and Guiseley runs along Mire Beck with a definite break between the settlements defined by a corridor of green belt. I urge you to reconsider these inclusions
124	Not dated	Elector	N	Moorland Crescent, Menston and the High Royds area have never been part of Guiseley and have nothing to do with the town. Neither does Hawksworth Village. These are separate areas and I believe will be amply represented by Aireborough Neighbourhood Development Forum. These areas are part of Aireborough, but most definitely not part of Guiseley. This historic and geographic boundary between Menston and Guiseley runs along Mire Beck with a definite break between the settlements defined by a corridor of green belt. I urge you to reconsider these inclusions
125	25/11/2014	Electors	Y	I feel its time for a Guiseley Town Council, I support the proposal
126	25/11/2014	Electors	N	It was a letter from Cllr Latty dated 29/10/2014 which first brought to my attention that a petition had been presented to LCC for a town council. Absolutely nothing has been sent to me by the proposers of this petition and I believe the Tranmere Park Estate. This is not unusual as Tranmere park Estate is considered by many residents in Guiseley not being part of Guiseley. I only visit Guiseley when it is necessary because of the huge problem of traffic congestion and the serious deficiency of car parking. It is therefore crucial that the planning will not be the remit of a town council. We already have the Guiseley & Rawdon Forum where residents can make their views and problems known and acted upon, why then do we need a town council? Which I suspect is a political play in order to enter into discussions via the back door with the LCC by disappointed voters. I strongly object to 10% of the local population creating the request for a town council. it is quite likely in the near future that the cap put on the council tax will be lifted, resulting in an increase. So in addition to a rise in the council tax we will also have a precept to pay for an organisation <u>we do not need</u> . As the tranmere estate probably pays the highest council tax in Guiseley, we do not require this additional financial burden or another talking shop
127	Not dated	Elector	N	I strongly disagree with this suggestion. The cost will be too much and Leeds will still have the last word
128	24/11/2014	Elector	N	I object to the town council for Guiseley, it is another pier of government. It will be an extra charge on the rates. There has been an alarming lack of publicity about this
129	26/11/2014	Elector	Y	This is to confirm my support for a Guiseley Town Council
130	06/11/2014	Electors	N	We totally agree with your comments. We do not need a town council for Guiseley already having a neighbourhood forum at no cost. There are enough bureaucrats that we already pay for. We strongly oppose the proposal for a town council for Guiseley
131	17/11/2014	Elector	N	I do not think this a good idea as it will only cause more expense for the residents of this area. We already have a neighbourhood forum who are doing a good job the same as a town council therefore I do not agree with the idea of forming the said council
132	Not dated	Electors	N	Our search for a home in 1959 came to an end when we found our house in Menston. The open views over farm land soon made us realise we had found a gem. So for 55 years we have been lucky to enjoy those same views. Its been a battle at times with the threat of our precious green belt being built upon, but we have won so far and god willing we will win again, once built upon this land will never be the same again. We need this oasis for us and for future generations to enjoy. We need this green and pleasant land in a crazy world. Menston we are and hopefully will remain

Community Governance Review - Proposed Guiseley Town Council Representation Log

<u>File Ref.</u>	<u>Date</u>	<u>Capacity</u>	<u>In Support?</u>	<u>Comments</u>
133	10/11/2014	Electors	N	I am writing about Guiseley town council and the area that it hopes to represent. Firstly I am in complete opposition to the creation of this un-elected body. I also feel that there are already enough bodies to represent us at the moment, and enough Councillors etc with their feet in the trough who should be better representing their voters. The next bone of contention is that this body of people are to cover an area including High Royds, hawksworth and my local area Moorland Crescent, may I say none of these areas have ever been part of Guiseley, although part of the Aireborough area. These areas are already amply represented by Aireborough neighbourhood development forum. The historic and geographic boundary between Menston and Guiseley runs along Mire Beck with a definite break between the 2 settlements defined by the corridor of green belt. I would therefore ask you to reconsider these inclusions should Guiseley Town Council be formed.
134	Not dated	Elector	N	Moorland Crescent, Menston and the High Royds area have never been part of Guiseley and have nothing to do with the town. Neither does Hawksworth Village. These are separate areas and I believe will be amply represented by Aireborough Neighbourhood Development Forum. These areas are part of Aireborough, but most definitely not part of Guiseley. This historic and geographic boundary between Menston and Guiseley runs along Mire Beck with a definite break between the settlements defined by a corridor of green belt. I urge you to reconsider these inclusions
135	Not dated	Elector	N	Moorland Crescent, Menston and the High Royds area have never been part of Guiseley and have nothing to do with the town. Neither does Hawksworth Village. These are separate areas and I believe will be amply represented by Aireborough Neighbourhood Development Forum. These areas are part of Aireborough, but most definitely not part of Guiseley. This historic and geographic boundary between Menston and Guiseley runs along Mire Beck with a definite break between the settlements defined by a corridor of green belt. I urge you to reconsider these inclusions
136	Not dated	Elector	N	Moorland Crescent, Menston and the High Royds area have never been part of Guiseley and have nothing to do with the town. Neither does Hawksworth Village. These are separate areas and I believe will be amply represented by Aireborough Neighbourhood Development Forum. These areas are part of Aireborough, but most definitely not part of Guiseley. This historic and geographic boundary between Menston and Guiseley runs along Mire Beck with a definite break between the settlements defined by a corridor of green belt. I urge you to reconsider these inclusions. I am writing in full support for keeping the green belt. it is essential that we restrict the possibility of having any more housing developments in this area. The A65 main road through Guiseley is one of the busiest roads around the district (and all the way to Leeds) and cannot take anymore traffic. Yellow lines are overdue at the moment in addition schools and GP surgeries are already over capacity
137	Not dated	Elector	N	Moorland Crescent, Menston and the High Royds area have never been part of Guiseley and have nothing to do with the town. Neither does Hawksworth Village. These are separate areas and I believe will be amply represented by Aireborough Neighbourhood Development Forum. These areas are part of Aireborough, but most definitely not part of Guiseley. This historic and geographic boundary between Menston and Guiseley runs along Mire Beck with a definite break between the settlements defined by a corridor of green belt. I urge you to reconsider these inclusions
138	Not dated	Elector	N	Moorland Crescent, Menston and the High Royds area have never been part of Guiseley and have nothing to do with the town. Neither does Hawksworth Village. These are separate areas and I believe will be amply represented by Aireborough Neighbourhood Development Forum. These areas are part of Aireborough, but most definitely not part of Guiseley. This historic and geographic boundary between Menston and Guiseley runs along Mire Beck with a definite break between the settlements defined by a corridor of green belt. I urge you to reconsider these inclusions
139	Not dated	Elector	N	Moorland Crescent, Menston and the High Royds area have never been part of Guiseley and have nothing to do with the town. Neither does Hawksworth Village. These are separate areas and I believe will be amply represented by Aireborough Neighbourhood Development Forum. These areas are part of Aireborough, but most definitely not part of Guiseley. This historic and geographic boundary between Menston and Guiseley runs along Mire Beck with a definite break between the settlements defined by a corridor of green belt. I urge you to reconsider these inclusions

Community Governance Review - Proposed Guiseley Town Council Representation Log

<u>File Ref.</u>	<u>Date</u>	<u>Capacity</u>	<u>In Support?</u>	<u>Comments</u>
140	Not dated	Elector	N	Moorland Crescent, Menston and the High Royds area have never been part of Guiseley and have nothing to do with the town. Neither does Hawksworth Village. These are separate areas and I believe will be amply represented by Aireborough Neighbourhood Development Forum. These areas are part of Aireborough, but most definitely not part of Guiseley. This historic and geographic boundary between Menston and Guiseley runs along Mire Beck with a definite break between the settlements defined by a corridor of green belt. I urge you to reconsider these inclusions
141	Not dated	Elector	N	Moorland Crescent, Menston and the High Royds area have never been part of Guiseley and have nothing to do with the town. Neither does Hawksworth Village. These are separate areas and I believe will be amply represented by Aireborough Neighbourhood Development Forum. These areas are part of Aireborough, but most definitely not part of Guiseley. This historic and geographic boundary between Menston and Guiseley runs along Mire Beck with a definite break between the settlements defined by a corridor of green belt. I urge you to reconsider these inclusions
142	Not dated	Elector	N	Moorland Crescent, Menston and the High Royds area have never been part of Guiseley and have nothing to do with the town. Neither does Hawksworth Village. These are separate areas and I believe will be amply represented by Aireborough Neighbourhood Development Forum. These areas are part of Aireborough, but most definitely not part of Guiseley. This historic and geographic boundary between Menston and Guiseley runs along Mire Beck with a definite break between the settlements defined by a corridor of green belt. I urge you to reconsider these inclusions
143	Not dated	Elector	N	I do not agree that Guiseley needs a town council
144	19/11/2014	Elector	N	I am writing to you with concerns about the area Guiseley town council hopes to represent. Moorland Crescent, Menston and High Royds area have never been part of Guiseley and have nothing to do with the town. Neither does Hawkesworth village. These are separate areas and I believe will be amply represented by Aireborough neighbourhood development forum These areas are part of Aireborough but most definitely not part of Guiseley the historic and geographic boundary between Menston and Guiseley runs along Mire Beck with a definite break between the 2 settlements defined by a corridor of green belt. I urge you to reconsider the inclusions
145	Not dated	Elector	N	Moorland Crescent, Menston and the High Royds area have never been part of Guiseley and have nothing to do with the town. Neither does Hawksworth Village. These are separate areas and I believe will be amply represented by Aireborough Neighbourhood Development Forum. These areas are part of Aireborough, but most definitely not part of Guiseley. This historic and geographic boundary between Menston and Guiseley runs along Mire Beck with a definite break between the settlements defined by a corridor of green belt. I urge you to reconsider these inclusions
146	Not dated	Elector	N	Moorland Crescent, Menston and the High Royds area have never been part of Guiseley and have nothing to do with the town. Neither does Hawksworth Village. These are separate areas and I believe will be amply represented by Aireborough Neighbourhood Development Forum. These areas are part of Aireborough, but most definitely not part of Guiseley. This historic and geographic boundary between Menston and Guiseley runs along Mire Beck with a definite break between the settlements defined by a corridor of green belt. I urge you to reconsider these inclusions
147	Not dated	Elector	N	Moorland Crescent, Menston and the High Royds area have never been part of Guiseley and have nothing to do with the town. Neither does Hawksworth Village. These are separate areas and I believe will be amply represented by Aireborough Neighbourhood Development Forum. These areas are part of Aireborough, but most definitely not part of Guiseley. This historic and geographic boundary between Menston and Guiseley runs along Mire Beck with a definite break between the settlements defined by a corridor of green belt. I urge you to reconsider these inclusions
148	Not dated	Elector	N	Moorland Crescent, Menston and the High Royds area have never been part of Guiseley and have nothing to do with the town. Neither does Hawksworth Village. These are separate areas and I believe will be amply represented by Aireborough Neighbourhood Development Forum. These areas are part of Aireborough, but most definitely not part of Guiseley. This historic and geographic boundary between Menston and Guiseley runs along Mire Beck with a definite break between the settlements defined by a corridor of green belt. I urge you to reconsider these inclusions

Community Governance Review - Proposed Guiseley Town Council Representation Log

<u>File Ref.</u>	<u>Date</u>	<u>Capacity</u>	<u>In Support?</u>	<u>Comments</u>
149	17/11/2014	Elector	N	Moorland Crescent, Menston and the High Royds area have never been part of Guiseley and have nothing to do with the town. Neither does Hawksworth Village. These are separate areas and I believe will be amply represented by Aireborough Neighbourhood Development Forum. These areas are part of Aireborough, but most definitely not part of Guiseley. This historic and geographic boundary between Menston and Guiseley runs along Mire Beck with a definite break between the settlements defined by a corridor of green belt. I urge you to reconsider these inclusions
150	Not dated	Elector	N	Moorland Crescent, Menston and the High Royds area have never been part of Guiseley and have nothing to do with the town. Neither does Hawksworth Village. These are separate areas and I believe will be amply represented by Aireborough Neighbourhood Development Forum. These areas are part of Aireborough, but most definitely not part of Guiseley. This historic and geographic boundary between Menston and Guiseley runs along Mire Beck with a definite break between the settlements defined by a corridor of green belt. I urge you to reconsider these inclusions
151	20/11/2014	Elector	N	Moorland Crescent, Menston and the High Royds area have never been part of Guiseley and have nothing to do with the town. Neither does Hawksworth Village. These are separate areas and I believe will be amply represented by Aireborough Neighbourhood Development Forum. These areas are part of Aireborough, but most definitely not part of Guiseley. This historic and geographic boundary between Menston and Guiseley runs along Mire Beck with a definite break between the settlements defined by a corridor of green belt. I urge you to reconsider these inclusions
152	21/11/2014	Elector	N	Moorland Crescent, Menston and the High Royds area have never been part of Guiseley and have nothing to do with the town. Neither does Hawksworth Village. These are separate areas and I believe will be amply represented by Aireborough Neighbourhood Development Forum. These areas are part of Aireborough, but most definitely not part of Guiseley. This historic and geographic boundary between Menston and Guiseley runs along Mire Beck with a definite break between the settlements defined by a corridor of green belt. I urge you to reconsider these inclusions
153	Not dated	Elector	N	Moorland Crescent, Menston and the High Royds area have never been part of Guiseley and have nothing to do with the town. Neither does Hawksworth Village. These are separate areas and I believe will be amply represented by Aireborough Neighbourhood Development Forum. These areas are part of Aireborough, but most definitely not part of Guiseley. This historic and geographic boundary between Menston and Guiseley runs along Mire Beck with a definite break between the settlements defined by a corridor of green belt. I urge you to reconsider these inclusions
154	Not dated	Elector	N	Moorland Crescent, Menston and the High Royds area have never been part of Guiseley and have nothing to do with the town. Neither does Hawksworth Village. These are separate areas and I believe will be amply represented by Aireborough Neighbourhood Development Forum. These areas are part of Aireborough, but most definitely not part of Guiseley. This historic and geographic boundary between Menston and Guiseley runs along Mire Beck with a definite break between the settlements defined by a corridor of green belt. I urge you to reconsider these inclusions
155	Not dated	Elector	N	Moorland Crescent, Menston and the High Royds area have never been part of Guiseley and have nothing to do with the town. Neither does Hawksworth Village. These are separate areas and I believe will be amply represented by Aireborough Neighbourhood Development Forum. These areas are part of Aireborough, but most definitely not part of Guiseley. This historic and geographic boundary between Menston and Guiseley runs along Mire Beck with a definite break between the settlements defined by a corridor of green belt. I urge you to reconsider these inclusions
156	Not dated	Elector	N	Moorland Crescent, Menston and the High Royds area have never been part of Guiseley and have nothing to do with the town. Neither does Hawksworth Village. These are separate areas and I believe will be amply represented by Aireborough Neighbourhood Development Forum. These areas are part of Aireborough, but most definitely not part of Guiseley. This historic and geographic boundary between Menston and Guiseley runs along Mire Beck with a definite break between the settlements defined by a corridor of green belt. I urge you to reconsider these inclusions. My family have lived here for 49 years

