

## **SCRUTINY BOARD (SUSTAINABLE ECONOMY AND CULTURE)**

**TUESDAY, 18TH NOVEMBER, 2014**

**PRESENT:** Councillor K Groves in the Chair

Councillors A Castle, J Chapman,  
D Cohen, P Davey, R Harington,  
A Hussain, M Ingham, S McKenna, B Selby  
and P Wadsworth

### **38 Late Items**

There were no formal late items of business to consider.

### **39 Declaration of Disclosable Pecuniary Interests**

There were no disclosable pecuniary interests declared at the meeting.

### **40 Apologies for Absence and Notification of Substitutes**

There were no apologies for absence.

### **41 Minutes - 21 October 2014**

**RESOLVED** – That the minutes of the meeting held on 21 October 2014 be confirmed as a correct record.

### **42 20mph Speed Limits in Leeds**

Members considered a report on the implementation of 20mph speed limits in Leeds.

In attendance to address the Board and answer Members' queries were:

- Councillor Richard Lewis, Executive Member for Transport and Economy
- Andrew Hall, Head of Transportation
- Kasia Speakman, Transport Planner
- Chief Inspector Phil Wiggins, Safer Leeds
- Mark Lansdown, 20s Plenty for Us

The following issues were raised in discussion:

- The Board heard about the Council's current approach to the phased implementation of 20mph zones, with a prioritised programme based on injury statistics and school travel areas. The present programme would eventually cover most residential streets.

- The key difference from the approach put forward by the 20s Plenty for Us campaign group was described in terms of process. The council had adopted an approach which involved consultation in each local area and the use of traffic calming measures where appropriate, whereas the campaign group advocated a blanket introduction of 20mph speed limits using signs and road markings rather than physical measures.
- Although cheaper to implement initially, the blanket approach could require more significant ongoing revenue support for education and enforcement, or the retro-fitting of physical measures in some cases. There was less evidence about the speed reductions achieved in areas with signs and lines only.
- It was noted that local councillors had contributed funding to implement schemes in some areas.
- Some concern was expressed about areas where the speed limit reduced from 40mph to 20mph in a short length of road.
- The potential health benefits from increased walking and cycling associated with lower traffic speeds was highlighted.
- The Board noted that road safety was a priority in the Police and Crime Commissioner's Plan.
- The Board was made aware of Safer Leeds' commitment to working in partnership at all stages from scheme design through to targeted enforcement in support of 20mph zones.
- It was suggested that there was potential to explore additional partnership funding opportunities in order to speed up implementation of 20mph zones, particularly with the full range of Health partners and the Police, but also giving consideration to other potential beneficiaries from a reduction in accidents, for example the DWP in terms of benefit payments or business interests. Examples were provided of partnership funding elsewhere.
- The 20s Plenty for Us campaign emphasised the desire for zones to be large enough to reflect communities' travel patterns, particularly the journey to school. It was also argued that increasing the area covered helped to create a 20mph culture.
- It was acknowledged that a blanket 20mph limit could be introduced on all residential streets, but this might be unpopular with communities, and was not considered to be enough on its own to reduce speeds significantly.
- It was also suggested that the amount of rural roads in the Leeds district meant that a blanket 20mph approach was not necessarily appropriate.
- Members recommended that as an immediate step, a default 20mph speed limit be adopted for all new residential developments.
- It was suggested that there was further scope for the 20s Plenty for Us campaign group to work with the council at a local level around initiatives including school cycling and community speed watch.
- It was noted that the Road Safety Partnership centrally controlled road cameras used for enforcement, with road policing also being determined at a West Yorkshire level. Neighbourhood Policing Teams

could provide a more localised and flexible response but their deployment had to be prioritised against a range of competing demands.

- The impact of national TV advertising campaigns in the past was highlighted.
- It was confirmed that the schools programme would take about 4 years to complete at the current funding levels, with a further consolidation phase taking until 2020, at a cost of around £3m.
- Problems with parking outside of schools was also highlighted as an issue of concern.