Community Governance Review - Proposed Guiseley Town Council Representation Log

<u>File Ref.</u>	<u>Date</u>	<u>Capacity</u>	<u>In Support?</u>	<u>Comments</u>
157	Not dated	Elector	N	Moorland Crescent, Menston and the High Royds area have never been part of Guiseley and have nothing to do with the town. Neither does Hawksworth Village. These are separate areas and I believe will be amply represented by Aireborough Neighbourhood Development Forum. These areas are part of Aireborough, but most definitely not part of Guiseley. This historic and geographic boundary between Menston and Guiseley runs along Mire Beck with a definite break between the settlements defined by a corridor of green belt. I urge you to reconsider these inclusions. I have lived here for 49 years
158	Not dated	Elector	N	Moorland Crescent, Menston and the High Royds area have never been part of Guiseley and have nothing to do with the town. Neither does Hawksworth Village. These are separate areas and I believe will be amply represented by Aireborough Neighbourhood Development Forum. These areas are part of Aireborough, but most definitely not part of Guiseley. This historic and geographic boundary between Menston and Guiseley runs along Mire Beck with a definite break between the settlements defined by a corridor of green belt. I urge you to reconsider these inclusions
159	Not dated	Elector	N	Moorland Crescent, Menston and the High Royds area have never been part of Guiseley and have nothing to do with the town. Neither does Hawksworth Village. These are separate areas and I believe will be amply represented by Aireborough Neighbourhood Development Forum. These areas are part of Aireborough, but most definitely not part of Guiseley. This historic and geographic boundary between Menston and Guiseley runs along Mire Beck with a definite break between the settlements defined by a corridor of green belt. I urge you to reconsider these inclusions
160	Not dated	Elector	N	Moorland Crescent, Menston and the High Royds area have never been part of Guiseley and have nothing to do with the town. Neither does Hawksworth Village. These are separate areas and I believe will be amply represented by Aireborough Neighbourhood Development Forum. These areas are part of Aireborough, but most definitely not part of Guiseley. This historic and geographic boundary between Menston and Guiseley runs along Mire Beck with a definite break between the settlements defined by a corridor of green belt. I urge you to reconsider these inclusions
161	Not dated	Electors	N	Moorland Crescent, Menston and the High Royds area have never been part of Guiseley and have nothing to do with the town. Neither does Hawksworth Village. These are separate areas and I believe will be amply represented by Aireborough Neighbourhood Development Forum. These areas are part of Aireborough, but most definitely not part of Guiseley. This historic and geographic boundary between Menston and Guiseley runs along Mire Beck with a definite break between the settlements defined by a corridor of green belt. I urge you to reconsider these inclusions
162	Not dated	Elector	N	Moorland Crescent, Menston and the High Royds area have never been part of Guiseley and have nothing to do with the town. Neither does Hawksworth Village. These are separate areas and I believe will be amply represented by Aireborough Neighbourhood Development Forum. These areas are part of Aireborough, but most definitely not part of Guiseley. This historic and geographic boundary between Menston and Guiseley runs along Mire Beck with a definite break between the settlements defined by a corridor of green belt. I urge you to reconsider these inclusions
163	Not dated	Elector	N	Moorland Crescent, Menston and the High Royds area have never been part of Guiseley and have nothing to do with the town. Neither does Hawksworth Village. These are separate areas and I believe will be amply represented by Aireborough Neighbourhood Development Forum. These areas are part of Aireborough, but most definitely not part of Guiseley. This historic and geographic boundary between Menston and Guiseley runs along Mire Beck with a definite break between the settlements defined by a corridor of green belt. I urge you to reconsider these inclusions
164	17/11/2014	Elector	N	Moorland Crescent, Menston and the High Royds area have never been part of Guiseley and have nothing to do with the town. Neither does Hawksworth Village. These are separate areas and I believe will be amply represented by Aireborough Neighbourhood Development Forum. These areas are part of Aireborough, but most definitely not part of Guiseley. This historic and geographic boundary between Menston and Guiseley runs along Mire Beck with a definite break between the settlements defined by a corridor of green belt. I urge you to reconsider these inclusions

Community Governance Review - Proposed Guiseley Town Council Representation Log

<u>File Ref.</u>	<u>Date</u>	<u>Capacity</u>	<u>In Support?</u>	<u>Comments</u>
165	Not dated	Elector	N	Moorland Crescent, Menston and the High Royds area have never been part of Guiseley and have nothing to do with the town. Neither does Hawksworth Village. These are separate areas and I believe will be amply represented by Aireborough Neighbourhood Development Forum. These areas are part of Aireborough, but most definitely not part of Guiseley. This historic and geographic boundary between Menston and Guiseley runs along Mire Beck with a definite break between the settlements defined by a corridor of green belt. I urge you to reconsider these inclusions
166	Not dated	Elector	N	Moorland Crescent, Menston and the High Royds area have never been part of Guiseley and have nothing to do with the town. Neither does Hawksworth Village. These are separate areas and I believe will be amply represented by Aireborough Neighbourhood Development Forum. These areas are part of Aireborough, but most definitely not part of Guiseley. This historic and geographic boundary between Menston and Guiseley runs along Mire Beck with a definite break between the settlements defined by a corridor of green belt. I urge you to reconsider these inclusions
167	17/11/2014	Elector	N	Moorland Crescent, Menston and the High Royds area have never been part of Guiseley and have nothing to do with the town. Neither does Hawksworth Village. These are separate areas and I believe will be amply represented by Aireborough Neighbourhood Development Forum. These areas are part of Aireborough, but most definitely not part of Guiseley. This historic and geographic boundary between Menston and Guiseley runs along Mire Beck with a definite break between the settlements defined by a corridor of green belt. I urge you to reconsider these inclusions
168	Not dated	Elector	N	Moorland Crescent, Menston and the High Royds area have never been part of Guiseley and have nothing to do with the town. Neither does Hawksworth Village. These are separate areas and I believe will be amply represented by Aireborough Neighbourhood Development Forum. These areas are part of Aireborough, but most definitely not part of Guiseley. This historic and geographic boundary between Menston and Guiseley runs along Mire Beck with a definite break between the settlements defined by a corridor of green belt. I urge you to reconsider these inclusions
169	Not dated	Elector	N	Moorland Crescent, Menston and the High Royds area have never been part of Guiseley and have nothing to do with the town. Neither does Hawksworth Village. These are separate areas and I believe will be amply represented by Aireborough Neighbourhood Development Forum. These areas are part of Aireborough, but most definitely not part of Guiseley. This historic and geographic boundary between Menston and Guiseley runs along Mire Beck with a definite break between the settlements defined by a corridor of green belt. I urge you to reconsider these inclusions
170	19/11/2014	Electors	N	Moorland Crescent, Menston and the High Royds area have never been part of Guiseley and have nothing to do with the town. Neither does Hawksworth Village. These are separate areas and I believe will be amply represented by Aireborough Neighbourhood Development Forum. These areas are part of Aireborough, but most definitely not part of Guiseley. This historic and geographic boundary between Menston and Guiseley runs along Mire Beck with a definite break between the settlements defined by a corridor of green belt. I urge you to reconsider these inclusions
171	Not dated	Elector	N	I wish to object to the above consultation. While I accept that a number of residents are in favour of having a town council for Guiseley it doesn't follow that they represent the majority of the electorate. The only fair and democratic way to establish what the majority of Guiseley residents prefer is to offer us a referendum. I ask you to consider

Community Governance Review - Proposed Guiseley Town Council Representation Log

<u>File Ref.</u>	<u>Date</u>	<u>Capacity</u>	<u>In Support?</u>	<u>Comments</u>
172	26/11/2014	Elector	Y	I am writing to you and to agree that we need a local council because we always find that we are out on a limb and forgotten about and need more say on what goes on in our local area. I always think that Guiseley is growing fast and needs more support. I enclose a copy of our presentation: - As a result of Government planning policies, developers will have to pay a community infrastructure levy (CIL). This could run into tens of thousands of pounds, some of which will be allocated to local communities .like Guiseley. We believe this CIL money should be allocated to a body that is accountable to the electorate via the ballot box. A town council is the most local level of government. It has an important role in promoting the town, representing its interests and supporting the work of different groups in the community. Town councils listen to local opinion and act as a voice of local residents. They can provide grants to local community groups for a whole range of activities. Some also provide support for local priorities like extra policing and environmental improvements. A Town Council would also have a legal right to be consulted on planning matters. Town Cllrs know the area and can (and increasingly do) represent their views to other authorities like the District or County Council Health authorities, Police and Fire Authorities. Town Councils are the most unbureaucratic and cheapest kind of local authority in existence. Their funds are the smallest part of the council tax and they do not receive a general government grant. So they have every incentive to keep expenditure low and be economical. The accounts are strictly and independently audited every year.
173	25/11/2014	Elector	N	Moorland Crescent, Menston and the High Royds area have never been part of Guiseley and have nothing to do with the town. Neither does Hawksworth Village. These are separate areas and I believe will be amply represented by Aireborough Neighbourhood Development Forum. These areas are part of Aireborough, but most definitely not part of Guiseley. This historic and geographic boundary between Menston and Guiseley runs along Mire Beck with a definite break between the settlements defined by a corridor of green belt. I urge you to reconsider these inclusions
174	Not dated	Electors	N	Moorland Crescent, Menston and the High Royds area have never been part of Guiseley and have nothing to do with the town. Neither does Hawksworth Village. These are separate areas and I believe will be amply represented by Aireborough Neighbourhood Development Forum. These areas are part of Aireborough, but most definitely not part of Guiseley. This historic and geographic boundary between Menston and Guiseley runs along Mire Beck with a definite break between the settlements defined by a corridor of green belt. I urge you to reconsider these inclusions
175	24/11/2014	Elector	N	I object to the above as it will be an extra charge on the rates and there has been an alarming lack of publicity about this
176	Not dated	Elector	N	Moorland Crescent, Menston and the High Royds area have never been part of Guiseley and have nothing to do with the town. Neither does Hawksworth Village. These are separate areas and I believe will be amply represented by Aireborough Neighbourhood Development Forum. These areas are part of Aireborough, but most definitely not part of Guiseley. This historic and geographic boundary between Menston and Guiseley runs along Mire Beck with a definite break between the settlements defined by a corridor of green belt. I urge you to reconsider these inclusions
177	20/11/2014	Elector	N	Moorland Crescent Menston and the High Royds areas have NEVER been a part of Guiseley and have NOTHING to do with the town! Neither does Hawksworth Village for that matter. These are separate areas and a part of Aireborough but are definitely NOT part of Guiseley. I bought my house on High Royds in MENSTON - NOT Guiseley and do not see why I should be subject to a Town Council for an area I do not live in. I urge you to reconsider the inclusions mentioned as I feel this is being forced into an area that we did not ask for. If the people of Guiseley want a Town Planning Council (which has yet to be determined) then it should be Guiseley only. The historic and geographical boundary between Menston and Guiseley runs along Mire Beck with a definitive break between the two settlements defined by a corridor of green belt. I would welcome to see a map of the local areas outlined with the statistics about the numbers supporting/objectioning in each area. If this could be provided online for everyone to see?

Community Governance Review - Proposed Guiseley Town Council Representation Log

<u>File Ref.</u>	<u>Date</u>	<u>Capacity</u>	<u>In Support?</u>	<u>Comments</u>
178	20/11/2014	Elector	N	I am writing to you with concerns about the area Guiseley Town Council hopes to represent. Moorland Crescent Menston and the High Royds area have never been a part of Guiseley and have nothing to do with the town, neither does Hawksworth village. These are separate areas and I believe will be amply represent by Aireborough Neighbourhood Development Forum. These areas are part of Aireborough, but most definitely not part of Guiseley. The historic and geographic boundary between Menston and Guiseley runs along Mire Beck, with a definite break between the two settlements defined by a corridor of green belt. I urge you to reconsider these inclusions.
179	20/11/2014	Elector	N	we would like to voice our objections to the creation of a Town Council for Guiseley. there is already a Neighbourhood Forum which is being used to develop a Neighbourhood Plan. We understand that this body already carries out many of the functions of a Town Council and more importantly at no cost. A Town Council would cost Guiseley residents additional charges on their Council Tax bills and we do not know what, if any, benefits of having a new Town Council would be.
180	20/11/2014	Elector	N	We cannot see how another layer of bureaucracy can possibly help alleviate the day-to-day problems that exist in Guiseley through uncontrolled expansion of housing in the area. The infrastructure is not capable of sustaining the rate of growth resulting in shortage of school places, shortage of Doctor appointments and daily traffic congestion. We already pay enough Council Tax so to add to it, in order to fund another layer of people long on promises and short on delivery, would be foolish in the extreme. We already pay for Councillors and MPs to represent us at different levels so we don't need any more.
181	21/11/2014	Elector	N	I have a Menston address although I pay my council tax to Leeds City Council . I note my address has been included in the proposed Guiseley a Town Council area. I wish to object to the proposals to establish a Town Council for the Guiseley area. I feel that we have adequate political representation and do not wish to see yet another layer of government which I will have to fund through council tax charges.I also feel that the public consumer consultation on this matter has been inadequate as I have only just found out about this matter by chance as I have not been written to on the matter . I believe many residents will be completely unaware of the proposals. I therefore also wish to object to the method of consultation which I believe to be undemocratic
182	21/11/2014	Elector	N	As a resident of the former High Royds Hospital estate I write to express concerns regarding the proposal to create a Town Council for Guiseley. As a local resident I oppose the idea for the following reasons; a) I believe the area is adequately represented by the Aireborough Neighbourhood Forum at no additional cost to local people. b) The Neighbourhood Forum already provides many of the functions of a Town Council. c) A Town Council is likely to be dominated by the main political parties rather than local people.I also have concerns regarding the proposal to include the High Royds estate and Moorlands Crescent within the boundaries of the proposed Town Council. Both historically & geographically these areas have been regarded as part of Menston I look forward to hearing the outcome of the consultation exercise
183	21/11/2014	Elector	N	I am writing to you with concerns about the area Guiseley Town Council hopes to represent. Moorland Crescent, Menston and the High Royds area have never been part of Guiseley and have nothing to do with the town. Neither does Hawksworth village. These are separate areas and I believe will be amply represented by Aireborough Neighbourhood Development Forum. These areas are part of Aireborough, but most definitely not part of Guiseley. The historic and geographical boundary between Menston and Guiseley runs along Mire Beck, with a definite break between the two settlements defines by a corridor of green belt.I urge you to reconsider these instructions
184	21/11/2014	Elector	Y	<u>I agree totally with the comments of my local Councillors that a referendum should be allowed.</u> I am grate full to the Councillors for drawing this to my attention

Community Governance Review - Proposed Guiseley Town Council Representation Log

<u>File Ref.</u>	<u>Date</u>	<u>Capacity</u>	<u>In Support?</u>	<u>Comments</u>
185	21/11/2014	Elector	N	I object to the creation of a town council for Guiseley for the reasons given below.I understand that 10% of the electorate of Guiseley have signed a petition asking Leeds City Council to proceed to “set up” this town council. It has taken a long time to reach that figure, surely an indication of a lack of enthusiasm. However, the proposed area is far greater than Guiseley when Haworth and Menston are included and the proposer stresses the local element as being core to the objectives. When the function of a Guiseley Town Council is considered it is seen to be a duplication of the existing structure. The interests of the people of Guiseley are adequately served by the three ward councillors, the Aireborough Neighbourhood Development Forum, the Guiseley & Rawdon Forum and the Civic Society.This unnecessary layer of administration and the resulting additional cost to the rate payers is unjustified.It is alarming that the lack of publicity about this change means that many people in Guiseley are unaware of the implications. In bold type the petition proposer’s hand out states “...include consulting everyone in the area about their view before a decision is made.” This has not happened.Consequently the imposition of the Guiseley Town Council could occur without the opportunity for all those affected to express a view. This is undemocratic and unacceptable.
186	21/11/2014	Elector	N	I am a resident at High Royds and regard the development as part of the community of Menston. I am keen to ensure that the Green belt buffer land is maintained between the different areas. I believe I will be amply represented by Aireborough Neighbourhood Development Forum. These areas are part of Aireborough, but most definitely not part of Guiseley. The historic and geographic boundary between Menston and Guiseley runs along Mire Beck, with a definite break between the two settlements defined by a corridor of green belt.Therefore, I do not believe Guiseley Town Council should be created at extra cost to a tax payer that lives in Menston.
187	21/11/2014	Elector	N	I refer to the letter of 29th October from Councillors Wadsworth & Latty. I think that the present arrangement with a Neighbourhood Forum is sufficient for Guiseley. I do not support the proposed Town Council with the addition of another layer of bureaucracy and potential delay in decision making and consequent cost. I think a referendum would have been the best way of gauging the feelings of the people of Guiseley
188	22/11/2014	Electors	N	I respond with respect to the views required from public before 28th of November.My wife and myself (Ann Heyes) would object to the establishment of a Town Council for Guiseley on the following grounds.The establishment of such an organisation would appear to be of benefit to the community, however in terms of reality and the small print connected in the enactment of such a system it appears there is yet to be another level of bureaucracy,and the establishment and terms of reference are totally unacceptable when the elements of planning and traffic are not within the scope of such an organisation. Another element is the cost involved of a setting up such an organisation and the levy on the general rates in order for this to be established .Had the above points been available for consideration when the original petition signed by 1179 people I doubt very much whether they would have agreed for any proposal
189	22/11/2014	Electors	N	As we have been requested to give our views regarding a town council for guiseley, our view is that we do not want one.
190	22/11/2014	Elector	N	I refer to a letter dated 29 October 2014 from Counsellors Wadsworth G Latty and P Latty together with a notice I received today 22 November 2014 regarding the above subject.As a former resident of Otley and having paid the Otley precept for many years I think it would be wrong for Guiseley to have a Town Council. Over the past 30 years Otley Council has been like Topsy it has just growed and growed, and they seem to have very little influence as to what happens in the town. They do of course have three representatives sitting on Leeds City Council. I am also of the opinion that Mr David Bowe is seeking to have a Town Council for Guiseley for his own reasons whatever they may be and not for the good of the residents of Guiseley. It seems undemocratic that having obtained 1179 signatures out of a population of some 16000 persons that a referendum for the whole township is not to be taken, but then I suppose as seems highly likely a Guiseley Town Council will be appointed and a large amount of ratepayers money will be raised for Leeds City Council. In short I am AGAINST a Town Council for Guiseley.
191	22/11/2014	Elector	N	I have received a circular reminding me of the need to confirm if I agree that Guiseley needs a Town Council. I do not believe that a Town Council is necessary, or desirable for Guiseley. It would be a cost too far for many residents and no major benefits.Thank you for this opportunity to have a say

Community Governance Review - Proposed Guiseley Town Council Representation Log

<u>File Ref.</u>	<u>Date</u>	<u>Capacity</u>	<u>In Support?</u>	<u>Comments</u>
192	23/11/2014	Elector	N	Morning, In reply to the notification for the proposed introduction of a town council for Guiseley, we think this is not necessary and just another layer of administration. So therefore we are against this proposition.
193	23/11/2014	Electors	N	We note that the proposed area for Guiseley Town Council includes Moorland Crescent, High Royds and Hawksworth village. These areas have not previously been regarded as part of Guiseley and currently include a corridor of green belt land which forms a definite break between Menston and Guiseley. Recent development plans have shown the land between Tranmere Park and High Royds as 'unsuitable for housing development'. The fields between Ings Lane and Moorland Crescent also act as a green belt buffer zone between settlements and help to maintain separation. Does the proposed inclusion of these areas in the new town council mean that the current development status will be changed? Are there any plans to allow development in either of these areas? Given the historic difference between these settlements, inclusion in the proposed town council areas appears to be no more than an administrative convenience. We would urge you to reconsider any change that would compromise the development status of the areas noted above
194	23/11/2014	Elector	N	Moorland Crescent Menston and the High Royds area have never been part of Guiseley and have nothing to do with the town. Neither does Hawksworth village. These are separate areas and I believe will be amply represented by Aireborough Neighbourhood Development Forum. These areas are part of Aireborough, but most definitely not part of Guiseley. The historic and geographic boundary between Menston and Guiseley runs along Mire Beck, with a definite break between the two settlements defined by a corridor of green belt I urge you to reconsider these inclusions.
195	23/11/2014	Elector	N	I would like to express my support for a Town Council for Guiseley. I strongly feel that would be a great benefit to the residents in Guiseley
196	28/11/2014	Elector	N	I would like to add my support to the letter you will have received from the ANDF and add these comments to those I have already made within the deadline. ANDF should be consulted properly and I don't believe they have been. There should not be political parties getting involved in this review as Labour has done via Guiseley Town Council literature. The consultation has been poor and is being divisive, many people I know will refuse the precept as they don't feel properly engaged. The Neighbourhood Forum has done so much work already and is positioned at a much more relevant and democratic level for all the sub communities such as High Royds etc. I am concerned to hear people say that consultation is a 'done deal' ie. Leeds has already decided that Guiseley TC will be approved. I sincerely hope that this is not the case
197	23/11/2014	Elector	N	I wish to object to the formation of a Town Council for the following reasons:-1. It will add another layer of bureaucracy 2. It will involve an addition to the bill for all Council Tax payers in the area. 3. It will not add anything to the existing groups e.g. the Guiseley & Rawdon Forum, the Aireborough Neighbourhood Development Forum and the Civic Society. 4. The petition was signed by 1197 people (were they all Council Tax payers?), which is just over the 10% required for it to be considered. This not a majority of the electorate. Without each member of the electorate being invited to make their views known it does not seem to be a true democratic process. I am very concerned that many people may not be aware of the petition having been lodged and in particular the fact that there has been a "consultation" period starting in October with a deadline of 28th November 2014. For instance some of us only became aware of the situation at the Guiseley & Rawdon Forum Meeting on the evening of Wednesday 19th November when David Bowe, Guiseley Town Council Coordinator reported the position. Many we have spoken to since were also unaware of the submission of the petition and the "consultation" period. This has given very little time to engage others in the process and for them to look into the pros and cons of a Town Council. There has been no real opportunity for public consultation for the electorate. It is appalling and undemocratic to think a decision might be made without the whole electorate being invited to express their views
198	23/11/2014			I object to the proposal for a Town Council for Guiseley. Many of the duties of this council are already undertaken for free by the existing Neighbourhood Forum. The additional cost of the Town Council is not justified.

Community Governance Review - Proposed Guiseley Town Council Representation Log

<u>File Ref.</u>	<u>Date</u>	<u>Capacity</u>	<u>In Support?</u>	<u>Comments</u>
199	28/11/2014	Consultation Proposer	Y	I am writing to you on behalf of myself David Bowe, to express my support for the establishment of a Town Council in the parish of Guiseley. I would support the establishment of a Town Council boundaries proposed by the petitioners a long with the electoral arrangements (i.e. polling districts, and number of Councillors) also proposed by the petitioners. I believe that the establishment of a Town Council would serve a vital vote for the area of Guiseley which Guiseley is increasingly in need of. The promotion and representation of the best interests of Guiseley to other authorities like the (City Council, Health Authorities, Police and Fire Authorities is increasingly important. This is best done by town councillors who know the area, who listen to local opinion and can act as a voice of local residents. The Town Council would also have a legal right to be consulted on planning matters, something we see as becoming increasingly important. Town Councils are the most non-bureaucratic and cheapest kind of local authority in existence. Their funds are the smallest part of the Council Tax and they do not receive a general government grant. So they have every incentive to keep expenditure low and be economical. Their accounts are strictly and independently audited every year. I/we therefore believe that monies coming from the new Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) in Guiseley should be allocated to the Guiseley Town Council. A body that is accountable to the electorate via the ballot box. I hope that you will be able to confirm to me that the proposal for a Town Council in Guiseley will go forward as quickly as possible
200	23/11/2014	Elector	N	Please note I do not want a town council for Guiseley
201	23/11/2014	Elector	Y	I would like to offer my support to propose a Guiseley Town Council. I have lived in Guiseley for over 30 years and believe a town council has an important role in promoting the interests of Guiseley and would act as a voice for local residents
202	23/11/2014	Elector	Y	I write to declare how important I believe it is for the creation of a Town Council for Guiseley. As the most local form of Government such a council would provide a genuine democratic opportunity to improve the town and environs. Devolved power is essential for healthy democracy and a means for local people to be involved in what goes on in their locale. I can think of no better use for CIL money; that it be allocated to a body that is accountable to the local electorate. Town Councils are also the most unbureaucratic and cheapest form of local authority and their funds are the smallest part of the Council Tax. Furthermore, elected Town Councillors know their area, have a legal right to be consulted on planning matters and have the power to provide grants for local community groups. For all these reasons a Town Council for Guiseley would be a massive boon for the town and its inhabitants
203	23/11/2014	Elector	N	I do not want any more bureaucracy in this area. Another level will only cause more delays and especially more expense. There will be additional charges on the council tax for no benefit. It would not cover all the more important issues of planning and traffic so again what benefit would it give.
204	24/11/2014	Elector	N	With reference to the above consultation I wish to place on record my opposition to the creation of a town council. Apart from creating another tier of government I cannot see that the benefits such a council might bring would offset the costs that will be raised and the hardship that would be felt by many people in the area in meeting them. In my research I have not found where the town council could do anything other than delay the metropolitan council's implementation plans.
205	24/11/2014	Elector	N	I understand that moves are afoot to set up a Town Council in Guiseley and I am writing to let you know that my husband and I are totally opposed to such a move. We feel that a Town Council will not serve any purpose except to add more money to our Council Tax Bill. Therefore, please register our objection to such a move
206	24/11/2014	Elector	N	Nothing good can come from a Town Council. LCC look after all our needs and we have a good rapport with LCC Councillors, in Particular Cllr Latty

Community Governance Review - Proposed Guiseley Town Council Representation Log

<u>File Ref.</u>	<u>Date</u>	<u>Capacity</u>	<u>In Support?</u>	<u>Comments</u>
207	24/11/2014	Elector	N	I am concerned that very few people are aware that a decision on whether Guiseley should have a Parish Council is to be taken in the next few days. Many are in the dark as to the benefits of having one. I take the Airedale and Wharfedale Observer but I do not recall any publicity or explanation on the proposal. At the moment we have the Guiseley and Rawdon Forum which meets very regularly under the auspices of the local councillors. At these meetings many items of local concern are reported and discussed eg police reports on crime, anti-social behaviour, local bus services, parking on pavements, overhanging trees etc. A group called Aireborough Forum also meets to discuss improving local amenities. I believe their co-ordinator is Jennifer Kirby. I do feel we have enough layers of governance and another would not improve the everyday lives of the people of Guiseley. I am not in favour therefore of Guiseley having a Parish Council
208	24/11/2014	Elector	N	I wish my view to be known that I do not want a town council for Guiseley
209	24/11/2014	Elector	N	I would like to make clear my objection to the formation of a town council for Guiseley. I don't feel that we need another layer of bureaucracy and associated cost. It is the role of Leeds Council to administer Guiseley equally along with other areas of the City and if this is not being done, we have the right to vote in new Councillors. Could you therefore please note my objection to the proposal.
210	24/11/2014	Electors	N	We would just like to clearly state that we DO NOT WANT a town council and feel that an additional tier of Government is not required
211	24/11/2014	Elector	N	We were not aware of this question even having been raised previously and under the circumstances of the Neighbourhood Watch scheme just having been initiated by Mark Kelly, I am wondering whether this scheme has been introduced at this time, in order to try and make the question of 'the benefits' of a Town Council for Guiseley (in your eyes) limited. I do feel that this is quite an important question and wonder why no-one has been informed of this locally, surely as Councillors we rely on you to keep people informed on matters such as this and not wait until the so called consultation has taken place. I do know that my daughter living in Bramhope, are fortunate to have a Parish Council which does seem to look after their interests very well. Can we be informed a little more on what powers a Town Council for Guiseley would possess. We clearly need our pavements and drains clearing of the very dangerous piles of wet leaves, which would surely help with the continual floods which seem to be occurring these days. I know it's old fashioned to talk of what was done years ago, but the gutters and pavements were kept clear of both snow and leaves which made it much safer for people walking. I know that Councillor Pat Latty believes she has answered this problem, but it certainly is no better where we live near Old Hollins Hill and along the road towards Morrisons. I know that a large drain has been installed near Morrisons and at the moment seems to be kept clear, but the rest of the area is left as was. Also it reminds me that Morrisons car park is kept clear of snow by LCC lorries, but we never see one up our own road of Hawkstone View, even though they pass the end of the road on Old Hollins Hill. This small part of Guiseley seems to get thought about less and less. I hope that you will take on board what I have written and I look forward to hearing your response
212	24/11/2014	Elector	N	both opposed to the concept as they feel it will not benefit the area.
213	24/11/2014	Elector	N	Mrs Ayres feels that a Guiseley Town Council is unnecessary
214	24/11/2014	Elector	N	Feel it is an unnecessary level of government that isn't wanted or needed and don't want to have to pay more tax for it
215	28/11/2014	Elector	N	I wish to register my objection to a Guiseley Town Council being formed. I believe the Aireborough Council serves our needs. I also object to increase in council tax to pay for these councils with no power to operate.

Community Governance Review - Proposed Guiseley Town Council Representation Log

<u>File Ref.</u>	<u>Date</u>	<u>Capacity</u>	<u>In Support?</u>	<u>Comments</u>
216	28/11/2014	Elector	N	<p>I do not support the suggestion of a town council for Guiseley.</p> <p>We are well represented by our local councillors such as Councillor Wadsworth with ease of contact by phone and although there are minor issues such as the lack provision of brown bins for garden waste these do not justify another layer in the council and associated costs.</p> <p>The extra costs have to be passed on and if extra funding is needed I would prefer that funding to be directed to the Police or Fire services for more community benefit.</p>
217	28/11/2014	Elector	Y	We would like to confirm our support of the Guiseley town council.
218	28/11/2014	Elector	N	<p>I would just like to let it be known that I am against the creation of a Town Council for Guiseley.</p> <p>It strikes me as an unnecessary cost for an area which is already well served by its' councillors and Neighbourhood Forum. (I have lived in Guiseley for almost 30 years.)</p>
219	24/11/2014	Elector	N	With regard to the proposal to establish a Guiseley Town Council, I would like to register my view that a Town Council would be an unnecessary level of government and cost, and would not be of benefit to local residents.
220	24/11/2014	Elector	N	Betty is against having an additional council
221	24/11/2014	Elector	N	As Guiseley resident,s myself and Mrs Lynne Bootland do not want a Town Council for Guiseley.This in our opinion would be a duplication of the existing duties of our Three Councillor,s together with the various actions of our local MP Stuart Andrew in not only resolving many local issues in our community.They have regular meetings and surgeries with resident,s which in our opinion keeps them well informed.Our experience is that our Councillor,s and our MP are very much tuned in to what is going on in our area.An acknowledgement of receipt would be appreciated
222	24/11/2014	Electors	N	We do not need a Town Council for Guiseley
223	24/11/2014	Elector	N	I understand that you are co-ordinating the consultation about a Town Council for Guiseley.I view this as a positive step for Guiseley, as long as an agreed definitive boundary is agreed with neighbouring communities. Guiseley should develop its own identity, using a Town Council as a voice. Guiseley should not just be a commuting thoroughfare and shoppers drop off. I support the development of a Town Council
224	24/11/2014	Elector	N	I am writing to object to the proposal for a town council for Guiseley. I feel that it would just be an added layer of expensive and unnecessary bureaucracy that we do not need.
225	24/11/2014	Elector	N	Thanks for your explanation. It means that a Town Council will have no benefit at all, and I will withdraw my support. You are also giving a good message for the next Councils elections
226	24/11/2014	Elector	N	I was most surprised to hear that there was a proposal for a Town Council for Guiseley.I have yet to see any convincing argument as to why a new council is needed and what benefits would accrue to the residents of Guiseley. In a time when there is already too much process and red tape, adding yet another tier of local government and cost is a step too far. We are well served by our Councillors on Leeds City Council.I trust that the review of this proposal will conclude that there is no demand or need for a Town Council for Guiseley
227	24/11/2014	Elector	N	As a resident of polling district GRB, Menston I object to the proposal for a guiseley Town hall. I have lived in GRB for 2 years and already it is clear to me that this estate gravitates it's source of community from Menston as opposed to Guiseley. I see the creation of a Guiseley town council as an extra expensive layer of local government which would have limited political impact on the wider area. I am happy with the representation that I currently have and do not want to have my locality decided by people who will put Guiseley first at the expense of Menston/Highroyds.