At the end of the discussion, the Board requested a report back in March 2015, providing further information on casualty figures for Leeds and the associated costs. Members also asked that potential additional funding opportunities be explored with all partners, particularly the Police and health partners, and that progress on this aspect also be reported back in March 2015.

#### **RESOLVED –**

- a) That the Director of City Development be recommended to take the necessary steps to implement a 20mph default speed limit for all new residential developments in Leeds.
- b) That the Board receive a progress report in March 2015, providing the information on casualties requested above and reporting progress on partnership funding opportunities.

(Councillor Hussain joined the meeting at 1.40pm and Councillor Castle left the meeting at 2.25pm during the discussion of this item.)

### **43 European Capital of Culture**

The Board considered a report on the current consultation being carried out to inform a decision next year by the Executive Board on whether Leeds should bid to become the 2023 European Capital of Culture.

In attendance to address the Board and answer Members' queries were:

- Councillor Lucinda Yeadon, Executive Member for Digital and Creative Technologies, Culture and Skills
- Cluny Macpherson, Chief Officer, Culture and Sport
- Dinah Clark, Principal Officer, Culture and Sport
- Leanne Buchan, Marketing Officer, City Development

The Board received a presentation setting out the background to the Capital of Culture scheme and summarising key messages arising from the consultation to date.

The following issues were raised in discussion:

- The extent and reach of consultation activity to date.
- The range of responses received and the level of commitment, including funding, from potential partners.
- The need to be realistic about funding for a bid in the current economic climate.
- Exploring the benefits to the city of bidding, especially if a bid was not successful.
- Members sought further clarification of the potential costs to the city council of bidding, including the short term costs of preparing an initial bid.
- The need to clearly define a legacy at an early stage.
- Research already undertaken around other cities who have been successful and advice received from experts in this field.
- The need for a credible cultural strategy for the city, even if a bid does not go ahead.
- The strong desire of Board Members for any bid to involve local communities in its development, and to deliver a year that local communities would benefit from.
- A request that all 99 councillors be asked whether they are in favour of the city bidding.
- Discussion of what might be included in a Leeds bid.
- The link to jobs and skills, and the importance of the cultural sector as a source of employment.
- The potential for a bid to have a regional dimension, acknowledging that the rules require bids to be based on a specific city.
- Opportunities to engage communities in the consultation, for example through Community Committees.
- The ability of hospitality and transport infrastructure to cope with a year-long event.
- Queries as to who the competition might be and why Manchester had already announced it would not bid.
- Potential links to the proposed Business Improvement District (BID) in the city centre.

At the end of the discussion Members requested a further report on the outcomes of the consultation process and providing more detail on costs, prior to a decision being taken by the Executive Board.

**RESOLVED** – That a further report be brought back to the Scrutiny Board in the spring, in advance of the Executive Board decision on whether to make a bid.

(Councillors Ingham, Cohen and Chapman left the meeting at 3.35pm, 3.55pm and 4.10pm respectively during the discussion of this item.)

#### **44 Recommendation Tracking**

Members considered a report presenting progress against one outstanding recommendation from the Board's previous inquiry on the engagement of young people in cultural, sporting and recreational activities.

**RESOLVED** – That the status of this recommendation be confirmed as category 4 (Not achieved – progress made acceptable. Continue monitoring.) with a further progress report to be scheduled in April 2015.

#### **45 Work Schedule**

The Board received a report of the Head of Scrutiny and Member Development which set out the latest version of the Board's work schedule.

Members agreed to add an additional session to the Employment and Skills inquiry to encompass: information on corporate budgets for employment and skills related activity; input from Community Committee champions; and the role of the City Region Enterprise Partnership. The Board also agreed to invite the Chair of the Resources and Council Services Scrutiny Board to take part in the remainder of the inquiry.

**RESOLVED** – That the work schedule be agreed.

#### **46 Date and Time of Next Meeting**

Tuesday 16 December 2014 at 1.30pm (a pre-meeting will start at 1.00pm for Board members.)

The meeting finished at 4.20pm