Community Governance Review - Proposed Guiseley Town Council Representation Log

<u>File Ref.</u>	<u>Date</u>	<u>Capacity</u>	<u>In Support?</u>	<u>Comments</u>
228		Elector	N	<p>I do not support this proposal because of the following reasons: Town or Parish Councils are only <u>consulted</u> in some matters by Leeds City Council. Guiseley Town Council if it existed would have no power of veto on planning matters and other major LCC proposals. It might cost me as much as an extra £50 or so, an almost 4% increase in my rates which I would prefer to spend elsewhere. am retired living on a pension, so do not welcome any increase in our cost of living. Duplication of examination of planning consents will occur as it will be done once by LCC and once by GTC if it exists. This work is already done well enough by our existing councillors, and also by Aireborough Civic Society which does examine Aireborough planning applications and comments on planning proposals if required for nothing. It is my opinion that whilst the process used in this proposal may be technically correct, it may be flawed and open to challenge, thus causing even more unwelcome expense. The I Petition survey itself has shown that there is very little electoral support locally, for town council. If you enquire you will find out that the IPetition went live just after Christmas 2013. As of yesterday Sunday 23rd November 2014 at 16.30 hours it only had 205 signatures, that is less than one signature per day. After almost two months in February of this year it only had about 28 as far as I remember. The other flaw in this IPetition method of trying to gather support is of course that it only records those in favour of the proposal and does not record those against. Similarly the other 974 signatures that the Mr. Bowe must have obtained door to door were only for those in favour. Further, since the actual fact that the gathering of support door to door has taken so long (almost 4/5 of year), this again shows the low density of support amongst the rate payers within the Aireborough district. Clearly some of those who were personally approached refused to support the proposal, but are not recorded! Using the concept of natural justice, the electors in Guiseley and district have not been given enough time to look at this proposal. In view of the time allowed and accepted by LCC to get the required 10% of elector support for a review of the need for a Town Council, (about 40 weeks) one would think that in a well run and truly democratic council, and equal amount of time would be given to the electors to properly consider the merits and demerits of this proposal. It is reprehensible that the City Council General Purposes Committee has chosen not to have an LCC council organised referendum on this matter, amongst the electors of Guiseley Hawksworth and Menston. I think this because the rate payers will have to pay extra rates, at a time of austerity for most persons as well as my other objections. You might like to know that Portsmouth City Council have set a precedent on this sort of thing by holding a proper full vote amongst the electors of Southsea. At a 24% turnout 66% voted for the abolition of Southsea Town Council, and only 33% voted for its retention. Southsea Town Council was abolished by Portsmouth City Council on the 31st March 2010, it existed for 11 years. Thus I can see no reason why a proper LCC organised vote cannot be held next May along with the General Election, this would be cheaper to do, and far more democratic. <u>General Comment</u> - I find it completely outrageous that local politicians allow themselves almost a full year of nice steady time to get the 10% of signatures required by law. Whilst we the electors, and ratepayers who will be footing the bill for Guiseley Town Council should it actually come into existence, only get five weeks to consider and respond properly to the proposal. I only found out about the terms of reference of the 24 October 2014 on the 19th November 2014. In view of the fairly recent electoral outcomes for Regional Councils, and elected City Mayors I find this proposal totally at odds with what the electorate appear to want.</p>
229	25/11/2014	Elector	N	<p>We recently received a flyer through our postbox, reminding us that we should express a view about the proposed Town Council for Guiseley. I have to admit I can see no over-riding benefit in such a council, and would vote against it. My primary concerns relate to the condition of the footpaths, street lighting, refuse collection, regular maintenance of the excellent flowers on the roundabouts etc., and as far as I understand, these are best dealt with by the existing arrangements with Leeds. A Town Council would simply introduce an additional layer of bureaucracy, and achieve only a voice for minor issues favoured by a distinct minority.</p>
230	25/11/2014	Elector	Y	I would like to register my support for a Guiseley Town Council
231	25/11/2014	Elector	N	not in favour of a town council and there is sufficient representation already
232	25/11/2014	Electors	N	Another two objections to a Town Council for Guiseley
233	25/11/2014	Property owner	N	<p>I wish to comment on the proposals to establish a Town Council status for Guiseley. There are several concerns including the proposed sites identified for housing development in order for LCC to reach their target of 2300 for this area. This relates to the fact that High Royds, Moorland Crescent and Hawksworth Village have all been marked on plans as being within Guiseley boundaries. In my view this is not correct as these areas fall within Menston. An obvious knock on effect would be that green field sites would be used for future housing as is already being proposed by the developer at High Royds (Chevin Park). As such I would ask that these specific areas be removed from within the proposed boundaries.</p>
234	25/11/2014	Elector	N	Thinks it's pointless
235	25/11/2014	Electors	Y	As long term residents of Guiseley my wife and I fully support the idea of a town council

Community Governance Review - Proposed Guiseley Town Council Representation Log

<u>File Ref.</u>	<u>Date</u>	<u>Capacity</u>	<u>In Support?</u>	<u>Comments</u>
236	25/11/2014	Electors	Y	I am adding my voice to the support for a town council in Guiseley My wife and I have lived here all our married life-some 47 years My main reason for support stems from a desire for democracy and cost effectiveness in local planning.Until my retirement I was a Director in NHS Planning for community based services.Here as in all locality planning and service provision power with ACCOUNTABILITY was and is paramount My wife and I support the principal of a town council for Guiseley.The case is compelling on its own but we are surrounded by precedents in Rawdon and Horsforth more recently AND neighbours in Otley and Ilkley enjoy the benefit of a truly democratic body at grass roots
237	25/11/2014	Elector	N	I wish to register my objection to having a Town Council for Guiseley.1. It would add an unnecessary tier of administration. It already has the Guiseley & Rawdon Forum headed by three Councillors and the Aireborough Neighbourhood Development Forum and other groups.2. It would be an additional expense for all the Council Tax payers in the area.I am also appalled that not every member of the electorate has been made aware of the Petition and that a period of consultation was started in October and ends on 28 November. I myself only became aware of it last Wednesday evening when a resident of Guiseley, David Bowe the Petition's proposer, brought it to the attention of the Guiseley & Rawdon Forum Meeting. Talking to people since I find there are many people who knew nothing about it.It is a matter of great concern that a decision could be made to create a Town Council on the basis of 1197 signatories (only just over 10% of the electorate) to the Petition and the views of those who may have happened to hear about it. This could not be said to be truly representative of the electorate or to be democratic.
238	25/11/2014	Electors	N	Moorland Crescent Menston and the High Royds area have never been part of Guiseley and have nothing to do with the town. Neither does Hawksworth village. These are separate areas and I believe will be amply represented by Aireborough Neighbourhood Development Forum. These areas are part of Aireborough, but most definitely not part of Guiseley. The historic and geographic boundary between Menston and Guiseley runs along Mire Beck, with a definite break between the two settlements defined by a corridor of green belt. I urge you to reconsider these inclusions.
239	25/11/2014	Electors	Y	As we (my wife and I) signed the petition for a Guiseley Town Council, we are writing to you to reinforce our support for this. Our primary reasons are as follows:The success of the town councils in Otley and Ilkley; the way that they are clearly focussed and actively support local groups and town-specific projects at very low cost to the residents. The little or no control the Guiseley community has had over the huge amount of residential development that has taken place in recent years. With a town council we would have a body that would have to be consulted on planning matters.The funds arising from the Community Infrastructure Levy would be managed by a democratically elected body.The town council could actively support local charities and community activities and could also be the instigator of local events, which would reinforce a sense of community If you wish for any further input on this very important matter then please contact us
240	25/11/2014	Elector	N	Moorland Crescent Menston and the High Royds area have never been part of Guiseley and have nothing to do with the town. Neither does Hawksworth village. These are separate areas and I believe will be amply represented by Aireborough Neighbourhood Development Forum. These areas are part of Aireborough, but most definitely not part of Guiseley. The historic and geographic boundary between Menston and Guiseley runs along Mire Beck, with a definite break between the two settlements defined by a corridor of green belt. I urge you to reconsider these inclusions.
241	25/11/2014	Elector	N	Moorland Crescent Menston and the High Royds area have never been part of Guiseley and have nothing to do with the town. Neither does Hawksworth village. These are separate areas and I believe will be amply represented by Aireborough Neighbourhood Development Forum. These areas are part of Aireborough, but most definitely not part of Guiseley. The historic and geographic boundary between Menston and Guiseley runs along Mire Beck, with a definite break between the two settlements defined by a corridor of green belt. I urge you to reconsider these inclusions.
242	25/11/2014	Elector	N	Against the decision. See no benefit of it due to parking issues already in the area that never seem to improve
243	25/11/2014	Elector	Y	I am writing to support the creation of a local council in Guiseley

Community Governance Review - Proposed Guiseley Town Council Representation Log

<u>File Ref.</u>	<u>Date</u>	<u>Capacity</u>	<u>In Support?</u>	<u>Comments</u>
244	25/11/2014	Elector	Y	I am writing to you to express my support for the establishment of a Town Council in the parish of Guiseley. I would support the establishment of a Town Council boundaries proposed by the petitioners a long with the electoral arrangements (i.e. polling districts, and number of Councillors) also proposed by the petitioners. I believe that the establishment of a Town Council would serve a vital vote for the area of Guiseley which Guiseley is increasingly in need of. The promotion and representation of the best interests of Guiseley to other authorities like the (City Council, Health Authorities, Police and Fire Authorities is increasingly important. This is best done by town councillors who know the area, who listen to local opinion and can act as a voice of local residents. The Town Council would also have a legal right to be consulted on planning matters, something we see as becoming increasingly important. Town Councils are the most non-bureaucratic and cheapest kind of local authority in existence. Their funds are the smallest part of the Council Tax and they do not receive a general government grant. So they have every incentive to keep expenditure low and be economical. Their accounts are strictly and independently audited every year. I/we therefore believe that monies coming from the new Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) in Guiseley should be allocated to the Guiseley Town Council - a body that is accountable to the electorate via the ballot box. I hope that you will be able to confirm to me that the proposal for a Town Council in Guiseley will go forward as quickly as possible.
245	25/11/2014	Elector	Y	Guiseley residents have a democratic right to a say in the decision process concerning this growing town. Many new developments have and are in the process of construction. Proper consideration is now required as how to provide for this growing community. A town Council would be local democratic and accountable body and meet the needs of my community
246	25/11/2014	Elector	Y	I wish to register my support for Guiseley Town Council as this will result in a better line of communication with LCC
247	25/11/2014	Elector	N	This email is to register my opinion that I DO NOT consider a Town Council to be in the best interests of the Township. It is presently well served by a neighbourhood forum doing good work for the local community, non political and open to the views of the whole area. It also does not impose a further financial burden on council tax payers. Your acknowledgement will be appreciated.
248	25/11/2014	Elector	Y	Please note and register my support for the proposal for the formation of a Guiseley town council
249	25/11/2014	Elector	Y	I am emailing you to inform you of mine and my partners support for a Town Council for Guiseley
250	25/11/2014	Elector	Y	Please note that I support the proposal for a Guiseley Town Council
251	25/11/2014	Elector	Y	I have just moved into Guiseley and have been contacted by my councillors and the Labour Party about this consultation. I don't know whether my views count as I am not yet on the Electoral Register. I would strongly support a Town Council. I have moved to Guiseley from Baildon where a town council has been a tremendous benefit to the town, taking various actions that help community cohesion, such as supporting groups and businesses to put on a "Baildon at Christmas" event, working with other organisations to start a farmers' market. I'd be most happy to pay a precept for a town council to be set up in Guiseley
252	25/11/2014	Electors	N	I'm writing to tell you I do not support the proposed plans to create a Town Council for Guiseley. I am a resident of Menston and therefore not happy to supplement a new Town Council for Guiseley through my council tax as there would be no benefit for us.
253	25/11/2014	Elector	N	I have received a circular advising that Leeds City Council have rejected the idea of having a referendum on the subject of a Guiseley Town Council on account of the cost (£40,000) but to start a 'local governance review' (whatever that is) instead. That seems totally unfair. The Council will not spend £40,000 but will happily give in to the whims of a few people who want a Council and thereby lumber the residents of Guiseley with a cost which will be much much more than £40,000. That is completely undemocratic. I therefore write to register my opposition (and that of my wife) to forming a Town Council in Guiseley.
254	25/11/2014	Elector	N	Objection: does not want/need an individual council

Community Governance Review - Proposed Guiseley Town Council Representation Log

<u>File Ref.</u>	<u>Date</u>	<u>Capacity</u>	<u>In Support?</u>	<u>Comments</u>
255	25/11/2014	Elector	N	Moorland Crescent Menston and the High Royds area have never been part of Guiseley and have nothing to do with the town. Neither does Hawksworth village. These are separate areas and I believe will be amply represented by Aireborough Neighbourhood Development Forum. These areas are part of Aireborough, but most definitely not part of Guiseley. The historic and geographic boundary between Menston and Guiseley runs along Mire Beck, with a definite break between the two settlements defined by a corridor of green belt I urge you to reconsider these inclusions.
256	25/11/2014	Elector	N	. Hawksworth, Menston and the High Royds areas (noted "GRA" and "GRB" on the submitted plans) are not historically part of Guiseley, and have no association with the town other than that of a neighbour. These are separate areas and I believe are already amply represented by Aireborough Neighbourhood Development Forum. Indeed the historic and geographic boundary between Menston and Guiseley runs along Mire Beck, with a definitive break between the two settlements defined by a corridor of green belt. I urge you to reconsider these inclusions
257	25/11/2014	Electors	Y	I would like to vote in favour of Guiseley Town Council. You can take this as two votes as my wife feels the same
258	25/11/2014	Electors	N	I wish to place both mine & my husbands objections to the proposed new Town Council. I see no reason for it when they are not able to deal with the 2 main problems which are too many houses being built for the size of area and the fact that our roads are gridlocked due to the amount of new building happening in the area. In view of this we strongly object to being forced into paying additional council tax to pay for this unwanted scheme especially when times are hard for the average working family already trying to put food on the table & pay the household bills. Please add our names to the objection list
259	25/11/2014	Elector	Y	I wish to express my support for and involvement in a proposed Guiseley Town Council. I look forward to hearing from you
260	25/11/2014	Elector	N	I am a resident of polling district GRK and I would like to register my opposition to the proposal for a town council for Guiseley
261	25/11/2014	Elector	Y	I am in favour of a Town Council for Guiseley. Since Aireborough Urban District Council and Leeds City Council have been in charge of the town it has lost its heart and individual identity and I feel a Town Council would help to give the town a much better sense of community than the current arrangements
262	25/11/2014	Elector	Y	Could I please register my full support for for the initiative by the Guiseley & Rawdon Labour Party to create a Guiseley Town Council. If it is within your remit to do so then could you please keep me informed of any proposed meetings or significant events in respect of this matter.
263	25/11/2014	Elector	Y	I write to offer my support to the proposal for a Guiseley town council. The Guiseley and Rawdon Labour Party have taken the time to inform me of the situation and seem to outline a sensible summary why it would be advantageous
264	25/11/2014	Elector	Y	I wish to notify you of my support for a Guiseley Town Council.
265	25/11/2014	Elector	N	I am writing to you with concerns about the area Guiseley Town Council hopes to represent. Moorland Crescent Menston and the High Royds area have never been part of Guiseley and have nothing to do with the town. Neither does Hawksworth village. These are separate areas and I believe will be amply represented by Aireborough Neighbourhood Development Forum. These areas are part of Aireborough, but most definitely not part of Guiseley. The historic and geographic boundary between Menston and Guiseley runs along Mire Beck, with a definite break between the two settlements defined by a corridor of green belt. I urge you to reconsider these inclusions.
266	26/11/2014	Elector	Y	I am in full support of a Guiseley Town Council. I feel this would greatly benefit the residents of Guiseley and should be implemented in line with other Parish Councils including Rawdon.

Community Governance Review - Proposed Guiseley Town Council Representation Log

<u>File Ref.</u>	<u>Date</u>	<u>Capacity</u>	<u>In Support?</u>	<u>Comments</u>
267	26/11/2014	Elector	N	<p>I have been made aware that there is a proposal for a Town Council to be formed in Guiseley.</p> <p>I wish to make my objection to this proposal.</p> <p>On the grounds that another layer of bureaucracy is unnecessary given that locally elected councillors of LCC will still have overriding powers in relations to the real problems of Guiseley, namely planning and highway management.</p> <p>I fail to see what benefit there will be to the residents of such a proposal.</p>
268	26/11/2014	Elector	N	Please place on record that my husband and myself are AGAINST the setting up of a Guiseley Town Council
269	26/11/2014	Elector	Y	Support for Guiseley Town Council
270	26/11/2014	Elector	N	Please note. I DO NOT agree with a Guiseley Town Council
271	26/11/2014	Elector	Y	Is in favour of Guiseley's proposed Town Council
272	26/11/2014	Elector	N	Pamela and I are against forming a Town Council here in Guiseley. We think that it is not necessary.
273	26/11/2014	Elector	Y	I am supporting the proposal for a town council
274	26/11/2014	Elector	Y	<p>I wish to make a representation to Leeds City Council regarding the proposed Guiseley Town Council.</p> <p>I feel it is a positive step for Guiseley to have a Town Council to focus specifically on Guiseley.</p> <p>A Town Council is a very local level of government and can promote the town within the wider area of Leeds. It can represent local interests and groups in the community and be a local voice.</p> <p>The Town Council would have a legal right to be consulted on planning matters, also it could provide small grants to specific community groups for say, environmental improvements.</p> <p>A Town Councillor would know the area and be able to make their views known to statutory authorities.</p> <p>Town Councils are the cheapest kind of local authority in existence. Funding does not come from a general government grant so they have every reason to keep spending low and accountable.</p>
275	26/11/2014	Elector	N	<p>I was one of the 1179 residents of Guiseley who signed the on-line petition. I have now changed my mind.</p> <p>The proposed Guiseley Town Council is not what the area needs. Its area of influence would be far too narrow for the needs of the locality. We need something which replicates the former Aireborough Urban District Council, which would represent Rawdon, Yeadon and Guiseley and outlying areas. It is pointless to take any one of these townships in isolation. They all suffer from being part of the A65 corridor, and would benefit from joint approaches to problems.</p> <p>In the meantime, the Neighbourhood Forum is serving the purpose.</p>
276	26/11/2014	Elector	N	Thinks it will not be effective, will decrease power and will see an increase in council tax.
277	26/11/2014	Elector	N	<p>I write to you in objection to the formation of a Town Council for Guiseley.</p> <p>Do we need a Town Council? I don't think so – we already have a Neighbourhood Forum and three very good Councillors in Wadsworth, Latty and Latty, who in the past have shown great interest in many matters concerning Guiseley. A Town Council would mean unnecessary duplication and additional cost to the residents of Guiseley.</p> <p>I am sure there are many people in Guiseley who knew nothing about the petition and the subsequent consultation. This is evident in the low percentage who signed the petition.</p> <p>I would ask you to think again very seriously before taking any action to create a Town Council for Guiseley.</p>

Community Governance Review - Proposed Guiseley Town Council Representation Log

<u>File Ref.</u>	<u>Date</u>	<u>Capacity</u>	<u>In Support?</u>	<u>Comments</u>
278	26/11/2014	Elector	N	<p>I have been recently informed by a neighbour of the proposal for a Town Council for Guiseley. This was the first I'd heard about this and was staggered to learn that 1179 signatories have apparently been obtained by David Bowe, 'Guiseley Town Council Coordinator'.</p> <p>I live on Silverdale Avenue and have done for ten years and am a daily user of the shops in Guiseley but have never been approached nor received any information regarding this proposal.</p> <p>I would have thought for this to be anything like a fair consultation then a communication of some sort should have been sent to every dwelling and business in Guiseley.</p> <p>I am perplexed by the thought of having to pay an additional charge and also by the possibility of having another, in my view completely unnecessary layer of bureaucracy in local government.</p> <p>I would be all for this if issues of planning and traffic management were to be the responsibility of a local town council but apparently they would remain with Leeds.</p>
279	26/11/2014	Elector	N	Not in favour of a Town Council for Guiseley
280	26/11/2014	Elector	Y	I signed the petition for a Guiseley Town council and wish to re-affirm my support that we, the people of Guiseley, seriously need our own Town Council. The area of Guiseley is becoming increasingly gridlocked, schools and medical practices totally overloaded and the whole infrastructure is on the brink of collapse! We have put up with a totally unacceptable rate of house building in the area for far too long and need to have a say in this regard. I feel our own Town Council will empower us in this regard.
281	26/11/2014	Elector	Y	<p>I would like to register my support for the formation of a Town Council in Guiseley. I believe that Guiseley needs to be able to put forward Guiseley resident's thoughts, hopes and fears for the future. We need to be heard.</p> <p>My thanks go to all the people who have been working so hard on his most important proposal.</p>
282	26/11/2014	Elector	N	Please note that I am AGAINST the formation of a Parish or Town Council for Guiseley
283	26/11/2014	Elector	Y	We both support the proposal for a Town Council in Guiseley
284	26/11/2014	Elector	Y	I am writing in support of the proposal to establish a town council in Guiseley.
285	26/11/2014	Elector	N	Would like a call due to lack of information. Town is not complete due to lots of new building so will not reflect the right people. Will increase Council Tax. Need meeting to explain this decision to residents due to lack of information. No benefit towards Guiseley
286	26/11/2014	Elector	Y	My reason for contacting you is I would like to put forward my support for a town council in Guiseley
287	26/11/2014	Elector	N	Objects to Town Council
288	26/11/2014	Elector	N	For a number of reasons, I am against the establishment of a Town Council for Guiseley

Community Governance Review - Proposed Guiseley Town Council Representation Log

<u>File Ref.</u>	<u>Date</u>	<u>Capacity</u>	<u>In Support?</u>	<u>Comments</u>
289	26/11/2014	Elector	N	<p>I am writing to you as I do not see the need for another layer of local government for Guiseley. Since the Aireborough Neighbourhood Development Forum was designated to come up with the Local Plan which is driven by consultation with the community, a town council seems redundant. The forum is non party political and there are no hidden agendas. It is evident by the letter I received today from the proposers of GTC that the council is already making derogatory political remarks and insinuating that the Forum is driven by the Tories. Their letter also fudges the issue of their precept, not mentioning that this will be added to our council tax and that a large chunk will be taken up with administration. A Neighbourhood Forum is driven by people who want the best for their area, listening to the views of the community, not party animals who spend their time scoring points off each other.</p> <p>One of the things that particularly concerns me is the process by which a town/parish council can be brought into being. It is quite easy to get 1100 signatures on a petition in favour. How many people declined to sign when approached? And what about the other 9000 or so? It is evident that the vast majority of people in Guiseley had no idea that a council was being proposed, the methods of informing them of the consultation period being totally inadequate. If this is democracy, why haven't the residents been properly informed and given their rightful opportunity to respond?</p>
290	26/11/2014	Elector	N	Do not want a Town Council
291	26/11/2014	Elector	Y	<p>. I have received your letter and am now writing to to support the proposal for a Guiseley Town Council, I have already registered my yes vote previously. I feel after dealing with councilor G. Latty on previously occasions that, he has no interest, no thoughts nor cares a damn about us here in Guiseley. I disagree whole heartedly with his views and opinions regarding a town council for us, I feel he lives in another world and should retire or step down to allow some one with our future interests at heart and not there own. As Laid out by David Bowes, I agree totally with his points 1 - 6 in his "Campaign for a Guiseley Town Council" Petition and can only give my full support for this.</p>
292	26/11/2014	Elector	N	<p>Please take this email as a formal objection to the forming of a Guiseley Town Council.</p> <p>However I would note that the Planning Approvals in terms of the huge amount of new build housing in the area, and the absolute SHOCKING traffic management needs urgent attention – the main road network grinds to a halt on the weekends now.</p>
293	26/11/2014	Elector	Y	I am sending this email to say that I am in favour of Guiseley having it's own town council
294	26/11/2014	Elector	N	I DO NOT agree with the proposal to create a town council for Guiseley
295	26/11/2014	Elector	Y	I have just received a leaflet from Guiseley and Rawdon Labour Party and would like to confirm that I support the idea of a town council for Guiseley.
296	26/11/2014	Elector	N	<p>Some time ago I signed a petition asking for the establishment of a Town Council for Guiseley. After due reflection, I realise that I was mistaken in my support and would, if possible, like my name to be removed from the petition.</p> <p>I would also ask to have my opposition to the establishment of Guiseley Town Council recorded. In the current climate I believe that the cost would far outweigh any benefits.</p>
297	26/11/2014	Elector	N	We wish to voice our disagreement to a town council for Guiseley. It seems to us that we are looked after very well by the Leeds City Council and that to have another body making similar decisions just stinks of a quango organisation. It is we believe totally unnecessary
298	26/11/2014	Elector	N	I declare I object to a Town Council for Guiseley as it would appear the cost to the electorate would not be justified.

Community Governance Review - Proposed Guiseley Town Council Representation Log

<u>File Ref.</u>	<u>Date</u>	<u>Capacity</u>	<u>In Support?</u>	<u>Comments</u>
299	26/11/2014	Elector	Y	I support the idea of a Guiseley Town Council.
300	26/11/2014	Elector	N	I wish to let you know that I do NOT support the proposal for a Town Council in Guiseley. It is another line of government that we can neither afford or want. There are far better ways of spending money locally than this.
301	26/11/2014	Elector	Y	I would like to support this proposal in the absence of any evidence that the council is seriously evaluating the impact of proposed development across Guiseley and Aireborough on local infrastructure and services. They are not listening to our voices on these matters.
302	26/11/2014	Elector	Y	Having given the formation of a town council for Guiseley some considerable thought, I feel it would be beneficial to the town and would support its creation. Despite the excellent efforts of the local councillors for Guiseley in the running of a Neighbourhood Forum, this appears to have little or no power to carry things out. Having had some very limited experience when I was on the local railway user group with Ilkley Parish Council, I discovered what they were able to do without referring every matter to Bradford Council first. (Incidentally is there any difference between a Parish and a Town Council?) I think Guiseley would benefit from a town council by becoming a more integrated unit. It has become largely a dormitory suburb of Leeds and many people like myself feel that we are simply a forgotten part of the city. Leeds appears to think of us as a building site and cannot cover our open spaces fast enough with houses. However it simply ignores the traffic grid lock this is now causing on the A65, even in off peak hours. The pressure on other local services is also increasing and we have little say in the matter. Unfortunately the introduction of a town council will mean a small increase in the council tax for the area, but I feel this will be well worth the benefits that will be gained. I would ask the General Purposes Committee to endorse the view of the 10% of the electorate who support its inception.
303	26/11/2014	Elector	Y	We would like to add our support for the creation of a Town Council in Guiseley. Over the last few years Guiseley has seen much housing development with apparently little thought being given to its infrastructure. Guiseley is now congested with traffic and there are insufficient school places for the local children. Local residents should have more of a say in planning and other issues in their local area and we believe that a Town Council is an inexpensive way of achieving this.
304	26/11/2014	Elector	Y	I am writing to you to express my support for the proposed Guiseley Town Council. Although I am new to the area (2 years) I have previously lived in an area that also had a town council and believe that town councils bring a significant benefit to the local area and its residents. Could you please keep me informed or advise how I can keep up to date with any progress of the proposed town council.
305	26/11/2014	Elector	Y	<p>I am writing to you today with regards to the current discussions taking place with regards to the forming of a Town Council for Guiseley.</p> <p>Having carefully taken the arguments of both sides into consideration, I would like to place on record my support for the proposal, on the grounds that it would provide an electable, accountable tier of local representation for the people of our township.</p> <p>Within the present scope of the role of Town Councils, I believe it would see many aspects of decision making devolved to the local population, and would go a long way to presenting many opportunities for Guiseley people to have a real say in the future of our town.</p> <p>I am 59, and have lived and worked in Guiseley all my life. I was born here, and I care about my town and want the best for it, and I believe that the introduction of a Town Council would provide an excellent opportunity for myself and many others to have a real say in the shaping of our community.</p>
306	26/11/2014	Elector	Y	I am in support of a Guiseley Town Council peopled with residents who are capable of looking after the needs of the population of Guiseley

Community Governance Review - Proposed Guiseley Town Council Representation Log

<u>File Ref.</u>	<u>Date</u>	<u>Capacity</u>	<u>In Support?</u>	<u>Comments</u>
307	26/11/2014	Elector	Y	I am writing to express my support for Guiseley to have its own Town Council I feel there are many local issues such as planning, amenities etc that would be far better served by a local council that has better knowledge of the community and has ties locally
308	26/11/2014	Elector	N	I do not want a Town Council for Guiseley.
309	26/11/2014	Elector	Y	We wish to register our support for the proposal of a Town Council for Guiseley. Not only would it provide a forum for the expression of opinions on a variety of matters of direct concern to residents of the district, but it would provide the means for local citizens to have the means to be consulted on planning applications, of vital concern in an area surrounded by green-belt land –in a sense the “lungs” of the community. Please add our names to any register of interested/concerned residents.
310	26/11/2014	Elector	Y	I would like to put my name forward as a supporter of the proposal for a Guiseley Town Council. A Town Council is the most local level of government . It has an important role in promoting the town, representing its interests and supporting the work of different groups in the community. Town Councils listen to options and act as a voice of local residents.
311	26/11/2014	Elector	N	I am a resident of Guiseley and run several community events in and around the area. I would like to register my strong opposition to a Town Council for Guiseley. It seems awfully profligate to impose a precept funded layer of bureaucracy on an electorate of around 11000 people in such constrained times. I am in favour of the current Development Forum. I hope the issue is not proving to be too much of a headache for you. All the best
312	26/11/2014	Elector	N	I am a resident of Guiseley and run several community events in and around the area. I would like to register my strong opposition to a Town Council for Guiseley. It seems awfully profligate to impose a precept funded layer of bureaucracy on an electorate of around 11000 people in such constrained times. I am in favour of the current Development Forum. I hope the issue is not proving to be too much of a headache for you. All the best
313	26/11/2014	Elector	Y	Hi my wife and I would like to make representation that a Town Council in Guiseley would be advantageous and cost effective for the Guiseley residents
314	26/11/2014	Elector	Y	My wife and I have been following the debate about a possible town council for Guiseley and Yeadon. We are long standing residents of Guiseley and have seen many changes to the area, in particular the developments in housing provision. I do believe that these developments are a natural process and needed providing the infrastructure matches the progress. There are certainly difficulties with parking and school provision in the area along with traffic congestion in and around the green with traffic backing up almost to the Whitecross on Fridays and Saturdays. I feel we, as a community, need to have some say in the decision process that will affect the area. We wish to add our support in establishing a Guiseley and Yeadon town council.
315	26/11/2014	Elector	Y	I support the proposal for Guiseley Town Council

Community Governance Review - Proposed Guiseley Town Council Representation Log

<u>File Ref.</u>	<u>Date</u>	<u>Capacity</u>	<u>In Support?</u>	<u>Comments</u>
316	26/11/2014	Elector	N	<p>I am writing to you with concerns about the area Guiseley Town Council hopes to represent.</p> <p>Moorland Crescent Menston and High Royds area have never been part of Guiseley and have nothing to do with the Town. Neither does Hawksworth village.</p> <p>These are separate areas and I believe will be amply represented by Aireborough Neighbourhood Development Forum. These areas are part of Aireborough, but most definitely not part of Guiseley.</p> <p>The historic and geographic boundary between Menston and Guiseley runs along Mire Beck, with a definite break between the two settlements defined by a corridor of green belt.</p> <p>I would also like you to note that I moved to Menston as it is a more affluent area. I believe being part of Guiseley Town will downgrade the area and not be as prosperous as it currently stands.</p> <p>I urge you to reconsider these inclusions.</p>
317	26/11/2014	Elector	Y	I have lived in Guiseley for 40 years and I am totally in favour for a Guiseley town council.
318	27/11/2014	Elector	Y	<p>While I am largely in favour of local governance, I'd like to comment on recent communications and plans for a Guiseley Town Council.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The area for the Guiseley town council takes in a lot of areas not previously counted as Guiseley. Of particular concern is that the Mire Beck area of Menston has been included (including our street, which is clearly classed as Menston). The green fields along the length of Mire Beck have long since been regarded as a Green Belt area between Guiseley and Menston. Including this area in the proposal adds doubt to the future of that Green Belt, and in my view makes it easier for future developers to claim that this historical and important boundary does not really exist, and gain planning for development. I think it is in the interest of the future of Guiseley and Menston for the boundary for the Guiseley Town Council to exclude the Mire Beck area (GRB and GRA on the published map). • The consultation period (5 weeks, compared to 6 weeks for a single storey house extension) is not long enough for people to become properly informed and take action if they so wish. A proper debate has not taken place, and the consultation period should be much longer. • I strongly object to the recent communication which was mailed on council headed paper pushing an agenda which was clearly a personal and Conservative party view on the matter. I strongly object to council funds being used to publish such a one sided view of such an important matter and as such I think it will lead to a distorted discussion on this matter. The consultation period should be restarted, and better publicity and clearer, more impartial material should be available for public consumption. A public debate held in Guiseley would be welcome. • It is difficult to find the relevant details on the leeds.gov.uk website – for example, searching for Guiseley in the Newsroom does not bring back anything related to this consultation – just two old documents. I found my references and a link to the map on http://www.aireboroughnf.com/. • Because of the issues above with the proposal and the consultation, I don't think the Guiseley Town Council in its current form is suitable for approval and cannot accurately represent the interests of the people of the concerned area.
319	27/11/2014	Elector	Y	I would like to re iterate my vote for a local parish council for Guiseley.

Community Governance Review - Proposed Guiseley Town Council Representation Log

<u>File Ref.</u>	<u>Date</u>	<u>Capacity</u>	<u>In Support?</u>	<u>Comments</u>
320	27/11/2014	Elector	Y	<p>I wish to make a representation to Leeds City Council concerning the formation of a Town Council for Guiseley.</p> <p>I would support the creation of a town council for the following reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. A town council would be the most responsive and representative body for the people of Guiseley. 2. The town council would be cheap and unbureaucratic 3. The CIL will go some way to compensating the citizens of Guiseley for the high, and disruptive, levels of development in the area. The monies can be used for the benefit of the whole community. 4. The town council would finally give a voice to the people, a voice that is often side-lined and ignored.
321	27/11/2014	Elector	N	<p>I am writing to object to the creation of a Town Council for Guiseley. I understand that a number of the electorate at least 1179 just over 10% of the Electorate of Guiseley have signed a petition requesting Leeds City Council to proceed in setting a Town Council and that it has taken quite some time to reach that figure which seems to show that there is an indication of a lack of enthusiasm for the formation of a T C. I also understand that the proposed area for the T C is far greater than Guiseley when High Royds, Hawksworth and parts of Menston in included in the T C population are included. The Proposer stresses the local element being the core of the Objectives but the layer of Administration with the resulting additional costs to the Residents and Ratepayers is unjustified in these times. Also there has been very little publicity surrounding the Proposal so that a lot of Residents have been unaware of what has been going on which is rather undemocratic and unacceptable</p>
322	27/11/2014	Elector	Y	<p>I am writing to register my support to the proposal that Guiseley gets its own Town Council. Guiseley is an ever increasing town that seems to be very low down on the Leeds City Council agenda and as such I feel we would benefit by making some of our own decisions locally.</p>
323	27/11/2014	Elector	Y	<p>I am writing in support of Guiseley having its own Town Council for the following reasons:-</p> <p>It would have a legal right to be consulted on planning matters and provide a meaningful voice to the residents of Guiseley.</p> <p>Secondly, Government 'CIL' money should be allocated to a body that is accountable to the electorate via the ballot box.</p>
324	27/11/2014	Elector	N	<p>I write to inform you of my opposition to setting up a Town Council for Guiseley. I believe it is another unnecessary layer of bureaucracy which will cost the residents more Council tax for very little return.</p>
325	27/11/2014	Elector	N	<p>Doesn't see any point in a Town council as they would not be able to influence issues that the people of Guiseley care about such as planning and traffic.</p>
326	27/11/2014	Elector	N	<p>Given that, in my view, the creation of a Town Council for Guiseley would appear to serve no real useful purpose, I DO NOT support the proposal for a Town Council.</p>
327	27/11/2014	Elector	Y	<p>I would like to add my support for Guiseley to have its own town council.</p>
328	27/11/2014	Elector	Y	<p>We wish to register our support for the proposal of a Town Council for Guiseley. Not only would it provide a forum for the expression of opinions on a variety of matters of direct concern to residents of the district, but it would provide the means for local citizens to have the means to be consulted on planning applications, of vital concern in an area surrounded by green-belt land –in a sense the “lungs” of the community. Please add our names to any register of interested/concerned residents.</p>
329	27/11/2014	Elector	N	<p>Given that, in my opinion, the creation of a Town Council for Guiseley would appear to serve no useful purpose, I DO NOT support the proposal for a Town Council for Guiseley.</p>
330	27/11/2014	Elector	Y	<p>As a resident of the area concerned, I would like to register my support for the establishment of a Guiseley Town Council.</p>
331	27/11/2014	Elector	Y	<p>Myself and my partner would like to express our support of a town council for Guiseley</p>

Community Governance Review - Proposed Guiseley Town Council Representation Log

<u>File Ref.</u>	<u>Date</u>	<u>Capacity</u>	<u>In Support?</u>	<u>Comments</u>
332	27/11/2014	Elector	Y	In response to the letter signed by Paul Truswell, David Bowe and Jamie Hanlie dated this month, I would like to give my support to the proposal to form a Guiseley Town Council.
333	27/11/2014	Elector	Y	I fully support the proposal for a local Town Council
334	27/11/2014	Elector	Y	I support the need for a Town Council in Guiseley. I have signed a petition and hope that by having our own local council our needs will be better looked after, rather than as a part of Leeds. Also I have real concerns about the amount of homes been built in Guiseley and local areas which means Guiseley is gridlocked.
335	27/11/2014	Elector	Y	Support for Guiseley Town Council
336	27/11/2014	Elector	Y	<p>I would like to register my support for the proposal for a Guiseley Town Council, mainly for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Guiseley has recently been subjected to an unfair amount of residential building; planners and builders have not been made to consider local objections and make appropriate changes to their plans. This is having a negative impact on the local infrastructure and the wider area; • A Town Council would have a legal right to be consulted on all planning matters; • As a result of Government planning policies, developers will have to pay a 'Community Infrastructure Levy' which would then be allocated and benefit local communities such as Guiseley.
337	27/11/2014	Elector	Y	<p>I would like to express my support for the proposal to create a Guiseley Town Council. It cannot have escaped the majority of people in the county (and country) that the Scottish Independence movement has highlighted the democratic deficit that exists in the regions with respect to London and furthermore at the local level. While I appreciate the process of decentralization should only go so far, it is clear that at the moment far too much power is held centrally either with respect to London, or with respect to local government in Leeds.</p> <p>I'm sure you agree that it is time that Leeds had a greater decision over how the tax receipts raised in our city/surrounds are spent and furthermore how local people should have a greater say in how the taxes are spent in their towns. After all, individual towns have individual priorities to be focused on. There is no greater issue in Guiseley at the moment than traffic congestion, a problem which affects all of Leeds (at one time we were promised a tram system in the city and all we got was a glorified bus lane!). Although the creation of a town council may not be able to solve this problem individually it will allow ideas and opinion to be shared at a local level and to feed these back into the city itself.</p> <p>I personally feel disconnected from the governance of Guiseley and Leeds; the only time I have say is during an election which gives me limited input into how things are actually run above an ideological level. The creation of a town council will allow local people a much clearer say in how things are run and providing it is rigorously audited financially, can empower local people into shaping their town.</p>
338	27/11/2014	Elector	N	<p>I am writing to you with concerns about the area Guiseley Town Council hopes to represent.</p> <p>Moorland Crescent, Menston and the High Royds area have never been part of Guiseley and have nothing to do with the town. Neither does Hawksworth Village. These are separate areas and I believe will be amply represented by Aireborough Neighbourhood Development Forum. These areas are part of Aireborough, but most definitely not part of Guiseley. The historic and geographic boundary between Menston and Guiseley runs along Mire Beck, with a definite break between the two settlements defined by a corridor of green belt. I urge you to reconsider these inclusions.</p>

Community Governance Review - Proposed Guiseley Town Council Representation Log

<u>File Ref.</u>	<u>Date</u>	<u>Capacity</u>	<u>In Support?</u>	<u>Comments</u>
339	27/11/2014	Elector	Y	<p>I strongly support this proposal , and think that it reflects the growing trend to localism, with local people taking control of where they live in a democratic manner. Clearly there is a strong need for the people of Guiseley to control their own affairs and not have things imposed on them by Central and so called local government, which is really regional government far removed from the people.</p> <p>With this view in mind I am very dismayed at LCC's view that a local referendum cannot be attached to next year general election , as whilst a strong supporter would dearly have liked to see far greater mandate and support from the local populous which I believe such would have provided. I believe the great influence on this referendum was cost estimated by LCC at £40K. It would be interesting to have publicly available how that cost was arrived at. I also believe that the only real consultation could be only be referendum as the present one is quit hidden , being only officially advertised in Council establishments, I would have liked to see at at least bill board space for I about the area.</p>
340	27/11/2014	Elector	Y	<p>As a resident I was all in favour of Councillor Latty and his push for a town council for Guiseley, however a recent letter from the Guiseley & Rawdon Labour party has drawn my attention to the fact that Councillor Latty has now changed his tune.</p> <p>This is a significant concern to me and my wife.</p> <p>Please take this email as my support for a Town Council in Guiseley.</p>
341	27/11/2014	Elector	Y	I support the need for a Guiseley town council.
342	27/11/2014	Elector	N	<p>No No No No</p> <p>The main reason we would have wanted a Town Council has been negated as it was primarily to have a say and to do something about the Traffic and Planning matters which are leaving this area continually gridlocked with no consideration in regard to new housing -- the cars from which are blocking the streets by parking both sides throughout the area -- along with people using the Trains and Buses leaving their cars in all the surrounding streets during the daytime and also blocking up Supermarket and Retail parking at all times.</p> <p>Why not consider taking out calming measures on Queensway and making it One way with Leeds- Ilkley Road the other way with intermediate streets one way between the two i.e. a Giant Roundabout system.</p>
343	27/11/2014	Elector	Y	I am writing to you because I am keen to have a Town Council for Guiseley and would be pleased if you would add our names to the list of people for this proposition.
344	27/11/2014	Elector	Y	Please can you take this as my support for the proposal by Guiseley & Rawdon Labour Party for the forming of a town council for Guiseley and Rawdon.
345	27/11/2014	Elector	Y	Given there are already many town or parish councils within Leeds MDC, I support the idea for Guiseley

Community Governance Review - Proposed Guiseley Town Council Representation Log

<u>File Ref.</u>	<u>Date</u>	<u>Capacity</u>	<u>In Support?</u>	<u>Comments</u>
346	27/11/2014	Elector	Y	<p>We are surprised to learn there has been some opposition to the formation of a Town Council for Guiseley. We signed the petition in support of the proposal for a Town Council here and would like to confirm we still support that proposal.</p> <p>We have lived here for 11 years and in that time have seen significant changes in population due to house building, with changes in retail and the corresponding heavy traffic as retail parks have grown – and are now watching what will happen with the local schools, in particular the proposed expansion of Guiseley Infants. Guiseley has a strong community base with leisure and sports facilities, a theatre and the guide and scout huts, not forgetting its own Summer Fair and the great sense of togetherness at the memorial each Remembrance Sunday - but it could be in danger of being 'swallowed up' by Leeds. A Town Council would best serve the needs of the local community and have a higher awareness of the most appropriate way to use any funds and grants available. For Guiseley to have a future where residents' needs are properly considered and where there are opportunities for children, the elderly and adults alike, it would make sense for local people to be elected by the residents to run Guiseley's own council and to take us forward as we continue to deal with social, economic and environmental changes in our area.</p> <p>Thank you for taking the time to read this – we look forward to seeing the review progress.</p>
347	27/11/2014	Elector	Y	<p>I wish to raise a few points in support of a Town Council for Guiseley:</p> <p>As a result of Government planning policies, developers will have to pay a "Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL)." This could run into tens of thousands of pounds, some of which will be allocated to local communities like Guiseley. We believe this CIL money should be allocated to a body that is accountable to the electorate via the ballot box.</p> <p>A Town Council is the most local level of government. It has an important role in promoting the town, representing its interests and supporting the work of different groups in the community.</p> <p>Town Councils listen to local opinion and act as a voice of local residents.</p> <p>They can provide grants to local community groups for a whole range of activities. Some also provide support for local priorities like extra policing and environmental improvements.</p> <p>A Town Council would also have a legal right to be consulted on planning matters.</p> <p>Town Councillors know the area and can (and increasingly often do) represent their views to other authorities like the District or County Council, Health Authorities, Police and Fire Authorities.</p> <p>Town Councils are the most unbureaucratic and cheapest kind of local authority in existence.</p> <p>Their funds are the smallest part of the Council Tax and they do not receive a general government grant. So they have every incentive to keep expenditure low and be economical.</p> <p>The accounts are strictly and independently audited every year.</p>
348	27/11/2014	Elector	Y	<p>I live on in polling district GRC with my husband. Both myself and my husband are strongly in favour of Guiseley forming a town council.</p> <p>I feel this would provide an official voice, at a level that can be easily accessed for local residents. I feel it is especially important given the massive growth Guiseley has experienced in the last decade. The subsequent issues following on from this growth requires a town council to assist in addressing them.</p>
349	27/11/2014	Elector	Y	Please add my name to the list of supporters for the proposed Guiseley Town Council.

Community Governance Review - Proposed Guiseley Town Council Representation Log

<u>File Ref.</u>	<u>Date</u>	<u>Capacity</u>	<u>In Support?</u>	<u>Comments</u>
350	27/11/2014	Elector	Y	<p>I understand that you are wanting residents opinions regards the proposed town council for Guiseley.</p> <p>Both myself and my husband are in favour of the proposal. I believe that due to the rapid growth Guiseley has experienced in recent years, a council would provide a platform at a local level from which residents can have issues addressed.</p> <p>Please note both myself and my husband as supporting the proposed town council.</p>
351	27/11/2014	Elector	N	<p>I declare I object to Town Council for Guiseley as it would appear the cost to the electorate would not be justified.</p>
352	27/11/2014	Elector	N	<p>I DO NOT WANT A GUISELEY COUNCIL.</p> <p>The boundaries are wrong. Guiseley does not extend beyond the Mire Beck. Moorland Crescent, Menston and the High Royds area are not and have never been part of Guiseley. Neither is Hawksworth village.</p> <p>I moved here 44 years ago, when Guiseley was part of the West Riding and not of Leeds, and a self-managing unit, without all these added layers.</p> <p>The Aireborough Neighbourhood Development Forum is all we need. Another level of control merely adds to the time for actions to be carried out, the cost and more individuals slowing things down.</p> <p>Please reconsider your proposal.</p>
353	27/11/2014	Elector	Y	<p>I support the proposal that Guiseley should have a Town Council. It is totally unacceptable that Guiseley should be denied on the say-so of the Conservatives. I have never received a letter from Councillor Latty explaining his objections.</p> <p>We need people to have a real interest in local government, and representatives who take the trouble to engage with the electorate. We do not know what they are about, or hear much of their activities on our behalf. Presumably the Tories are just following a party line, on the "one size fits all" principle.</p> <p>I received this urgent appeal yesterday, which hardly gives time to make a considered response.</p>
354	27/11/2014	Elector	Y	<p>I am contacting you in your capacity as Electoral Services Manager of the Electoral Services Division at Leeds City Council.</p> <p>I am a local government elector living within the neighbourhood of Guiseley, part of the ward of Guiseley and Rawdon comprised of all of the town of Guiseley and that part of LS29 included in the Ward, bounded by Yeadon and Menston.</p> <p>I am writing to inform you that I support having a town council for Guiseley.</p>

Community Governance Review - Proposed Guiseley Town Council Representation Log

<u>File Ref.</u>	<u>Date</u>	<u>Capacity</u>	<u>In Support?</u>	<u>Comments</u>
355	27/11/2014	Elector	Y	<p>A proposed Town/Parish Council for Guiseley is something which I previously supported - it all went quiet. It is something which I then raised with local councillors whilst working as a member of the Tranmere Park Design Group, a few years ago. I recall my question was met by stony silence. The existence of a town/parish council would have facilitated the completion of our 'community consultation' task within a shorter timescale and freed up the resource of the three local councillors to undertake further good work in Aireborough.</p> <p>I also recall that our local councillors turned down the offer from the High Royds developer, Raven, to consult with the Guiseley community over this major housing redevelopment in the Green Belt. The first offer was readily grasped by Menston Community Association and following several requests from Guiseley people, a partial, belated and hasty consultation was organised by Councillor Latty. It is sad that the residents of Guiseley were overlooked when if anything, the impact of the development is surely greater on Guiseley than Menston ?</p> <p>Councillor Latty has undertaken much good work in the Guiseley community aided by key individuals with no political agenda to promote. Surely the beauty of a Parish Council is that it comprises local people with local knowledge and no party politics. Leeds already has 32 town/parish councils and one more for Guiseley Town would place the township on an equal footing with other communities in competing for district wide resources and representing its community. I believe these individual neighbourhoods have been able to draw upon greater political support, financial resources, and input from Leeds City Council staff as an indirect result of town/parish council status eg preparation of Kippax Neighbourhood Design Statement. As it is Guiseley, Yeadon and Rawdon are lumped together as Aireborough. Rawdon now has its own parish council and yet with suburban sprawl, it is difficult to distinguish its boundaries from Yeadon.</p> <p>Guiseley has a stronger identity on the ground than both Rawdon and Yeadon despite the major commercial and residential redevelopments that have taken place since 1974. Whilst I commend the input of local residents into the neighbourhood planning process, it has always struck me that Aireborough is an unwieldy area to study in depth and promote a neighbourhood plan for. I can recall an Aireborough Planning document promoted by Leeds City Council in the early 1980s which stated that there would be no more housing development in the A65 corridor - how wrong this has proved to be.</p> <p>Aireborough is made up of a diverse range of communities and whilst I have no objection to the ANDF as a vehicle for preparing a neighbourhood plan under The Localism Act, surely a town/parish council as a democratic body could work with ANDF, Councillor Latty and other local groups and stakeholders on a range of local issues and not just planning matters ?</p> <p>I support the concept of a town/parish council for Guiseley.</p> <p>I do feel that the consultation has been poorly resourced by the City Council and that wider discussion with all sectors of the Guiseley community is called for.</p>
356	27/11/2014	Elector	Y	<p>I am writing to you on behalf of myself, Helen Ann Adams, to express my support for the establishment of a Town Council in the parish of Guiseley.</p> <p>I would support the establishment of a Town Council boundaries proposed by the petitioners along with the electoral arrangements (i.e. polling districts, and number of Councillors) also proposed by the petitioners.</p> <p>I believe that the establishment of a Town Council would serve a vital vote for the area of Guiseley which Guiseley is increasingly in need of.</p> <p>The promotion and representation of the best interests of Guiseley to other authorities like the City Council, Health Authorities, Police and Fire Authorities is increasingly important. This is best done by town councillors who know the area, who listen to local opinion and can act as a voice of local residents.</p> <p>The Town Council would also have a legal right to be consulted on planning matters, something we see as becoming increasingly important.</p> <p>Town Councils are the most non-bureaucratic and cheapest kind of local authority in existence. Their funds are the smallest part of the Council Tax and they do not receive a general government grant. So they have every incentive to keep expenditure low and be economical. Their accounts are strictly and independently audited every year.</p> <p>I therefore believe that monies coming from the new Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) in Guiseley should be allocated to the Guiseley Town Council. A body that is accountable to the electorate via the ballot box.</p> <p>I hope that you will be able to confirm to me that the proposal for a Town Council in Guiseley will go forward as quickly as possible.</p>

Community Governance Review - Proposed Guiseley Town Council Representation Log

<u>File Ref.</u>	<u>Date</u>	<u>Capacity</u>	<u>In Support?</u>	<u>Comments</u>
357	27/11/2014	Elector	Y	<p>I am writing to you on behalf of myself, Stephen Hugh Adams, to express my support for the establishment of a Town Council in the parish of Guiseley.</p> <p>I would support the establishment of a Town Council boundaries proposed by the petitioners along with the electoral arrangements (i.e. polling districts, and number of Councillors) also proposed by the petitioners.</p> <p>I believe that the establishment of a Town Council would serve a vital vote for the area of Guiseley which Guiseley is increasingly in need of.</p> <p>The promotion and representation of the best interests of Guiseley to other authorities like the City Council, Health Authorities, Police and Fire Authorities is increasingly important. This is best done by town councillors who know the area, who listen to local opinion and can act as a voice of local residents.</p> <p>The Town Council would also have a legal right to be consulted on planning matters, something we see as becoming increasingly important.</p> <p>Town Councils are the most non-bureaucratic and cheapest kind of local authority in existence. Their funds are the smallest part of the Council Tax and they do not receive a general government grant. So they have every incentive to keep expenditure low and be economical. Their accounts are strictly and independently audited every year.</p> <p>I therefore believe that monies coming from the new Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) in Guiseley should be allocated to the Guiseley Town Council. A body that is accountable to the electorate via the ballot box.</p> <p>I hope that you will be able to confirm to me that the proposal for a Town Council in Guiseley will go forward as quickly as possible.</p>
358	27/11/2014	Elector	N	<p>Please note that I am against the establishment of a town council in Guiseley. I feel that such a council would have very little power and lead to an increase in council tax. However, I do feel that the people of Guiseley and surrounding areas need to have their views with regard to the planning of housing and infrastructure taken far more into account. Lack of wise planning has led to immense problems in these areas.</p>
359	27/11/2014	Elector	N	<p>Thanks to a couple of letters shoved through my letterbox, I have discovered that there is a consultation taking place regarding a Guiseley Town Council. Apparently "LCC says that all electors will be consulted on the proposal and their views will be taken into account as part of the review." – not sure how I missed the correspondence?</p> <p>If the people of Guiseley, as it stands now, wish to have a town council then fine. I don't live in Guiseley – hardly right that I should be against it. My BIG issue is, having looked at the maps I eventually found online, it appears someone thinks Moorland Crescent Menston, Hawksworth village, Hawksworth Moor and High Royds area (where I live) is part of Guiseley. It isn't and never has been.</p> <p>These are separate areas and I believe they are amply represented by the Aireborough Neighbourhood Development Forum. These areas are part of Aireborough, but most definitely not part of Guiseley. The historic and geographic boundary between Menston and Guiseley runs along Mire Beck, with a definite break between the two settlements defined by a corridor of green belt.</p> <p>I made a conscious decision to buy a house in Menston, not Guiseley. I did not, and still don't, want to live in Guiseley. I do not understand why there appears to be a 'land grab' taking place or, given the Conservative v Labour 'campaigns', why this now appears to be a very politically motivated decision rather than about the views and benefits to the people in Guiseley? And what is wrong with the current town, as it is defined, having a town council?</p> <p>Therefore I request you please reconsider the inclusion of the areas I've mentioned above. I don't want to be part of this Town Council.</p>

Community Governance Review - Proposed Guiseley Town Council Representation Log

<u>File Ref.</u>	<u>Date</u>	<u>Capacity</u>	<u>In Support?</u>	<u>Comments</u>
360	27/11/2014	Elector	Y	<p>I am writing to express my support for the creation of a town council for Guiseley. I feel that a town council would aid development in Guiseley and help to improve our public services by use of the CIL by local people who are representatives of our town.</p> <p>As a volunteer at a locally run group for disabled people I think a town council would be beneficial for community groups like ours, allowing us to apply for funding on a more local level and be more involved in the decisions that are made.</p> <p>Please accept my apologies for being so late to register my support,</p>
361	27/11/2014	Elector	Y	We are contacting you to express our support for the proposal to create a town council for Guiseley and Menston.
362	27/11/2014	Elector	N	<p>I am writing to you as Electoral Services Manager to express my concerns about the proposed Guiseley Town Council and the area which it is intended to represent. I understand that this includes the area of High Royds and Moorland Crescent, Menston.</p> <p>Moorland Crescent and the High Royds area have never been part of Guiseley and have nothing to do with the town. These are separate areas, both of which I believe will be amply represented by the Aireborough Neighbourhood Development Forum. These areas are all part of Aireborough, but both High Royds and Moorland Crescent are most definitely not part of Guiseley. The historic and geographic boundary between Menston and Guiseley runs along Mire Beck, with a definite break between the two settlements defined by a corridor of green belt.</p> <p>I do not know whether the Parish boundary has any bearing on this issue, but High Royds and Moorland Crescent are part of St John's Menston, which does not reach as far as Guiseley.</p> <p>I believe that the increased costs associated with the creation of a Town Council at a time of restricted budgets, at both Council and domestic level, cannot be justified. Local voice, representation and democracy is more than adequately satisfied through Ward Councillors and the Aireborough Neighbourhood Development Forum.</p> <p>In any event I oppose the proposal.</p> <p>I urge you to reconsider this proposal and the inclusion of High Royds and Moorland Crescent.</p>
363	28/11/2014	Elector	Y	<p>Please be advised that I support the proposal for the creation of an elected Guiseley Town.Council providing the most local level of local government.</p> <p>The Town Council representing the Guiseley residents would have a legal right to be consulted on planning issues.</p> <p>As a result of government planning policies, developers will have to pay a Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL), this money should be accountable to the Town Council for the benefit of Guiseley community groups .</p>
364	28/11/2014	Elector	Y	Please register our support for a town council as a resident of Guiseley, thank you.
365	28/11/2014	Elector	Y	I hope it's not too late, but I wish to support the proposal for a Guiseley Town Council. I feel that this will be an asset to the democratic processes, and provide a useful function in providing a local voice.

Community Governance Review - Proposed Guiseley Town Council Representation Log

<u>File Ref.</u>	<u>Date</u>	<u>Capacity</u>	<u>In Support?</u>	<u>Comments</u>
366	28/11/2014	Elector	N	<p>I'm emailing with regard to the Guiseley town council consultation to give my input as a local resident. I am also a senior lecturer in geography and planning at Leeds Beckett University and a member of Aireborough Neighbourhood Development Forum.</p> <p>I do not think Guiseley needs a town council. Recent shifts have been towards to opening out of decision making, with more inclusive and open structures such as neighbourhood forums. Whilst not without their own problems, these give a broader spectrum of people a chance to have their voice heard. They encourage communication and decision making within the local community. Aireborough Neighbourhood Development Forum is currently doing great forward looking work which is of great benefit to the area. The addition of a town council risks a duplication of effort and a conflict over decision making. A town council operates in a more outdated way, with voices filtered by representatives. Given the low turn out at all elections, these representatives are likely to be elected with limited support from the local community, and given the experiences of other such councils may not even need any election if enough people cannot be found to contest the places. This is an outdated way of ensuring local democracy, particularly given the well-functioning structures already in place.</p>
367	28/11/2014	Elector	N	Wish to register their objection to the proposal due to the extra financial charge and increased level of bureaucracy.
368	28/11/2014	Elector	N	<p>We are writing to protest in the strongest terms against the above proposal. It is not necessarily that we are against the proposals per se, but we are conscious that they could result in yet another layer of local government with all the additional expenses that this would incur for little or no extra benefit. To guard against this, and in view of the the magnitude of the proposals, its advocates should put forward convincing arguments for their case for debate and discussion. This as far as we know has not been done, and if it has the results have not been widely publicised.</p> <p>It is not as though there is a major level of dissatisfaction with our existing local government - at least as far as we are concerned. That is not to say that we are perfectly happy with the status quo but neither are we convinced that another layer of local government would improve the situation. Indeed, this residual dissatisfaction could be part of the necessary compromise between the pursuit of parochial interests an the interests of the community at large.</p>
369	28/11/2014	Elector	Y	Please can I register my support for a Guiseley town council. Thank you.

Community Governance Review - Proposed Guiseley Town Council Representation Log

<u>File Ref.</u>	<u>Date</u>	<u>Capacity</u>	<u>In Support?</u>	<u>Comments</u>
370	28/11/2014	Elector	N	<p>I'm hoping I have the correct contact for representations for the consultation in to the proposal for a Town Council in Guiseley?</p> <p>I'd like to record that as a resident of Guiseley I am not in favour for the establishment of the council. My reasons for objecting are that I believe through the Aireborough Neighbourhood Form we have sufficient representation locally to address concerns in the area. Specifically in recent years the problem of over development in the area has become a critical issue which has had real impact to local services such as schools, doctors and dentists. The Aireborough Neighbourhood Form is working with our local councillors and local bodies to establish the Neighbourhood Development Plan which hopes to address these issues and I'm simply unclear on what benefit a Town Council could bring that the Aireborough Neighbourhood Form is not already doing?</p> <p>I'm also concerned that in Guiseley the amount of engagement from the electorate is low. Look at the turn out for local council elections (38.8% of the total available electorate*1) and the Police and Crime Commissioner (13.3%of the total available electorate*2) and I feel that a town council would be elected without the mandate of the majority of the Guiseley residents. I understand that the petition lodged to the council to begin this process had approximately 1179 signatures from a potential electorate of 11039*3 .</p> <p>Finally, it's not clear on the financial implications on local residents with regards to council tax. Given the lack of apparent engagement I feel it would be unfair for a levy to be placed on council tax to finance the Town Council when the majority of Guiseley residents have not actually engaged in this process and or voted for the establishment of the Town Council.</p> <p>If you could confirm that these views will be included with other feedback relating to this process it will be appreciated.</p>
371	28/11/2014	Elector	Y	I wish to support the proposal that there should be a Guiseley Town Council. We used to have one, and it used to work.
372	28/11/2014	Elector	Y	As a resident of Guiseley I wish to state my support for a Town council as I believe CIL should be subject to democratic accountability.
373	28/11/2014	Elector	Y	We are in favour of a Guiseley Town Council
374	28/11/2014	Elector	Y	<p>I am writing to support the proposal to establish a Town Council for Guiseley.</p> <p>I have been impressed by the work done by the nearby Otley Town Council and feel such a Council will be able to foster a strong community identity for Guiseley. The voluntary work of it's members will enable the Elected Ward Councillors to concentrate their time on strategic issues in the Ward and across the City.</p> <p>I am writing to support the proposal to establish a Town Council for Guiseley.</p> <p>I have been impressed by the work done by the nearby Otley Town Council and feel such a Council will be able to foster a strong community identity for Guiseley. The voluntary work of it's members will enable the Elected Ward Councillors to concentrate their time on strategic issues in the Ward and across the City.</p>
375	28/11/2014	Elector	Y	Can I please add my name and my husband's to the list of people in support of Guiseley Town Council.

Community Governance Review - Proposed Guiseley Town Council Representation Log

<u>File Ref.</u>	<u>Date</u>	<u>Capacity</u>	<u>In Support?</u>	<u>Comments</u>
376	28/11/2014	Elector	Y	<p>I am writing in support of the proposal to establish a Guiseley Town Council. Previously I have lived in places with town and parish councils, and they have been a constructive way to deal with local questions and needs locally, either by councillors dealing with matters themselves (local facilities such as playgrounds, war memorials, and so on), or by advising other bodies such as city/district councils, health trusts, etc.</p> <p>As a growing town Guiseley is facing the consequences of that growth, both good and bad, and a town council is a democratic forum which can help resolve these questions. I understand that Guiseley has just over 11,000 electors; most places with parish and town councils in England probably have fewer, so its size shouldn't preclude it having its own council.</p>
377	28/11/2014	Aireborough Neighbourhood Development Forum	N	<p>Aireborough Neighbourhood Development Forum is writing to you regarding the Local Governance Review for a Guiseley Town Council, that you are currently conducting under the Local Government and Public Involvement in Health Act 2007. We note that the Act says at Part 4 Chapter 3 Section 93 that "The principal council must consult the following (a) the local government electors for the area under review; (b) any other person or body (including a local authority) which appears to the principal council to have an interest in the review. Therefore, we presume that you will be contacting the Forum directly under part (b) to consult with our members. This is particularly relevant as we note in the Government Guidance¹ it says that 'Principal Councils must consider other 'non-parished forms of community governance when conducting a review as these may be seen as an alternative or stages towards the establishment of a Parish Council' We particularly mention this for two reasons, firstly the Neighbourhood Forum has been set up to facilitate better stakeholder involvement in the area and thus we consider ourselves to be a step on the way to helping the local community decided on the form of governance they desire. Secondly, we have looked very carefully at the thorny issue of the area of governance, and have the evidence that led to the decision to form an Aireborough Forum, rather than separate township forums. We have discussed both these points with Mr Chris Pilkington, Deputy Chief Officer, of Yorkshire Local Council's Association, and the organizers of the Guiseley Town Council Petition in January 2014. To expand on these points 1 Parish and Town Councils: recent issues, 1) The Neighbourhood Forum is designated by Leeds City Council to do a neighborhood plan for Aireborough; which covers Guiseley. The purpose of the Forum is to "facilitate collaboration between the Area's stakeholders in order to improve economic, social, cultural and environmental well-being". The specifics of this are laid out in our constitution which you will find here https://aireboroughnf.files.wordpress.com/2014/10/andf-oct-2014.pdf. The Forum has always considered itself to be a 'stage' in the process of improving community governance, and we have written the evaluation of that into our constitution, which was a key part of our getting designated status from Leeds City Council. We discussed with Chris Pilkington and fact that once the Neighbourhood Plan is complete, that the Forum could, with local agreement, apply to become a 'Parish Council(s)' without the need for a petition. That idea could be put to local people at the same referendum as the neighbourhood development plan – which is paid for by DCLG as part of the neighborhood planning support. There are advantages to taking this route for both effectiveness and convenience which we believe are measures you consider in the governance review. In addition, this route is helpful to your review criteria of ensuring that governance reflects the identities and interests of an area. The first advantage concerns effectiveness: a key reason for people signing the current petition is for the Town Council to try and control overdevelopment and traffic congestion in the area. Obviously there is a misunderstanding here as to the powers of a Parish Council: a council does not have control over these areas and so cannot be effective in this regard.</p>

Community Governance Review - Proposed Guiseley Town Council Representation Log

<u>File Ref.</u>	<u>Date</u>	<u>Capacity</u>	<u>In Support?</u>	<u>Comments</u>
		377 continued		<p>However, local people can shape the place they live (under the Localism Act 2011) through a neighborhood development plan, and a designated body. And we already have that in place. People can already work on the issues of development and congestion, and at a later stage, when people are more involved and more knowledgeable about local governance, take the important decision of whether to Parish or not; with much more understanding of what a Parish Council can and cannot do. We consider this to be a far more effective, and convenient route to improving a very crucial concern for people in Aireborough particularly, but not solely, Guiseley. The second advantage of this route also helps the measure of effectiveness. The Neighbourhood Forum and planning process, by being inclusive, will have involved more people in civic affairs and the issues of the area. Therefore, there may be more people willing to step forward and be considered as potential Councillors, as they will know what it entails. Lack of candidates for a Parish Council is often an issue, and people in Guiseley during this review, have been particularly worried about who is likely to stand – many people involved in the community do so for that reason; they absolutely do not want to stand under the banner of any political party to continue doing so. Being involved in the non-party political Neighbourhood Forum could, therefore, give them the confidence and the exposure to stand as successful Independent candidates; and strengthen democratic choice. The third advantage is again one of effectiveness, in that people will have a better idea of what a Parish Council can and cannot do, and therefore the value for money they might get. This is an important consideration, when a number of our residents already face paying council tax, a management fee on their newly build estate (in some cases this is in excess of £100 a year), and then a Parish precept on top. We also have areas of deprivation, where even a small Parish precept would be a concern. Fourthly, the route we suggest is an effective and convenient way of having a democratic referendum on governance. We understand that Leeds Council has declined to pay £40,000 for a referendum at this current time – we also know that there is a potential Yeadon Town Council in the pipeline. Yet, we know that for legitimacy a referendum is important, as currently there are highly divided opinions on whether a Town Council is needed or not, for a number of different reasons. We feel pushing a Town Council on a large proportion of residents who do not want it, and who feel that there has not been a well publicized consultation, discussion and vote – would be divisive. Divisive is the actually word people are using to describe this current process, and what may well ensue, and some residents are already threatening that they will not pay the precept. This cannot be considered effective. This situation has not been helped by the petition's organizing group sending out a leaflet about the Community Infrastructure Levy, which was misleading. It was also considered to be Party Political Campaigning as it attacked another party and one of the signatories was a perspective parliamentary candidate for Pudsey, who does not live in Guiseley. In addition, the City Councillors could only afford to send other information with their position to a small number of residents to alert them to the consultation. Surely this is all very inadequate and unbalanced. Political party politics should not enter into a Governance Review. Therefore, we would suggest that our route with its experience, inclusiveness and referendum may be far less divisive and lead to a more effective Council or Councils (when considering Yeadon); if that was what people chose.</p>
		377 continued		<p>2) Our second point on governance and taking the staged approach, is to do with geographical area and what constitutes Guiseley? Which is an important consideration for ensuring that identity and interests are properly reflected as it says in the Act. You will have had many letters from people in Hawksworth, High Royds, and Moorland Crescent, Menston, to complain that they do not wish to be part of a Guiseley Town Council. Quite rightly: these areas all have their own identity or feel they belong to another community not to the township of Guiseley. High Royds is a new village, but its residents have far more to do with Menston than Guiseley. They shop in Menston, go to church and attend groups in Menston, and the primary children go to school in Menston. All the area, Hawksworth, High Royds and Menston have their own community groups which also should be part of your governance review under section (b) above. However, all these areas are historically, and through identity, part of Aireborough, along with Guiseley, Yeadon and Rawdon. (In the same way as other communities are part of Wharfedale.) We have found that they are content to be part of the Aireborough Neighbourhood Development Forum and are working together collaboratively to pool talent to solve the various development issues we face and to consider the plan for the future. When we set up the Forum, we looked very carefully at the issue of whether there should be a neighborhood plan for Guiseley, Yeadon, Rawdon, Hawksworth, and High Royds/Menston, separately, or whether the area's issues were better solved at an Aireborough level. After a lot of research, local people, including our MP's and Councillors all decided that Aireborough was the best level for a neighborhood plan for a variety of good reasons. We looked at this to a far greater depth than the current governance review has been able to do, and would be happy to share this evidence. We also discussed this with Chris Pilkington, who advised that the governance review should actually be for Aireborough – then it could consider if one council or many was the way to go. This does not appear to have happened. The positioning we take is that Aireborough is the area of distinctiveness that has common demos. However, this does not subsume the identities of the different villages and townships. We take a 'quarters' approach to the neighborhood plan, which balances the strength of variety with cohesiveness. This indeed was the whole purpose of setting up an Aireborough Council in 1937 which brought together in common cause the councils of Yeadon, Guiseley and Rawdon – and stopped the unhelpful 'bickering' hindering development. It is also the case that Leeds has designated Aireborough as a major settlement in its Local Development Plan, and has set targets such as housing on an Aireborough basis. A major settlement has to have services and facilities that complement that standing, and it is doubtful that a major settlement could manage that if there were five different governance groups. That is not an efficient or cost effective way of solving the issues of an area which involve serious infrastructure and future development solutions, and needs people to work together. So, in conclusion we await the governance review's consultation with the Aireborough Neighbourhood Development Forum, so that we can share with you the work on governance we have done to date. We also urge you not to forget the other groups involved such as Hawkesworth Residents Association, High Royds Residents Association, and Menston Parish Council. We also offer two solutions to the issue of an effective and convenient way to reach a fair and democratic decision on future governance; neither would not be divisive and both would consider identity and the interests of Aireborough and its constituent parts. 1. The Neighbourhood Forum is seen as a stage process to a referendum, at the time of the neighborhood development plan being completed, on both the acceptance of the plan and the decision on a Town Council(s), or other form of Governance. 2. Leeds City Council, conducts a series of debates on the issue of Governance in the area and the options, between now and May 2015. A referendum on the question of a Town Council can then be held at the same time as local and UK elections. The advantage being that people will be able to take a much more informed decision, on what the council would be for and if they would find that value for money. There is no urgency for this decision to be made (other than the year within which the report on governance has to be done) as the Neighbourhood Forum is already progressing the issue of most concern to people – the neighborhood development plan.</p>

Community Governance Review - Proposed Guiseley Town Council Representation Log

<u>File Ref.</u>	<u>Date</u>	<u>Capacity</u>	<u>In Support?</u>	<u>Comments</u>
378	28/11/2014	Elector		I would be grateful if you could add my name to the list that support the proposition of a town council for Guiseley. I am truly appalled at the duplicitous nature of local Councillor Graham Latty's in respect to his revised views and subsequent treatment of the original petition for a town council. The area has seen a number of changes in recent years that in my mind, and that of many of my peers, have been to the detriment of the local community. I support the premise of a town council on the basis that a local level of government stands a better chance of having an impact in supporting the interests of different groups in the community, and is more likely to act as the true voice for the local residents, owing to the proposed body being closer to the source of the matters that concern the area of Guiseley. Please forward my concerns to the relevant people at Leeds City Council.

Directory of Parish/Town Councils 2014













Type: **PC** = Council **PM** = Parish Meeting **CPC** = Common Parish Council **TC** = Town Council

Parish/Town Council	Parish/Town Council Wards	Polling District(s)	Electorate	No. of Cllrs	Type	Clerk	Contact Details
Aberford & District	Aberford	HAC HAG	235 667	5	PC	Ms Julie Sou	3 Beech Walk Adel Leeds LS16 8NY ☎ 0771 979 7072 ✉ jsou.aberford@outlook.com
	Lotherton cum Aberford	HAD	172	2			
	Parlington	HAE	72	2			
	Sturton Grange	GSA	306	2			
Allerton Bywater	Central	KML	566	2	PC	Mrs Clare Murray	4 St Mary's Court Allerton Bywater, Castleford WF10 2AZ ☎ 01977 517519 ✉ abparishclerk@tiscali.co.uk
	East	KMF	1948	4			
	North	KMG	1188	4			
Alwoodley	-	ALB	2749	11	PC	Mrs Catriona Hanson	17 Oakridge Court, Bingley, BD16 4TA ☎ 07532 011269 ✉ the.clerk@alwoodleyparishcouncil.org
	-	ALH	2813				
	-	ALI	742				
	-	ALJ	866				
Arthington	-	AWI	214	5	PC	Ms Val Butcher	2 Valley View, Arthington, Otley LS21 1NP ☎ 0113 2842065 ✉ arthingtonparish@live.co.uk
	-	AWL	245				
Austhorpe	East	GSQ	21	0	PM	-	-
	West	GSR	12				
Bardsey cum Rigton	-	HAN	1276	9	PC	Mrs P J Gallant	21 Rose Croft, East Keswick Leeds LS17 9HR ☎ 01937 573365 ✉ june.gallant@virgin.net
	-	HAO	681				

Parish/Town Council	Parish/Town Council Wards	Polling District(s)	Electorate	No. of Cllrs	Type	Clerk	Contact Details
Barwick in Elmet & Scholes	Barwick	HAF	2115	6	PC	Mr Keith Langley	33 Flats Lane, Barwick in Elmet LS15 4LJ ☎ 0113 393 5861 💻 clerkLS154@btinternet.com
	Scholes	HAJ	2031	6			
Boston Spa	-	WYF	1305	10	PC	Vivienne Skinner	The Village Hall, High Street, Boston Spa, Wetherby LS23 6AA ☎ 01937 843956 💻 clerk@bostonspapc.org.uk
	-	WYI	2054				
Bramham cum Oglethorpe	-	WYH	1363	9	PC	Ms Marie Lynch	1 Fossards Close, Bramham LS 23 6WD 💻 ☎ 01937 841328 clerk@bramhamparishcouncil.org.uk
Bramhope & Carlton	Bramhope	AWJ	2816	13	CPC	Mrs Kate Fraser	Robert Craven Hall, Old Lane, Bramhope, Leeds LS16 9AZ ☎ 07530 900934 💻 bramhopecarlton@hotmail.com
	Carlton	OYF	136				
Clifford	-	WYG	1358	9	PC	Mr Peter Seed	1 Mill Dam, Clifford, Wetherby, LS23 6EZ ☎ 07500 462279 💻 clerk@clifford-pc.org.uk
Collingham with Linton	Collingham	HAK	1881	7	PC	Mrs Gina Carter	3 Keswick Grange, East Keswick, Leeds, LS17 9BX ☎ 07778140837 💻 CLPCclerk@gmail.com
	Linton	HAL	573	3			
Drighlington	East	MNF	1677	4	PC	Mr Derek Lacey	105 Rein Road, Tingley WF3 1QJ ☎ 0113 2532528 💻
	West	MNA	2646	8			


Parish/Town Council	Parish/Town Council Wards	Polling District(s)	Electorate	No. of Cllrs	Type	Clerk	Contact Details
East Keswick	-	HAM	970	7	PC	Mrs P J Gallant	21 Rose Croft, East Keswick Leeds LS17 9HR ☎ 01937 573365 💻 june.gallant@virgin.net
Gildersome	-	MNB	3092	13	PC	Ms Sheila Leeman	59 Forest Bank, Gildersome, Leeds LS27 7AD ☎ 0113 2536412 💻 leemans01@ntlworld.com
	-	MNG	1540				
Great & Little Preston	-	GSK	970	9	PC	Cllr Ian Wallace Chairman	☎ 0113 2867991 💻 ian.wallace21@btopenworld.com
	-	GSO	235				
Harewood	Harewood & Wike	HAH	509	2	PC	Mr Kevin Sedman	36 High Ash Mount, Leeds LS17 8RW ☎ 0113 3490685 💻 harewoodpc@yahoo.co.uk
	Wigton	ALA	2526	7			
Horsforth	Broadfields	HOG	2966	5	TC	Mr Tom Ferry	Mechanics Institute Town Street, Horsforth Leeds LS18 5BL ☎ 0113 2580988 💻 clerk@horsforthtowncouncil.gov.uk
	Brownberrie	HOB	2832	5			
	Hall Park	HOE HOJ	1618 2243	5			
	Victoria	HOD HOI	1596 2230	5			
	Woodside	HOC	1388	2			
Kippax	Central	KMH KMK	1740 1075	6	PC	Mr Colin Child	The Stables, Rudstone Grove Sherburn In Elmet LS25 6EQ ☎ 07775 567094 💻 clerk.kippaxparishcouncil@btinternet.com
	East	KMJ	2423	5			
	North	KMC	2501	5			

Parish/Town Council	Parish/Town Council Wards	Polling District(s)	Electorate	No. of Cllrs	Type	Clerk	Contact Details
Ledsham	-	KME	153	7	PC	Chris Pilkington	41 The Oval, Notton, Wakefield, West Yorkshire, WF4 2NX ☎ 01226 700260/07754 905223 💻 clerk@ledshamparishcouncil.gov.uk
Ledston	-	KMD	169	5	PC	Ms Catherine Black	7 Main Street, Ledston, Castleford WF10 2AA ☎ 07775 567094 💻 chrisblackmail@tiscali.co.uk
	-	KMI	146				
Micklefield	-	KMA	722	9	PC	Ms Joanne Hebden	6 Churchville Avenue, Micklefield, Leeds LS25 4AS ☎ 0113 2875829 💻 jobrigante@aol.com
	-	KMB	728				
Morley	Central	MSD MSE	1653 1386	3	TC	Ms Karen Oakley	Morley Town Hall Queen Street Morley LS27 9DY ☎ 0113 2474370 💻 town.clerk@morley.gov.uk
	Churwell	MND MNH MNI	821 1841 1515	4			
	Elmfield	MSC MSG	1869 1937	4			
	Scatcherd	MNC MNE	3102 1788	5			
	Teale	MSA MSB	1615 1220	3			
	Topcliffe	MSF MSI MSJ	1254 1147 2260	5			
	Woodkirk	MSH		2			
Otley	Ashfield	OYA	2714	5	TC	Suzanne Kidger Executive Officer	7 Bay Hourse Court Otley LS21 1HD ☎ 01943 466335
	Danefield	OYE	2236	4			
	Manor	OYC	2040	4			
	Prince Henry	OYD	1735	3			

	West Chevin	OYB	2272	4			 eo@otleytowncouncil.gov.uk
Parish/Town Council	Parish/Town Council Wards	Polling District(s)	Electorate	No. of Cllrs	Type	Clerk	Contact Details
Pool	-	AWG	224	9	PC	Mr John Ryan	11 Avondale Grove, Shipley, Bradford BD18 4QT  07766547651  poolparishcouncil@gmail.com
	-	AWH	1545				
Rawdon	Cragg Wood	HOA	336	1	PC	Ms Lis Moore	11 Lisker Avenue Otley LS21 1DG   clerk@rawdonparishcouncil.gov.uk
	Greenacre	GRG	1366	2			
	Larkfield	GRH	1810	3			
	Layton	HOF HOK	1858	3			
Scarcroft	-	HAA	1026	9	PC	Mrs Gina Carter	3 Keswick Grange, East Keswick, Leeds LS17 9BX  07778 140837  clerk@scarcroftparishcouncil.org
Shadwell	-	HAI	1556	9	PC	Ms Lesley Hoff	2 Parklands Crescent Bramhope Leeds LS16 9AQ  clerk@shadwell-parish-council.org
Swillington	-	GSI	162	9	PC	Ms Diane Brown Clerk and Responsible Officer	Five Gables, 5a Gunthwaite Lane Upper Denby, Huddersfield, HD8 8UL  01484 863233  Clerk@swillingtonparishcouncil.gov.uk
	-	GSJ	1647				
	-	GSS	870				
Thorner	-	HAB	1364	9	PC	Barry Riley	 0113 2892434  thornerparishcouncil@gmail.com

Parish/Town	Parish/Town Council	Polling	Electorate	No. of	Type	Clerk	Contact Details
-------------	---------------------	---------	------------	--------	------	-------	-----------------

Council	Wards	District(s)		Cllrs			
Thorp Arch	-	WYD	637	5	PC	Ms Tina Wormley	7 Woodlands Close Scarcroft Leeds LS14 3JP ☎ 0113 289 3624 💻 clerk@thorp-arch.org.uk
Walton	-	WYE	179	7	PC	Ms Janet Parkin	11 Chancel Square, Meanwood, Leeds,LS6 4FG ☎ 0113 2757129 💻 secretary@walton-pc.gov.uk
Wetherby	East	WYC WYJ	1544 859	5	TC	Ms B Ball	The Town Hall, Market Place, Wetherby LS22 6NE ☎ 01937 583584 💻 wetherbytc@btconnect.com
	North	WYA WYK	1454 1433	5			
	West	WYB WYL	2262 1269	5			
Wothersome	-	HAP	22	0	PM	Mr G C Wakeham	Wothersome Grange, Bramham Wetherby LS23 6LT



This page is intentionally left blank